

How can career education and guidance address social justice?

**Exploring reflexivity and enactment
through cooperation with practitioners**

Kristin Midttun,

April 2015

Master dissertation in Career Education, Information and Guidance in
Higher Education, the University of Warwick

Abstract

In this dissertation I present research undertaken for two objectives: to explore how career education and guidance (CEG) can address social justice, and how reflexivity around the issue can be stimulated in the emerging Norwegian CEG profession. I critically evaluate selected texts (Irving, 2010; Irving, 2013; Rogers, 1977; Simon et al., 1991; Sultana, 2014), discussing how CEG can make positive contributions to social justice, but also has the potential to be oppressive and reproduce social injustice. A range of approaches are outlined, including individualistically oriented client guidance, group oriented educational approaches, and approaches that entail advocacy and systems work. I argue that the critical pedagogy approach of Simon et al. constitutes a particularly strong contribution because of its non-reductive and practical aspects. Seeing professional reflexivity as vital for the enactment of social justice and avoidance of oppressive practices, an innovative project is undertaken to facilitate professional reflexivity in Norwegian CEG, and to explore how social justice can be enacted by Norwegian CEG practitioners. A workshop for professional reflexivity around CEG and social justice is designed, and workshop content, objectives and materials are presented. Taking an action research approach, the workshop is trialled and evaluated in cooperation with two groups of Norwegian career professionals at County Career Centres, who have a dual role as practitioners and trainers. It is concluded that the workshop is successful and appropriate for further delivery to Norwegian CEG practitioners in a variety of contexts. Moreover, based on workshop analyses, I present recommendations for how the County Career Centres can address social justice in Norway.

Acknowledgements

Concluding this work, I am grateful to all those who have made the project possible and supported me. First, I could not have undertaken this research without the participation of the practitioners at two County Career Centres. You know who you are, and I will extend my gratitude once again for you taking of your precious time, engaging strongly in the workshops and being so enjoyable to cooperate with. The CEIGHE master programme at the University of Warwick has provided a strong learning experience for me. My dissertation supervisor Phil Mc Cash has been of invaluable support with his sharp eye for academic content and good humoured and constructive supervision. Moreover, my employers at the Career Centre at the University of Oslo and subsequently The National Unit for Lifelong Guidance have been supportive and allowed for flexible work hours. This has been crucial for my undertaking master studies while being in work life. My thanks furthermore go out to my prior and current colleagues. You have all contributed to my professional development, been supportive throughout my studies and provided good company. At home, my partner Atle's faith in me has been relentless; his willingness to take part in the ups and downs of my research process has been of great comfort. Our dog, Rufus, also deserves acknowledgement for his regular insistence on taking breaks to refresh my thinking in the woods of Oslo. Finally, I want to thank my friends for their continual cheering, care and invigorating company.

Content

- Chapter 1: Introduction and research questions 1
 - Introduction..... 1
 - Research questions 4
- Chapter 2: Research methods, ethics and reflexivity..... 5
 - Research methods..... 5
 - Ethics and reflexivity 9
- Chapter 3: Response to research question 1 - How can CEG address social justice? 12
 - Perspectives on social justice 12
 - CEG’s current and future role..... 14
 - Enactment of social justice..... 15
 - Expansiveness versus reductionism 16
 - Applicability 18
 - Conclusion 20
- Chapter 4: Response to research question 2 - Workshop design 22
 - Backdrop..... 22
 - Workshop outline: learning outcomes, sections’ content and learning evidence..... 23
 - Workshop rationales: pedagogy, content, negotiation and evaluation 32
- Chapter 5: Response to research question 3 - Learning from the workshops..... 38
 - Research question 3a: Review of workshop 38
 - Conclusion 43
 - Recommendations for further workshop delivery..... 44
 - Research question 3b: The County Career Centres’ addressing of social justice..... 44
 - Foundation for enactment 45
 - Enactment 47
 - The practitioners’ position – scope for further enactment..... 50
 - Conclusion 51
 - Recommendations to the County Career Centres 52
- Chapter 6: Summary, critical reflections and recommendations..... 53
 - Summary 53
 - Critical reflections..... 56
 - Recommendations 59
- List of references..... 62

Bibliography.....	66
Appendices	69
Appendix 1 Research project timeline.....	69
Appendix 2 Glossary	70
Appendix 3 Workshop information and consent form.....	71
Appendix 4 Workshop consent form II.....	74
Appendix 5 Workshop evaluation form - template.....	75
Appendix 6 Workshop summaries and exercises - template	78
Appendix 7 Workshop feedback forms – summary	91
Appendix 8 Extended info on the practitioners’ position	96
Appendix 9 Workshop presentation slides.....	98

List of tables

Table 1: Watts' approaches to socio-political ideologies in career education and guidance	1
Table 2: Selected texts for the literature review.....	6
Table 3: Analytical framework for the literature review.....	7
Table 4: Workshop learning outcomes (LOs)	23
Table 5: Overview - workshop sections.....	24
Table 6: Workshop section 1	25
Table 7: Workshop section 2	26
Table 8: Workshop section 3	27
Table 9: Workshop section 4	28
Table 10: Workshop section 5	29
Table 11: Workshop section 6.....	30
Table 12: Learning outcomes and corresponding learning evidence	31
Table 13: Learning outcomes, evidence and achievements	40
Table 14: Recommendations for further workshop delivery	44
Table 15: Recommendations to the County Career Centres.....	52
Table 16: Content of workshop sections - summarised	55
Table 17: Summary - Scope for further work	60

Chapter 1: Introduction and research questions

Introduction

While socio-political concerns were fundamental to the founding father of career guidance, Frank Parsons (1909/1989), attention to such issues has been fluctuating among career theoreticians and practitioners in the subsequent century. Tony Watts has pointed to the political nature of career education and guidance (CEG), and claimed that a neutral position is impossible, unless society is just:

Careers education and guidance is a profoundly political process. It operates at the interface between the individual and society, between self and opportunity, between aspiration and realism. It facilitates the allocation of life chances. Within a society in which such life chances are unequally distributed, it faces the issue of whether it serves to reinforce such inequalities or to reduce them (Watts 1996: 351).

Moreover, Watts has articulated four socio-political approaches, based on the dichotomous scopes of individual versus society, and initiating change versus accepting status quo (1996: 355). These are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Watts' approaches to socio-political ideologies in career education and guidance

	Core focus on society	Core focus on individual
Change	Radical (social change)	Progressive (individual change)
Status quo	Conservative (social control)	Liberal (non-directive)

Following Watts' arguments, the radical, and partly the progressive position, are most easily

identified with social justice agendas¹. The conservative approach contributes - at best unintentionally - to social control by serving the interests of the labour market, rather than social justice for clients. The non-directive character of the liberal approach is considered to reproduce social patterns that are unjust.

CEG practice has largely attended to the individual; progressive approaches and the liberal position inspired by Rogerian philosophy (Rogers, 1951), have a strong hold. However, globalisation and financial crises have spurred attention to structural influences on careers, and to how CEG can respond. Several theorists have argued that structural and critical perspectives, systems work and advocacy, should be part of CEG training and practices (McMahon et al., 2008; Watson, 2010; Arthur, 2008). IAEVG, the world's largest organisation for educational and vocational guidance, has appealed to providers, practitioners, academics and policy makers that they "increase their efforts by embracing social justice as a core value that guides their practices" (IAEVG, 2014: 154-155). Ronald Sultana, professor and contributor to OECD and EU policy development on CEG, has voiced concern that CEG practices can feed into neoliberal regimes and perpetuate injustice (2014). He calls for the profession to collectively develop a "more grounded understanding of the possibilities of enacting social justice..." (2014: 331). Other writers have presented explicit critique of the social control function carried out by CEG (McIlveen and Patton, 2006; Plant and Thomsen, 2012; Plant and Valgreen, 2014). This international attention to social justice has raised questions for me about the relevance of placing social justice on the agenda of Norwegian CEG. The CEG delivery and profession is not very well developed in Norway (OECD, 2002; OECD, 2014a; Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2010). Simultaneously, the situation is comparatively good, with unemployment rates around 3% (NAV, 2015), more than 90% of employees holding permanent positions (Svalund, 2013), and a top ranking on the UN Inequality-adjusted Human Development Index (UNDP, 2013: 153). Still, there are social and economic inequalities in Norway that are a source of concern (Finansdepartementet, 2009: 21), e.g. nearly 15% of the population is living at risk of poverty or social exclusion (Eurostat, 2012: 3). Moreover, it has been argued that inequalities are on the rise (Piketty and

¹ There is no universally accepted definition of social justice. Disparate definitions will be further explored in the literature review of the dissertation. Most writers relate social justice to issues of economic distribution, however many will argue that cultural and social dimensions should be included in its definition, and particularly issues related to recognition and participation (Halsaa and Hellum 2010; Fraser 2009).

Goldhammer, 2014). Thus, there is a case for addressing social justice in Norway, and for Norwegian CEG to engage with the issue.

My research approach is *work based* in the sense that I draw on my professional experience within Norwegian CEG for nearly a decade. I am currently a senior adviser in the National Unit for Lifelong Guidance (NULG), a subsidiary of the Ministry of Education. The NULG's overall mission is to contribute to the coordination and professionalisation of Norwegian CEG, and to secure all inhabitants' access to career guidance (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2010). In my research I want to explore how CEG can address social justice, and in particular, how the County Career Centres (CCCs)² can address social justice in Norway³. I aim to develop my own and practitioners' reflexivity around social justice. Ultimately, I hope to contribute to a stronger enactment of social justice. Summing up, my objectives for this project are the following:

1. Explore how CEG can address social justice – by means of a literature review and cooperation with Norwegian CEG practitioners
2. Develop my own and practitioners' reflexivity and stance with regard to social justice

My research project is rooted in a constructionist epistemological position, which applies to research in general, as well as to the issue of CEG and social justice in particular. I see subject and object as intermingled, and knowledge as constructed, rather than objective; "Meaning is not discovered, but constructed" (Crotty, 1998: 9). The constructed character of knowledge applies to all sides of my research, including my sources and my own theorising. I have not set out to test hypotheses. Rather, I have taken inspiration from Bent Flyvbjerg's argument in *Making Social Science Matter*, to create a research design that can serve my practice and hopefully that of others:

² In the last decade, 38 public CCCs have been established in Norway, covering all but two counties. These centres are considered a vital measure for the operational side of the NULG's goals. They provide free guidance to adults, are resource centres for practitioners in schools and Public Labour and Welfare Services (LWS), and coordinate and facilitate cooperation among relevant parties in the counties, including employers. The centres are founded on a partnership between the LWS and educational authorities in each county. The NULG has a responsibility to follow up and support these centres in particular.

...alternative social science is dedicated to enhancing a socially relevant form of knowledge, that is, “phronesis” (practical wisdom on how to address and act on social problems, in a particular context)...Phronesis, in this sense, is knowledge that is sensitive to its application in specific settings (2012: 1).

Following my constructionist epistemology, I will work within interpretivist frameworks (Crotty, 1998), undertaking research that will be exploratory in character (Robson, 2002).

Research questions

My research questions are the following:

- 1) *How can CEG address social justice?*
- 2) *Based on my introduction, and response to research question 1: How can I design a workshop that can enable Norwegian CEG practitioners to address social justice?*
- 3) *Based on experiences with design, negotiation, delivery and evaluation of the workshop for two County Career Centres:*
 - a. *To what extent is the workshop successful and suitable for further delivery?*
 - b. *How can the County Career Centres address social justice in Norway?*

The timeline for the research project is presented in Appendix 1. Appendix 2 contains a glossary for the acronyms I apply as well as explanations of some Norwegian concepts that I refer to.

Chapter 2: Research methods, ethics and reflexivity

In the following I will present my research methods, taking each research question in turn. I will proceed to discuss research ethics and reflexivity.

Research methods

Research question 1:

How can CEG address social justice?

Research question 1 is answered with a literature review. Data has been collected through online searches in academic journals, Google and Google Scholar, and through the pursuit of relevant references within articles and textbook chapters. Starting out, main search words were “socio-political + career guidance/counselling” and “social justice + career guidance/counselling”. I identified far more literature than I could include within the scope of my project (parts of it is referenced in the bibliography following my references). Thus, I have chosen to undertake an in-depth exploration of selected texts that appeared particularly relevant to the establishment of my own position. Moreover, the selected texts represent a breadth of perspectives, including what Watts labelled liberal, progressive and radical socio-political ideologies (1996). The selected texts are presented in Table 2. Between them these texts represent one of the most influential theorists on CEG (Rogers), and a central provider of analyses for CEG policy development over the last decade (Sultana). Irving is a CEG researcher who has made social justice his key issue. He takes quite a radical stand; hence his texts offer ample opportunity to discuss ideals versus realities. Simon et al.’s text presents a practical pedagogy for enactment of social justice. Some of the texts primarily refer to career education, others to guidance. I have considered writing about either of these, yet decided to include both. I want to take a broad approach, and do not see the two as essentially different. Rather, I believe an extended transfer of approaches between them would be appropriate in Norwegian CEG.

Table 2: Selected texts for the literature review

Authors	Texts
Barrie Irving	<p>(Re)constructing career education as a socially just practice: An antipodean reflection in <i>International Journal for Educational and Vocational Practice</i> (2010)</p> <p>Re/constructing career education as a critical social practice: Pushing the discursive boundaries of possibility. Paper presented at IAEVG conference (2013)</p>
Carl Rogers	<p>Introduction</p> <p>Chapter 6: The Person-centered approach and the oppressed</p> <p>Chapter 9: The power of the powerless</p> <p>Chapter 12: The emerging person: Spearhead of the quiet revolution</p> <p>Chapter 13: Conclusion. In a nutshell</p> <p>(pp xi-xiii + 105-114 + 186-204, 255-290) in <i>On personal power. Inner strength and its revolutionary impact</i> (1977)</p>
Roger L. Simon, Don Dippo and Arleen Schenke	<p>Introduction</p> <p>Session outline for career planning and the use of tests</p> <p>(pp 1-23 + 154-158) in <i>Learning work. A critical pedagogy of work education</i> (1991)</p>
Ronald Sultana	<p>Chapter 18: Career Guidance for Social Justice in Neoliberal Times</p> <p>in <i>International Handbook for Career Development</i> (2014)</p>

In the literature review I identify what kinds of social justice perspectives, roles and actions that are advocated. Moreover, I search for what I have termed expansive positions; positions that retain complexity and encourage critical thinking, rather than compliance with the authors. The expansive positions also avoid reductionism. By reductionism I refer to an excessive emphasis on one aspect, which results in the negligence of other, reasonable or legitimate aspects. Lastly, the review attends to the applicability of the advocated positions. This analytical framework is summed up in Table 3.

Table 3: Analytical framework for the literature review

Aspect	Elaboration
1. Social justice definition/perspective	What definition of, or perspectives on, social justice are advocated?
2. CEG's current and future role	How do the authors view CEG's current and desirable future role with regard to social justice?
3. Enacting change	How do the authors suggest that CEG professionals enact social justice?
4. Expansiveness	To what extent are the authors taking expansive or reductionist positions?
5. Applicability: Specificity and feasibility	Do the authors describe specific ways for CEG professionals to enact change? Are the suggested actions, roles and strategies feasible? E.g. is it likely that CEG professionals will be willing and able to commit to them?

Research question 2:

Based on my introduction, and response to research question 1: *How can I design a workshop that can enable Norwegian CEG practitioners to address social justice?*

The research strategy for question 2 is work-based action research, meaning the research is not only based on my Master's degree, but furthermore on my professional experience within CEG. Moreover, according to Michael Hammond and Jerry Wellington,

Action research seeks to address social and professional problems...a form of practitioner inquiry focused on an attempt to improve practice, through a systematic cycle, or cycles, of planning, doing and reflecting (2013: 4).

Question 2 relates to the first part of this cycle; to *develop* and *plan* for a workshop. Data has been collected and constructed through use of my dissertation introduction, answers to research question 1, and my knowledge of Norwegian CEG. To provide rigour to the workshop's learning design, I have established an analytical framework, drawing on David Kolb's experiential learning theory (1984), and elements from Donald Kirkpatrick's four level model of training criteria (Kirkpatrick, 1976; Kirkpatrick, 1996). Furthermore, I have taken inspiration from person-centred philosophy and critical pedagogy (Rogers, 1994, Simon et al., 1991). These analytical frameworks will be further elaborated in Chapters 4 and 5.

Research question 3:

Based on the experiences with design, negotiation, delivery and evaluation of the workshop for two County Career Centres:

3a: To what extent is the workshop successful and suitable for further delivery in Norwegian CEG?

3b: How can County Career Centres address social justice in Norway?

The work based action research strategy is extended to answer these questions; this time involving practitioners, and focusing on the *doing* and *reflecting*, followed by *recommendations* (Hammond and Wellington, 2013: 4). The workshop product from research question 2 is trialled and evaluated, with the cooperation of two groups of Norwegian CEG practitioners. In order to recruit practitioners, I approached the managers of two CCCs; they responded quickly and positively. CCCs were chosen due to their broad role: to provide guidance for all adults, to serve as resource centres for career practitioners within schools and public labour and welfare services (LWS), and to cooperate with regional partners, including local business. The choice of two trial groups was taken partly to ensure accomplishment, even if unforeseen circumstances should lead to one group dropping out.

Moreover, I wanted the opportunity to integrate feedback from a first group, trialling it in a second workshop. Given the project's explorative character, I found it sufficient to undertake the workshop twice. Finally, the scope of the project limited the number of workshops I could undertake and analyse.

Data was collected through delivery and recording of two workshops, including a joint evaluation session. Additionally, I asked for individual, anonymous feedback from the participants in an electronic evaluation form, which they submitted three days after the workshops. There were respectively four and five participants in the workshops, and the low number of workshops and participants makes the material inappropriate for generalisations. Nevertheless, I contend the participants' feedback and learning evidence is useful for answering question 3a. Being experienced trainers themselves, the practitioners were particularly well equipped to review the learning experience. Moreover, I will argue a case of *transferability* in my use of workshop findings for answering question 3b, something I will elaborate in Chapter 5. A process of respondent validation was undertaken (Denscombe, 2007: 297): I sent nearly finished drafts of my answers to research questions 3a and 3b for the workshop participants to read and comment on. The feedback I received was positive, and did not contain any suggestions for changes. This validation process contributed to the validity/credibility of the data, and moreover to the safeguarding of the cooperating participants.

As in research question 2, I have used Kirkpatrick's and Kolb's models in the analytical framework for research question 3a (Kirkpatrick, 1976; Kirkpatrick, 1996; Kolb, 1984). However, while Kolb's model is predominant in my answer to question 2, Kirkpatrick's model is predominant in question 3a. Research question 3b can be seen as a specific and contextualised version of research question 1, and it largely shares question 1's analytical framework, which was presented on page 7.

Ethics and reflexivity

Researcher role

I have given consideration to whether I should undertake the research project as an "independent" student, or as a NULG staff member, and discussed this with my manager.

We decided it would be most appropriate that I undertook the research independently. First, I did not want my studies to cause challenges or ambiguities for my new work situation. Secondly, the student researcher role would give greater latitude to express my views in workshops and writing, regardless of how they relate to the NULG's work. Nevertheless, I have drawn on my work experience in my researcher role. The workshop participants recognised me as a NULG employee, but were explicitly informed about the independent character of the project. I was careful to consistently use my personal contact information in my dialogue with them.

Harm, confidentiality and consent

The project has been informed by Denscombe's guidelines for the protection of the participants' interests: to do no physical or psychological harm, to treat the information as confidential, and to guarantee the anonymity of the organisations and individuals taking part, in any published documents (2010: 331-332). In particular, I aimed for a data collection that would "not be unduly intrusive, respect the participants' privacy and sensitivities" (ibid). I developed a consent form for participants that included information on research aim and design, specified what was expected of the participants, and emphasised their right to withdraw, as well as guaranteeing confidentiality (Appendix 3). Furthermore, I informed the participants that I wanted to make recordings, and they consented to this. Consent forms were signed by participants and the researcher prior to the workshops; they will be stored safely for a limited period of time before destruction. My original research question 3b was not directly related to the CCCs, hence I did not initially ask explicitly for consent to write about the centres. Through my workshop analyses, I realised I wanted to write about the CCCs, and chose to confer with the participants again. A second consent was given by all participants (Appendix 4).

Reflexivity

According to Kathryn J. Ahern, "total objectivity is neither achievable nor necessarily desirable in qualitative research" (1999: 407). Nevertheless, she argues the value of identifying "potential bias and to 'bracket' them, so that their influence on the research process is minimal" (ibid). Ahern builds on Michael Crotty's understanding of bracketing as

...the process in which researchers endeavours not to allow their assumptions to shape the data collection process and the persistent effort not to impose their own understanding and constructions on the data (ibid).

While I see the value of identifying and exposing my biases for myself and my readers, I do not fully agree with the aim for them to have a minimal influence. Following my epistemological and theoretical stances and my aims for this study, I have allowed experiences, emotions, values and theoretical preferences to influence my choice of research issue, literature and questions. Moreover, my motivation is related to a particular aim: a stronger enactment of social justice by Norwegian CEG. Simultaneously, I have aspired to facilitate the participants' critical thinking, and I received feedback that I succeeded in not imposing my own views on them. I have taken cues from Ahern's guidance for bracketing, not to minimise all subjective influences on the research process, but to examine systematically, and expose *how* my subjectivity influences on the research process. More specifically, I have reflected on power distribution, potential role conflicts, and personal issues and interests. I have also explored my personal value systems and feelings that could indicate a lack of neutrality (Ahern, 1999: 408-410). These reflections resulted in an increased awareness of several issues. First, it strengthened my dedication to communicate in a way that minimised any power issues between me and the workshop participants. Moreover, I identified potential role conflicts, and adapted the research design to avoid this. At last, I identified some personal values and views around independence, critical perspectives and economic discourses that were emotionally charged to me, and that I needed to be aware of in workshop facilitation.

The primary gate-keepers for this project were the managers and staff members of the centres that I wanted to cooperate with. I know they are under time pressure, and made sure that requests were sent in good time. One group contacted me for a rescheduling, and both parties needed to show considerable flexibility to find a solution. I was aware that the participants might have concerns about how I would use the findings, so I was very clear on my intentions to safeguard them and their interests. Moreover, I followed up on this when undertaking a second round of consents.

Chapter 3: Response to research question 1 - How can CEG address social justice?

In the following I will critically evaluate my selected texts. I start out by presenting different perspectives on social justice, as well as suggestions for CEG's social justice roles and enactment. Subsequently, I will review the authors' positions, and in particular, whether their arguments are expansive. I will also consider the applicability of their suggestions. Throughout the review I will establish my own position, which I will summarise at the end of the chapter.

Perspectives on social justice

The selected authors' perspectives on social justice differ, and are, to a varying degree, explicitly defined. Drawing on Gale (2000), Irving gives his account of the ideologies behind retributive, distributive and recognitive forms of justice (Irving, 2010: 52-54), to which I will refer briefly. Within *retributive justice*, it is argued that everyone gets what s/he deserves. The logic is that of the market, and inequality is seen as a motivator for work performance. The state's role is cast as the securing of well-functioning markets and the fostering of individual responsibility. Within a *distributive justice*, inequalities are acknowledged and attempts made at "levelling the playing field". Simultaneously, competition is appreciated and economic participation encouraged, but a social security net is in place. A *recognitive form of justice* involves recognition of difference on the basis of group identity. Different ways of relating to family, community, culture and society are acknowledged. It is recognised that oppression takes place in a variety of ways, and efforts are made to assure the voices of marginalised are heard. Dialogue is cultivated, moreover the fostering of self-respect and opportunities for self-expression. Economic concerns are placed within a social frame, and the distribution of goods does not revolve around labour market participation. Irving contends there is insufficient attention to economic distribution within a recognitive justice ideology, and moreover, that the ideology can lead to reification and essentialising of social and cultural differences. Following this, he advocates a *critical social justice model*, which he purports takes up the qualities of the recognitive form, and furthermore "engages with a more critical and democratic stance" (Irving, 2010: 52-53). A more holistic and inclusive

understanding is provided, by seeing (re)distribution as integrated with recognition of difference and diversity (Gale and Densmore, 2003, Irving, 2010). Equitable distribution of economic goods is secured. Individuals and groups are not primarily prized for their economic potential, but for their social contribution, and who they are. To strengthen identification, understanding and addressing of issues of oppression and domination, members of all groups are encouraged to discuss and critique their own and “others” practices (Parekh, 2000 in Irving 2010).

The retributive, distributive and recognitive forms of justice are also mentioned by Sultana; however, he sets out to explore quite a different concept. Sultana presents Alisdair MacIntyre’s classification of four rival philosophical traditions that underpin European thinking, and which emphasise different aspects of social justice (MacIntyre, 1984, MacIntyre, 1988). To demonstrate how insights can be won by exploration of these traditions, Sultana examines one himself: the “harmony” tradition. Here, any action that contributes to social harmony is seen as serving social justice. The needs of the individual and the society are seen as coherent. According to Socrates, every man (sic) has an “*arete*”; an area in which he excels. Justice is seen as fulfilled when everybody develops his *arete*, in the best interest of individual and society alike. Sultana argues that this tradition resonates with common CEG practices, but he also discusses its inappropriateness in times of constant change, and in which it has been argued that good jobs are a “privilege of the few” (Bauman, 2001 in Sultana 2014). Additionally, Sultana contends that social justice should be pursued as a stance rather than a state; there will always be contradictory aspects within different forms of justice that need to be balanced (Fraser, 1997 in Sultana 2014). Also, rivalling groups will always be challenging a given state, making the objective of social justice an ongoing struggle (Sultana, 2014: 321).

Rogers does not refer explicitly to social justice. However, his key concerns are related to aspects of social justice as articulated by the other authors, e.g. recognition, *arete* and non-oppressive practices. Rogers articulates visions for a radically different and more democratic society, fostered by a person-centred approach in which there is a “prizing of individuals for what they *are*, regardless of sex, race, status, or material possessions...more even distribution of material goods...more genuine and caring concern for those who need help”

(1977: 282). He addresses issues of power and oppression in a variety of contexts, upholding these as the central themes of his person-centred philosophy (1977: xii-xiii).

Like Rogers, Simon et al. do not refer explicitly to social justice. However, they express their commitment to a radical democratic project, in which power, economic goods and recognition are critically examined and fairly distributed (Simon et al., 1991). It could be argued that their position is a specific example of critical social justice. But while Irving emphasises this perspective's decoupling of economic distribution and participation in work life, Simon et al. uphold the central place of work and aim to increase participation, as well as influence, for all in work life (ibid). Further details on Simon et al.'s approach will be presented in the section on social justice enactment on the following page.

CEG's current and future role

All the authors selected express apprehension regarding the roles played by (some) CEG practitioners in relation to social justice issues. Irving articulates this most sharply (2010: 50), by referencing that "concerns have been voiced about the risk of career practitioners becoming unwitting, or complicit, agents of the neoliberal state by placing economic agendas above all else (Colley, 2000; Harris, 1999; McIlveen and Patton, 2006)", an argument he has also put forward himself (Irving, 2013). Sultana illuminates how individualistically oriented CEG practices might feed into neoliberal discourses, fuelling a "politics of responsabilization", in which structural problems are unjustly cast as personal failure (2014: 328). However, Sultana balances his concerns with an appreciation of practitioners' work:

To deride career guidance practitioners for doing what, at the one-to-one interactive level, *can* be done is as ungracious and as perverse as putting down ambulance workers who attend to the wounded, criticizing them for not stopping the war (2014: 319).

Sultana contends it is possible to work within the system, yet work against aspects of it (2014: 317). He refers to Antonio Gramsci to support this position, emphasising that to

create change, we need to engage with the world as it is - even if this places us in an uncomfortable zone (2014: 320).

When addressing preferable future roles for CEG, Simon et al., Irving and Rogers focus primarily on *facilitative professional roles that empower students and clients* from a variety of backgrounds, to influence individually or collectively on their personal lives, work life and societies. Sultana additionally encourages that practitioners take on *advocacy* roles and “lobby for the transformation of social structures” (2014: 319). He exemplifies with how CEG professionals have engaged in national policy development, but also in local actions, e.g. school advisors advocating for curricula and organisational changes that reduce “push-out” of students (ibid).

Enactment of social justice

Sultana and Rogers describe enactment through acknowledgement and support in individual guidance, arguing that this can increase the client’s chances of securing a job, finding one’s *arete* or expressing individuality more strongly, all potentially supporting a form of justice. The abstention from power exertion and the provision of unconditional acceptance are central to Rogers’ suggested enactment of justice. He contends this will mobilise the “actualizing tendency” inherent in all humans, in turn strengthening their ability to express themselves, and cater better for their own and others’ needs (1977: 8-14). Irving and Simon et al. argue that through acknowledgement *and* scrutiny of all knowledge and experience in groups, critical awareness and a sense of community can be fostered, empowering individuals and groups to influence on their opportunities and societies. Irving argues a shift is needed from individualistically oriented career development approaches, geared at serving the current needs of the economy, to a more critical approach in which career education is integrated with other teaching on citizenship, preparing the students to engage critically and actively in all aspects of life. He contends there is good scope for action:

Career educators...occupy powerful positions as they interpret policy, define career, construct career-relevant knowledge, determine curriculum content, and relate this to the post-school arena (2010: 58).

Simon et al. make a specific contribution for enactment with a variety of session outlines for work/career education, including assignments for the students and instructions to the teachers. Their pedagogy is founded on four major principles, strongly reflected in the session outlines⁴. Firstly, they aim to alert students to the socially and politically constructed nature of work, in order for them to see that work life and society are open to change. Secondly, they advocate that all experience should be challenged, and that this is necessary to widen opportunity horizons. Thirdly, questioning, debate and critique are encouraged; it is seen as prerequisite for envisioning change. Finally, they claim that competition and over-individualising tendencies are inherent in many career development programmes; they aim to counter this with the fostering of a sense of community and cooperation.

For the potential enactments to happen, the authors list several prerequisites. Irving and Sultana bring attention to the necessity of practitioners scrutinising their world-views, as these might be coloured by dominant discourses, serving the interests of the more privileged (2010: 56, 2014: 329). Rogers argues that practitioners must let go of an elevated expert role and stretch towards an unconditional acceptance of all individuals (1977: 10). Simon et al. emphasise the necessity of establishing secure learning environments (1991: 17). Irving furthermore identifies external barriers for enactment, e.g. the negligence of social justice in relevant policy documents and curricula, insufficient training programmes for career education teachers, and insufficient resources, in particular enough time (2010: 59).

Expansiveness versus reductionism

I have chosen “expansiveness” as a central criterion for the review of the texts and the forming of my position. By this concept, I refer to positions which encourage critical thinking without appeals to compliance, and also avoid reductionism. Using *reductionism*, I refer to a failure to retain complexity; an excessive emphasis on one aspect which results in the negligence of other, reasonable or legitimate aspects.

I contend that Irving’s, Sultana’s and Rogers’ texts are weakened by reductive tendencies. As for Irving, there is a tendency in his texts to reduce career education to be a remedy against injustice, thereby disregarding other objectives. Moreover, Irving insists on the dichotomous nature of a critical educational approach versus a career developmental approach, and

⁴ For a specific example, see my workshop slides on p. 103

rejects the latter (2010: 50). Through this, he neglects the value of being able to manoeuvre in the world of work as it is - which underprivileged students might suffer the most from (Hodkinson, 2008; Krumboltz, 2009). Irving creates a dubious dualism, in which career development and critical career education are seen as irreconcilable. In comparison, Simon et al.'s ambition to reformulate the relation between the resembling dichotomy of *education* and *training* is more expansive (1991: 6). They aim to develop skills needed to obtain a job and critical awareness. Simon et al. acknowledge the importance of getting a job within society *as it is*, while simultaneously being enabled to envision changes within work life and broader social arrangements, and to act on this vision. Their approach provides a foundation for the students to consider what degrees of change or adjustment they are committed to. As such, Simon et al.'s position seems simultaneously more pragmatic and responsible than Irving's.

Moreover, Irving's descriptions of the economy come across as one-sided. "The economy" is portrayed as a unilaterally evil system, in which overlaps between the needs of the individual and the economy are largely neglected, as is the potential for individual and social growth to happen within the economy, or the relation between employers and employees to be seen as one of cooperation. I agree that market economies have problematic aspects, and that related dominant discourses and ideologies can be damaging. Nevertheless, from a Norwegian context of a mixed economy and well developed cooperation between the state, employer and labour confederations, Irving's critique seems out of proportion, and weakened by the lack of historical evidence for other, more favourable orders. I recognise that economic agendas influence Norwegian CEG practices, and in particular within the Labour and Welfare Services (Stjernø and Øverbye, 2012). Nevertheless, Irving's suggestion that CEG practitioners place economic agendas *above all else* seems reductive and unfair.

Writing from a very different position, Rogers' philosophy also harbours reductive tendencies in its predominant attention to the unique individual. While he acknowledges how external influences can be internalised, the *patterned character* of these processes is insufficiently dealt with. The mutual interpenetration of agency and structure is neglected within a largely unidirectional focus on individual change, as *the* way to create social changes. Nevertheless, I contend Rogers' philosophy can provide valuable input to anti-oppressive practices - on condition that it is complemented with structural perspectives.

Sultana's urge for the CEG profession to avoid supporting a "politics of responsabilization", while simultaneously defending the "doing good" of individualistically oriented CEG practices within existing systems, acknowledge the complexity of social justice challenges. I find that this is true for the better part of his text; however, I am puzzled by the reductive character of the harmony perspective on social justice that he presents. Summing up his chapter, Sultana contends he has not aimed to please the reader with conclusive answers, rather to "trouble the reader - as much as the author - by asking questions..." (2014: 330). Maybe this is the reason why it remains unclear whether he advocates a harmony perspective on social justice, or whether he has explored it to expose the weaknesses of a philosophy that has a strong influence on CEG. Granting that the idea of putting one's excellence to the best use for the society and oneself bears some relevance to career guidance, I find the harmony perspective inappropriate as a social justice perspective, due to its failure to address issues of power and economic distribution.

Seeing the authors' positions in relation to Watts' fourfold approach, Irving can be placed in the radical approach and Rogers in the liberal. While the *harmony* perspective is rather conservative, Sultana places his work in the progressive approach (2014: 317). I contend the expansive position of Simon et al. largely transcends these approaches. This is due to its orientation towards change on an individual *and* societal level, along with strong elements of non-directiveness in its encouragement of critical thinking.

Applicability

Regarding the applicability of the texts, all authors contribute with *something* that is relevant for fostering reflexivity or socially just practices. However, with the exception of Simon et al., the authors remain vague about how social justice should be enacted, e.g. what exactly does Irving mean when encouraging teachers to "develop learning materials that are located within a socially just framework"? (2010: 57). Nevertheless, I will argue that Irving's texts provide a good foundation for professional reflection. They can serve as eye-openers to the pervasiveness of economic discourses' framing of and influencing on CEG. More generally, they introduce critical perspectives on widespread practices. On the other hand, it could be argued that Irving's position - for a number of reasons - is the one that is the least feasible to be taken up by Norwegian practitioners. His account of the evils of a mixed economy is likely to be conceived as unreasonably negative in a Norwegian context. Moreover, the decoupling

of economic distribution and participation in the labour market that he advocates, is at odds with the long lasting Norwegian “work approach policy” (Sosial- og helsedepartementet, 1995; Bjørnskau et al., 1997; Stjernø and Øverbye, 2012)⁵, and possibly at odds with strong strands among Norwegian CEG practitioners (Stjernø and Øverbye, 2012). Irving’s position seems to suggest a practice in which the development of a critical awareness displaces learning for career development; a position unlikely to be backed up by policies, funding, curriculum, or teachers who are concerned about their students’ career development. However, this does not preclude that practitioners can - and I dare say *should* - practice drawing on other discourses than the dominant, economically oriented discourses. I advocate that they practice with awareness of the *performative functions* of their statements; that these can reproduce or challenge dominant constructs. This stance can be related to some of Irving’s suggested enactments that are well argued and constitute realistic objectives, e.g. to develop career education programs that relate to other teaching on citizenship, including provision of a discursive framing in which issues of power, privilege and oppression can be addressed (2010: 57).

Similar to Irving, Simon et al. are challenging the economic order, representing a more radical position than current policy and mainstream CEG practices. However, their position comes across as more open than Irving’s, and this makes it more feasible. Simon et al. avoid appealing to adherence to specific social arrangements, and encourage independent thinking. Their communicative style concerned with articulating good practice, is less likely to create resistance, than Irving’s sharp critique and polemic. Simon et al.’s position could well be adopted by less radical practitioners who want to foster critical and independent thinking, as well as a sense of community. These aspects are also in line with general objectives in the Norwegian school curriculum (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2011), something which could ease the introduction of their approach in schools. This being said, Simon et al.’s ambition to provide reflective learning spaces in which training *and* education is accommodated, is likely to demand extended time resources. Issues of time distribution and

⁵ The objective of the work approach policy is to enrol more people in work life and reduce the number of people receiving public benefits. This entails that work should be the first preference, and that policy measures and programmes are designed with the intention to reinforce this preference.

curriculum priorities are common challenges in schools, and a considerable barrier to the achievement of such an objective (Stanbury, 2010: 112).

The long-lasting and strong hold of Rogerian philosophy within CEG bears testimony to its capacity to engage practitioners. Rogers' insistence on unconditional acceptance and democratic distribution of power seems hard to follow through all the way within CEG arenas; it requires a high level of reflexivity among practitioners *and* their superiors, moreover a distribution of power at odds with many current systems. Nevertheless, it is feasible that the philosophy can influence practices to some extent, and through this extend social justice.

Sultana's text is not particularly applicable to specific CEG practices. However, unlike the other authors, he explicitly addresses some of the dilemmas as well as the opportunities of working *within* the system – which, after all, most CEG practitioners do. As such, his arguments can feed into grounded reflections around CEG professionals' contributions to social justice.

Conclusion

In the following I will sum up my answer to research question 1, relating it to the contexts of Norwegian CEG and my role as a fairly new staff member of the NULG.

By and large, I subscribe to an understanding of social justice that is in line with critical perspectives; emphasising recognition as well as fair distribution of goods and power, and encouraging critical reflection and dialogue around own and others' practices. However, I am undecided with regard to *what degree* of decoupling of income distribution and participation in the labour market that would serve social justice best. I am in favour of a softening of the work approach policy; yet I am uncertain whether a complete decoupling would provide ultimate justice. Furthermore, I think it is highly unrealistic that Norwegian policies will take such a turn in the near future. A grounded perspective on Norwegian CEG's opportunities for enactment of social justice needs to take this into account. I believe there is scope for the emerging profession to enact social justice, and that there are lessons to be learnt from all the reviewed texts. However, with the exception of Simon et al.'s contribution, all suggestions need further specification. I share all the selected authors' concern about CEG's potential to inadvertently support injustice. However, on balance, I

contend that Norwegian CEG can contribute positively to social justice, and that it will be best positioned for this if it is independent and informed by professional reflexivity, recognition and critical perspectives. This will be further explored in my next research questions. My own professional work is framed by policies influenced by economic discourses and work approach policies that primarily resonate with a distributive perspective on justice. Nevertheless, I have experienced that there is scope for me to bring in recognitive and critical perspectives in a number of settings related to client practices as well as systems work. At times I do find myself in the uncomfortable zone described by Gramsci and Sultana, - I work, being alert to my limited influence on powerful structures and current circumstances. However, granting my professional profile, I consider my best opportunity to influence positively on social justice, is to sustain my work within the public CEG system, where I repeatedly have found occasions to negotiate understandings and measures. While there might not be scope for the most radical actions, I am convinced there is room for positive contributions. In this, I will lean on Amartya Sen's position, to avoid an "all or nothing" approach with regard to social justice; to aim for making a difference, even if it might not bring about a wholly new social order (in Sultana, 2014: 321). In my final chapter I will suggest some ways for me to address social justice from my work role in the near future.

Chapter 4: Response to research question 2 - Workshop design

In this chapter I will answer my research question 2:

Based on my introduction, and response to research question 1: *How can I design a workshop that can enable Norwegian CEG practitioners to address social justice?*

The chapter is threefold. I will present a *backdrop* for some strategic considerations pertaining to this research question. Subsequently, I will display a workshop *outline*, including the overall aim, learning outcomes, workshop plan and learning evidence. In the last section I will present the *rationale* for the workshop design, including rationales for the content, pedagogy, negotiation, and evaluation and assessment.

Backdrop

While undertaking my literature review, I was alerted to a discrepancy between critical/radical positions on social justice that I largely support, and strong strands in Norwegian CEG policies and practices that are less critical/radical. Taking this situation into consideration, I have increasingly come to see my workshop project as one initial step in a process, rather than something which is likely to create substantial, immediate changes. I have realised the importance of mobilising allies for social justice work. Hence, a major strategic objective for my research became the involvement of leading CEG organisations, and the strengthening of their capacity to address social justice issues. To this end, I negotiated delivery of the workshop at two professionally recognised and influential CEG communities, offering them the opportunity to adapt and reuse my workshop materials in the future. Furthermore, workshop time was dedicated for the participants to reflect on their potential roles in taking the issues further in training of other practitioners.

In the following I will present the overall aim and learning outcomes for the workshop, the workshop plan, and evidence needed to assess learning outcomes.

Workshop outline: learning outcomes, sections' content and learning evidence

The following is the *overall aim for the workshop*: By the end of the workshop, the participants can identify different forms of justice and socio-political roles for CEG, relate and apply these to own practices as counsellors and trainers, and form their own responses.

The workshop's *learning outcomes* are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Workshop learning outcomes (LOs)

By the end of the workshop, the participants are able to:	
LO 1	-engage in professional reflection around the issues of social justice and CEG's socio-political roles
LO 2	-identify four different perspectives on justice
LO 3	-relate different forms of justice to own client practices and to the practices of the practitioners they support in LWS and schools
LO 4	-identify at least four different socio-political roles for CEG
LO 5	-relate different socio-political roles to own client practices and to the practices of the practitioners they support in LWS and schools
LO 6	-identify one specific pedagogy for enactment of social justice
LO 7	-evaluate the appropriateness of the specific pedagogy for use in Norwegian schools
LO 8	-evaluate own client guidance practices with regard to social justice
LO 9	-explore how social justice can be enacted; form their own responses related to their roles as counsellors and trainers
LO 10	-evaluate the appropriateness of the workshop with regard to facilitate relevant learning and engagement

As for the *workshop plan*, the workshop is scheduled for six hours; one hour is dedicated to lunch and short breaks throughout the day. The facilitator facilitates all exercises and plenary dialogues. Power Point slides are used to guide the introductions. A preliminary evaluation form, sheet 1 (Appendix 5), and a booklet with sheets 2-5 (Appendix 6), contain summaries and exercise briefs, and are distributed at the start of the workshop. In Table 5, I present an overview of all the workshop sections followed by a more detailed presentation of the separate sections in Table 6 through Table 11.

Table 5: Overview - workshop sections

Section	Section content	Timings
Section 1	Introduction	20 min
Section 2	Perspectives on Justice	70 min
Section 3	Socio-political roles in CEG	70 min
Section 4	A pedagogy for enactment: Simon et al.'s critical pedagogy	40 min
Section 5	Enactment in CCC context: Review, exploration and forming responses	65 min
Section 6	Workshop feedback and closure	35 min

Table 6: Workshop section 1

Activity	Section 1: Introduction	Resources	Timings: 20 min
<p>Start-up</p> <p><i>Facilitator & plenary</i></p>	<p><i>Facilitator opens workshop:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - invites self introductions - gives brief introduction about research project, learning objectives and evaluation - introduces the issue of CEG and social justice + relates it to a Norwegian context 	<p>Audio recorder, PPT, room with table for six, PC and projector, screen, flip chart, evaluation forms</p>	<p>20 min</p>

Table 7: Workshop section 2

Activity	Section 2: Perspectives on justice Learning outcomes: 1, 2, 3	Resources	Timings: 70 min
Bringing up and sharing experiences Theoretical introduction <i>Facilitator & plenary</i>	<i>Facilitator asks participants to identify and share a guidance case from own experience: a client who suffered from social injustice</i> <i>Facilitator introduces four perspectives on justice</i>	PPT	25 min
Exercise <i>Pairs & plenary</i>	<i>Facilitator introduces exercise 2b</i> <i>Participants identify and name at least one representation for each of the justice perspectives, e.g. saying, legislation or organisation</i>	Sheet 2: 2a - Summary of perspectives on justice + exercise brief 2b Flip featuring each perspective in a box	25 min
Exercise <i>Individually & plenary</i> Brief individual evaluation	<i>Facilitator introduces exercise 2c</i> <i>Participants reflect on which perspectives on justice that are framing/being reflected in different guidance practices and closest to their personal view</i> <i>Participants distribute "voting tags" to perspectives on joint flip and comment on it</i> <i>Participants fill in numbers and key words in evaluation form</i>	Sheet 2: Exercise brief 2c Flip from 2a, sets of tags to each participant	20 min

Table 8: Workshop section 3

Activity	Section 3: Socio-political roles in CEG Learning outcomes: 1, 4, 5	Resources	Timings: 70 min
Theoretical introduction <i>Facilitator</i>	<i>Facilitator introduces four approaches to CEG's socio-political roles</i>	PPT	15 min
Exercise <i>Pairs & plenary</i>	<i>Facilitator introduces exercise 3b</i> <i>Participants prepare and present their rationale and recommendations for Norwegian CEG, according to their assigned role</i>	Sheet 3: 3a - Summary of socio-political roles + exercise brief 3b	25 min
Exercise <i>Individual & plenary</i> Brief individual evaluation	<i>Facilitator introduces exercise 3c</i> <i>Participants reflect on socio-political roles in guidance practices and their view on the approaches</i> <i>Participants fill in numbers and key words in evaluation form</i>	Exercise brief 3c	30 min

Table 9: Workshop section 4

Activity	Section 4: A pedagogy for enactment Learning outcomes: 1, 6, 7	Resources	Timings: 40 min
Theoretical introduction <i>Facilitator</i>	<i>Facilitator introduces Simon et al.'s critical pedagogy: General position and session on tests and career planning</i>	PPT	15 min
Exercise <i>Pairs & plenary</i> Brief individual evaluation	<i>Facilitator introduces exercise 4</i> <i>Participant pairs prepare a review of Simon et al. and their session outline for use of tests</i> <i>Participants fill in numbers and key words in evaluation form</i>	Sheet 4: 4a - Summary of Simon et al. + 4b - Summary of session on test + Exercise brief 4c	25 min

Table 10: Workshop section 5

Activity	Section 5: Enactment in CCC context: Review, exploration and forming responses Learning outcomes: 1, 8, 9	Resources	Timings: 65 min
Brief introduction to enactment <i>Facilitator</i>	<i>Facilitator shares reflections regarding opportunities and challenges related to Norwegian CEG and social justice, references to Sen, Sultana and Gramsci on opportunities for making a difference</i>	PPT	5 min
Exercise <i>Individual & plenary</i> Brief individual evaluation	<i>Facilitator introduces exercise 5</i> <i>Participants reflect individually and share in plenary – review of own practices as counsellors and trainers, exploration of enactment and forming responses</i> <i>Participants fill in numbers and key words in evaluation form</i>	Sheet 5: Exercise brief 5	60 min

Table 11: Workshop section 6

Activity	Section 6: Workshop feedback and closure Learning outcomes: 1, 10	Resources	Timings: 35 min
Reflection and dialogue <i>Individual & plenary</i> Brief individual evaluation Closure	<i>Participants reflect individually and share in plenary guided by sheet 6</i> <i>Participants fill in key words in evaluation form</i> <i>Closing comments from group and facilitator</i>	Sheet 6: Feedback	35 min

In Table 12 written and oral learning evidence is presented in relation to its corresponding learning outcomes

Table 12: Learning outcomes and corresponding learning evidence

Learning outcomes		Written evidence	Oral evidence
<i>By the end of the session, the participants are able to:</i>			
LO 1	- engage in professional reflection around the issues of justice and CEG's socio-political roles	Notes in exercise sheets throughout the workshop	Taking part in dialogues throughout the workshop
LO 2	- identify four different perspectives on justice	Notes on exercise sheet 2b and joint flip: Representations of justice perspectives	Presenting representations
LO 3	- relate different forms of justice to own client practices and to the practices of the practitioners they support in LWS and schools	Notes in exercise sheet 2c Voting tags placed on joint flip	Commenting on placing of voting tags
LO 4	- identify at least four different socio-political roles for CEG	Notes in exercise sheet 3b	Giving plenary introductions according to assigned role
LO 5	- relate different socio-political roles to own client practices and to the practices of the practitioners they support in LWS and schools	Notes in exercise sheet 3c	Taking part in plenary dialogue on socio-political roles

LO 6	- identify one specific pedagogy for enactment of social justice	Notes in exercise sheet 4c	Taking part in paired and plenary analyses for the review of critical pedagogy
LO 7	- evaluate the appropriateness of the specific pedagogy for use in Norwegian schools	Notes in exercise sheet 4c	Taking part in paired and plenary analyses for the review of critical pedagogy
LO 8	- evaluate own client guidance practices with regard to social justice	Notes in sheet 5, Questions a and b	Taking part in plenary dialogue, reviewing own guidance practices
LO 9	- explore how social justice can be enacted; form their own responses related to their roles as counsellors and trainers	Notes in sheet 5, Questions c-f	Taking part in plenary dialogue, exploring how to enact social justice and suggesting specific measures
LO 10	- evaluate the appropriateness of the workshop with regard to facilitating relevant learning and engagement	Notes in sheet 6 Submitted anonymous evaluation form	Feedback in plenary

Workshop rationales: pedagogy, content, negotiation and evaluation

I will now provide the *rationale* for the workshop design. Rationales will be presented in relation to four subsequent topics: pedagogy, content, negotiation, and evaluation and assessment.

The pedagogic design of the workshop is marked by workshop designs I have found stimulating for my own learning; in particular some sessions from a residential course on Career Development Learning as part of the CEIGHE Master's degree⁶. I have adopted three elements which are built into the workshop: 1) introduction of new perspectives, followed by exercises to work with them; 2) reflection and dialogue to relate the introduced perspectives to practice; 3) reflection and dialogue around how the learning experience could be further enhanced.

Design and facilitation is inspired by Simon et al.; to provide a structured setting for learning, and facilitate reflective learning spaces, in which participants can articulate their own views, be exposed to other views, and draw their own conclusions (1991: 10). One example is that the participants are introduced to a career education session outline for use of tests in career planning, and are asked to pair up to analyse its strengths and weaknesses for application in Norwegian schools. The exercise is framed as preparations for writing a review to a school counsellors' professional journal, and concludes with a plenary dialogue.

David Kolb's experiential learning theory is used to inform and give rigour to the workshop design (Kolb, 1984). Kolb's statement that "all learning is relearning" (1984: 28) serves as a reminder that the participants are not "tabula rasas" when they enter the workshop. This argues the case for bringing up old learning so that it can be articulated, reconsidered and provide a basis for further learning. For example, the participants are asked to identify and share a situation in which a client suffered from social injustice. Moreover, Kolb defines learning as "the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience" (1984: 38). He claims that for learning to happen, the learner needs to go through a process of four stages: concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualisation and active experimentation (1984: 40). I contend these stages do not always take place in a single circular sequence, in which each stage is covered before the next is approached. However, broadly speaking, the workshop is designed with the aim for participants to move through all four stages. In the following, I will relate Kolb's stages to workshop elements to exemplify. When introducing four different perspectives on justice, I

⁶ Master in Career Education, Information and Guidance in Higher Education at the University of Warwick. More info here: <http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/study/cii/othercourses/careerstudies/courses/ceighe/ceighe-ma/>

provide a *concrete experience*. *Reflective observations* take place as the participants identify the different perspectives listening to me, and repeat them to themselves as they start working on the adherent exercises. They proceed to the stage of *conceptualisation*, in which the identified perspectives are analysed and related to representations, guidance practices and themselves. At last, the participants enter the stage of *experimentation*, in which they explore how they can enact social justice, form their own responses to the learning, and make plans in line with these responses. If the participants go through with their ideas and preliminary plans after the workshop, the stage of active experimentation will be further extended.

I will now present the rationale for my choice of workshop *content*. It will be presented in the same order that it appears in the workshop, from section one to six. The first section is introductory. The primary objectives are to introduce the research project, workshop topic and agenda, introduce participants and researcher-facilitator to each other, and clarify practicalities and formalities. I aim to give the participants an understanding of my choice of issue, and to relate it to an international and Norwegian CEG scene. For this purpose I introduce Tony Watts' fundamental question about whether career education and guidance serve to reinforce or reduce inequalities (Watts, 1996: 351). I also clarify my point of departure for discussing this in a Norwegian context; acknowledging strengths and weaknesses with regard to the social justice situation in Norway (see page 98 in Appendix 9).

In the second section, I introduce four perspectives on justice (Irving, 2010) for the participants to work with. Career concepts that accompany the perspectives are also presented. Sultana argues that our sense of justice to a large extent is a result of socialisation, which raises the question of which sense of social justice current generations have been socialised into (2014: 329). In related vein, Irving argues the usefulness of reflecting on what ideologies that inform different concepts of justice, and to relate these to own practices (2010: 51). I concur with these arguments, and consider reflections around what constitutes social justice a prerequisite for discussing how justice can be enacted.

In section number three, the focus is zoomed in to the field of CEG and its role in providing social justice. My own engagement for CEG's socio-political roles was fuelled by exposure to Watts' approaches to socio-political ideologies in CEG (Watts, 1996: 355). However, I now

find these dichotomous approaches slightly reductive, and I have had concerns about contributing to the reproduction of reductive understandings by introducing them. In the end, I have chosen to include the approaches. This is partly because all the approaches described by Watts are reflected in Norway; consequently the practitioners can relate them to old learning and familiar stances. To balance my concerns, I have dedicated section four to Simon et al.'s critical pedagogy. This choice is partly based on the positions' potential to transcend Watts' approaches, partly because it constitutes an unusually specific source on how to enact social justice in CEG. However, bearing in mind Watson's argument that social justice needs to be contextualised (Watson, 2010: 25), the fifth section is dedicated to this. I invite the participants to review their practices, reflect on how social justice can be enacted in their contexts, and form their own responses - both in their roles as counsellors and as trainers.

The rationale behind section six on workshop feedback, relates to the involvement of the practitioners as co-researchers; drawing on their expertise and experiences to consider how the workshop can be improved.

With regard to the rationale for my *negotiation* of the workshops, I considered it vital to approach the centres in good time, and to come across as trustworthy and competent. Moreover, I needed to be clear about my intentions, the obligations and possible outcomes of participation. I sent e-mail requests to the managers of two County Career Centres, providing them with initial information and suggesting we could talk further on the phone. Both managers involved their staff members in the decision, and within a couple of days they responded positively to my request. We followed through with signing of consent forms by all participants and the researcher (Appendix 3).

I will now proceed to describe the rationale for my approach to *evaluation and assessment*. This approach has influenced the workshop design, and will be further applied when I evaluate the workshop to answer research question 3a. By *evaluation* I refer to overall judgements of the value of the workshop, while *assessment* refers to judgements concerning the participants' learning. Fitzpatrick et al. contend it is paramount to clarify and identify criteria for judgment (2012: 7), and in this project, I will apply Kirkpatrick's four level model

of training criteria (Kirkpatrick, 1976, Kirkpatrick, 1996). This model includes reaction criteria, learning criteria, behaviour/transfer criteria and results criteria.

The first criterion concerns the participants' *reactions or perception* of the training. I further specify this and ask the participants to judge whether the workshop is *engaging, relevant and comprehensible*. This specification bears resemblance to Warr and Bunce's *enjoyment, usefulness and difficulty* of training (1995). Reaction criteria are easily and commonly applied – notwithstanding that the connections between these and the other criteria are very weak (Alliger, Tannenbaum, Bennett, Traver and Shotland 1997). Nevertheless, Alliger et al. argue that reaction criteria could be important, e.g. for future funding, attendance and “word of mouth” advertising (1997: 344). I concur; hence the participants are asked about their reactions through plenary dialogue, and in an evaluation form (Appendix 5).

The second criterion relates to judgements of achieved *learning* outcomes. Keeping in mind the weak link between perception (reaction criteria) and actual learning, other measures are taken to assess the participants' learning. The Higher Education Academy (2012) advocates the integration of learning and assessment; that assessment is used, not only to monitor whether learning outcomes are met, but to deepen the participants' learning experience. Drawing on this, exercises are designed to integrate learning and assessment. Written and oral evidence is created and recorded throughout the workshop, and will provide material for subsequent learning judgements (see Table 12 on page 31, and Appendix 6). However, the plenary dialogues and presentations are not designed to assure that each participant comment on all aspects of the exercises and learning outcomes, rather this is done by the joint contributions of the group. The participants' exercise notes could be collected by the facilitator, to accurately assess each individual's learning. I chose not to do this, as I consider their personal notes an important source for their potential further work. What is more, I aimed to build cooperative relations between the participants and me, and wanted to avoid actions that underpinned a sense of “teacher – pupil” relations.

The *behavioural or transfer* criteria address changes in behaviour, e.g. whether the participants to a greater extent engage in professional reflection around their socio-political role, and whether their client and training practices are changed with regard to enactment of social justice. The *results* criteria relate to the desired end effects of the training; in our

case an informed social justice stance among CEG practitioners, and the effects of their practices with regard to the achievement of justice in society. By the end of the day, behaviour and results criteria might be the most valuable. However, they are also the most difficult to obtain and measure (Praslova, 2010); doing so properly, requires a more extensive process than I could allow for in this project. While my long term aim is to contribute to changed behaviour and new results, I have not aimed for a workshop or research design that will accommodate such evidence. However, through my work role, it is likely I will be able to observe whether the workshop triggers changes in behaviour after the project is completed.

Chapter 5: Response to research question 3 - Learning from the workshops

In this chapter, I will draw on my experiences with the design, negotiation, delivery and evaluation of the workshop for two County Career Centres to answer my twofold research question 3:

3a: To what extent is the workshop successful and suitable for further delivery in Norwegian CEG?

3b: How can the County Career Centres address social justice in Norway?

I will draw on experiences from the delivery of two nearly identical workshops in December 2014. Staff members and managers of two County Career Centres (CCCs) participated, with five and four participants respectively. Each workshop stretched over six hours, including breaks. Questions 3a and 3b will be answered separately, including a conclusion and recommendations for each.

Research question 3a: Review of workshop

To review the workshop, I will use Kirkpatrick's four evaluation criteria, presented in Chapter 4. These are reaction, learning, behaviour/transfer, and results criteria (Kirkpatrick, 1976; Kirkpatrick, 1996; Praslova, 2010). Moreover, I will apply findings and negotiation experiences to consider the feasibility of further workshop delivery.

1. Reaction criteria – the participants' perception of the training

The participants' reactions were documented in workshop audio recordings, including a plenary feedback session. Moreover, all participants made notes in anonymous evaluation forms throughout the workshop; these were completed and submitted within three days. By and large, the participants' reactions were overwhelmingly positive (see Appendix 7). On a scale from 1 to 5, 1 indicating "not at all" and 5 "fully", an average of approximately 4.8 was given for each of the following dimensions: *comprehensibility*, *relevance* and *ability to engage*. The average rating for each workshop section was close to 4.9, with the exception of the critical pedagogy section, which was 4.6. The deviant average was due to low scores

from a participant who found this section less relevant for their current work. Comments on the facilitator style revolve around it being agreeable, clear, attentive and assertive.

Participants in both workshops expressed appreciation of an explorative and non-judgmental facilitation.

The participants' feedback highlighted the need for a stronger explanation of *why* an agreed upon definition of social justice is not provided in the workshop. Secondly, they suggested that the issue should be related to specific, current issues in Norway. Pedagogical approaches for this were proposed, e.g. using images, films and news that could provoke immediate response, or specific discussions, e.g. "Should we advocate for more boys to work in health care professions?" Third, one participant recommended discussing enactment in relation to the work division within Norwegian CEG; acknowledging the varying programs and target groups of different CEG organisations⁷.

2. Learning criteria – what did the participants actually learn?

The learning evidence is documented in four sources: the participants' exercise sheets, a joint flip, the evaluation forms, and most importantly: the dialogues and presentations that were all recorded and transcribed.

All participants were engaged and created learning evidence throughout the workshop. The level of achievement is summed up in Table 13; the learning outcomes were largely met. In a few cases, details of perspectives and roles were mixed up, indicating a need for the facilitator to present some points more clearly. Moreover, the ideas on enactment in client work were fewer and less specific than for the training of others. Relating findings to Kolb's learning circle⁸, there is strong evidence of the participants going through the first three stages of concrete experience, reflection, and conceptualisation. With regard to the fourth stage, they did not actively experiment with new practices in the external world; however, they applied the learning to form responses.

⁷ There were several other suggestions for minor adjustments to the workshop design and delivery. Some feedback was integrated before delivery of the second workshop, and some more before I delivered parts of the workshop in a national forum for CEG organisations. However, I have not considered it relevant to include all the details in the dissertation.

⁸ Further described on pages 33-34

Table 13: Learning outcomes, evidence and achievements

Learning outcomes (LOs)	Written evidence	Oral evidence	LOs achieved?
LO 1: Engage in professional reflection around the issues of justice and CEG’s socio-political roles	Notes in exercise sheets throughout the workshop	Taking part in dialogues throughout the workshop	Yes: all participants engaged in all exercises and dialogues
LO 2: Identify four different perspectives on justice	Notes on exercise sheet 2b and joint flip: Representations of forms of justice	Presenting representations	To a large extent; some minor mix-ups of elements in different perspectives
LO 3: Relate different forms of justice to own client practices and to the practices of the practitioners they support in LWS and schools	Notes in exercise sheet 2c Voting tags placed on joint flip	Commenting on placing of voting tags	Yes
LO 4: Identify at least four different socio-political roles for CEG	Notes in exercise sheet 3b	Giving plenary introductions according to assigned role	To a large extent; some minor mix-ups of elements in different roles
LO 5: Relate different socio-political roles to own client practices and to the practices of the practitioners they support in LWS and schools	Notes in exercise sheet 3c	Taking part in plenary dialogue on socio-political roles	Yes

LO 6: Identify one specific pedagogy for enactment of social justice	Notes in exercise sheet 4c	Taking part in paired and plenary analyses for the review of critical pedagogy	Yes
LO 7: Evaluate the appropriateness of a specific pedagogy for use in Norwegian schools	Notes in exercise sheet 4c	Taking part in paired and plenary analyses for the review of critical pedagogy	Yes
LO 8: Evaluate own guidance practices with clients with regard to social justice	Notes in sheet 5, Questions a and b	Taking part in plenary dialogue reviewing own guidance practices	Yes
LO 9: Explore how social justice can be enacted; form their own responses related to their roles as counsellors and trainers	Notes in sheet 5, Questions c-f	Taking part in plenary dialogue exploring how to enact social justice and suggesting specific measures	To a large extent; all took actively part, however, there were fewer ideas related to their role as counsellors
LO 10: Evaluate the appropriateness of the workshop with regard to facilitate relevant learning and engagement	Notes in sheet 6 Submitted anonymous evaluation form	Giving feedback in plenary	Yes

3. Behavioural/transfer criteria – changes in behaviour and transfer of knowledge

According to Kirkpatrick and Alliger et al., behaviour or transfer criteria relate to observable changes in behaviour in real work situations, due to the training (1976; 1997). Following this understanding, no such evidence was produced in the workshops. However, Praslova argues that in educational settings, the application of learning from previous classes in the following class work, could be seen as one way of fulfilling the transfer criteria (2010: 221). In this

sense, we can see evidence of the participants' applying learning from the first sections of the workshop in subsequent sections. Moreover, there is evidence of their planning to act differently as counsellors and trainers. However, ideas for enactment in client work were fewer and less specific. This suggests a need for further development of the workshop design in section 5, on enactment, or to approach the challenge in additional ways.

4. Results criteria – end effects of training

Relevant results criteria for the workshops are twofold. First, they concern the development of a deliberate social justice stance among the participants. Secondly, they relate to social justice achievements as a result of the training. Due to the limited scope of this project, I have not aimed to measure social justice achievements. However, concerning the first aspect, I contend the participants have developed more deliberate stances, and I will exemplify this with some quotes. One participant expressed that she had become aware of how their professional views are often related to social justice issues:

I see now that many of the divergent views that show up when we discuss guidance cases reflect our different views on justice and socio-political roles.

Three participants expressed explicitly that the workshop provided a shared vocabulary for the clarification of their individual and mutual stances. However, developing a more deliberate stance does not necessarily result in a radical stance:

I feel very strongly now that there are contexts in which I could not have worked, because the retributive perspective partly resonates with me...I get annoyed with those who have skills and opportunities, but no willingness to contribute in work life.

There were a variety of participant statements that reflected envisioning of enactment, e.g.

We could have been more present in the media, taking part in debates around social justice. I am thinking of the whole CEG profession; we are a bit cautious. In the future, all relevant parties should be represented. When our issues are addressed, we only hear the Confederation of Norwegian Enterprise and the Confederation of Trade Unions; we are very quiet. When are we going to start making our voices heard? ... When it comes to social justice, we often hear the conservative arguments; imagine if we could bring forth other aspects.

One participant emphasised the importance of strengthening their own client practices:

I think we need to “sweep before our own door” before we start lecturing other practitioners on these issues.

The participants’ ideas around their potential enactment of social justice will be further discussed in my answer to research question 3b in Chapter 5.

With regard to opportunities for further workshop delivery, access should be feasible in a variety of settings. I easily negotiated a day with two busy organisations, and the CCCs receive many requests for professional development sessions. My work experience and networks in higher education career services should make access possible there too.

Moreover, the NULG is currently cooperating with the staff of a Master’s degree in career guidance, to merge a national seminar for CCC staff and master students in November 2015. It has been suggested that social justice should be the main topic. The seminar might open up to delivery of the tested workshop; in any case, it will be an important opportunity to address social justice.

Conclusion

By and large the workshop was successful; particularly with regard to reaction and learning criteria. It is suitable for further delivery, and this should be feasible in a variety of contexts. My recommendations include first steps towards higher achievement of behaviour and results criteria, as presented in Table 14 on the following page.

Recommendations for further workshop delivery

Table 14: Recommendations for further workshop delivery

Recommendations for further workshop delivery	
Negotiate further delivery	Both facilitator and participants could negotiate access in a variety of contexts Needs for adaptation to the specific settings should be considered
Develop workshop content	Further develop the workshop in two areas: 1) Relate social justice to specific, current issues in Norway 2) Strengthen Section 5 on enactment, particularly with regard to client work Developments could be undertaken by the facilitator or the workshop participants. The further developments could substitute the sections on the trainers’ role and feedback in the pilot workshops

Research question 3b: The County Career Centres’ addressing of social justice

Introduction

My last research question is dedicated to reflections around how the CCCs can address social justice in Norway. Research question 3b specifies and contextualises research question 1, and draws on the same analytical framework, which was presented on page 7. As before mentioned, there is a recurring challenge to social justice work: to move from rhetoric to action, from addressing to redressing social justice (Watson, 2010). Starting more or less from scratch, I found it necessary for us to take our time to reflect and establish a shared language around social justice. More time is needed to review and work out the ideas that were generated in the workshops. I contend any feasible aims for further enactment by the CCCs must be aligned to their practitioners’ social justice position. Hence, in addition to referring to the specific ideas that came up in the workshops, I will describe this position,

aiming to indicate a scope for further enactment. I have cooperated with two CCCs; however, I will argue the case of *transferability* (Denscombe, 2007: 299): that the findings from these two centres could be used for initial considerations around how the 38 CCCs in Norway could address social justice. First, the Ministry of Education's criteria for funding⁹ of the centres ensure some shared characteristics: that the CCCs are founded on a partnership between LWS and educational authorities in the counties, that they provide free guidance to adults, and that they support CEG practitioners in LWS and schools. Second, the centres have their regular national meetings and seminars in which they share and develop understandings and resources. From reports, seminars and meetings, I see the centres as reasonably aligned in their professional perspectives: maybe the participating centres are slightly more radical than some others, due to their dedication to independent guidance, recognitive approaches and career concepts, more holistic than those of the work approach policy. Based on this, I contend the position of the participating centres represents a reasonable basis for initial considerations of all the CCCs' potential for social justice enactment.

In my answer to question 3b I will look into two aspects of *addressing* social justice: First, I will discuss important elements of an appropriate *foundation* for enactment. Secondly, I will discuss *enactment*, drawing on the ideas of the workshop participants and myself. Recommendations will be made along the way. I will proceed to present the practitioners' social justice position, to indicate a scope for further enactment. The chapter is concluded with a summary of my recommendations pertaining to this question.

Foundation for enactment

Reflexivity

Irving (2010) and Sultana (2014) uphold an ongoing scrutiny of personal world-views and practices as vital for the enactment of social justice. The cooperating practitioners have established cultures, systems and practices for professional reflexivity. Moreover, in the workshops they identified a number of specific settings in which they could facilitate other practitioners' reflexivity around social justice. Simultaneously, they expressed that the workshop opened their eyes to new issues, and there seems to be a potential for further

⁹ <http://www.vox.no/contentassets/66f74f96bf674ba0af6c2c52a798748a/retningslinjer5mars2014-docx.pdf>

development of social justice related reflexivity. Consequently, I recommend that the practitioners dedicate themselves to such further development – internally, and in their role as trainers. One potential resource, is the section on reflexivity by Barbara Bassot and Hazel Reid in the Nice Handbook for professional training (Bassot and Reid, 2012).

Appropriate conditions

The CCCs' role is still being formed, and is not yet clearly defined by shared codes of conduct. The centres operate with different degrees of independence from other parties' agendas. Values of independence and person-centeredness were advocated by the cooperating CCC practitioners. Nonetheless these values might come under pressure and undermine the foundation for socially just practices, e.g. from politicians who want the centres to help secure regional settlement and targeted business development. The centres' two main partners might also challenge independence and person-centeredness to achieve their own objectives, e.g. LWS in their exhortation of the work approach policy, and educational authorities who might have economic incentives to fill up some courses, and to not offer others. Hence, it could be vital to secure and exert an independent role for the CCCs in order to sustain and enhance person-centeredness and recognition of clients' needs.

In one workshop, a participant suggested that further reflection around the CCC's enactment of social justice should take into account the work division within Norwegian CEG. I agree that looking at the centres as part of a system might lead to different conclusions about how they should enact social justice than if considering the CCCs exclusively. For instance, the CCCs are currently obliged to provide free guidance to all adults, while rehabilitation organisations provide targeted programmes for selected, often underprivileged clients. A dedication from the CCCs' to develop targeted services to underprivileged groups could strengthen justice on a short term basis; yet, it could result in diminished services towards the general public, which might undermine social justice in the longer perspective. It has been questioned whether CEG can engage primarily with marginalised groups without risking the alienation of those from dominant cultures (Jones, 1999). Moreover, the social justice educator Paulo Freire advocated caring for the oppressors; that it is part of a social justice process to liberate the privileged from their dominant positions, and to mobilise their support for a just society (Freire and Freire, 1998). In a CEG context this could involve, for

example, a move from the traditional advice to make full use of one's personal network to build one's own career, to an exploration of how the privileged could use their position to support the marginalised in work life, or refrain from taking advantage of a privileged position, at the expense of others. If CEG practitioners are to facilitate and support such exploration, they need to relate to the broader public.

Another important organisational condition for enactment, relates to the funding of the CCCs. Several of the enactment ideas that will be presented below, would need to be backed up by increased funding. Additionally, a well established agreement on funding might set the centres in a better position to speak freely about justice issues, without risking cuts. Hence, strategies for raising and securing permanent funding can be vital for a strengthened enactment.

Enactment

In my literature review I presented the selected authors' views on CEG's enactment of social justice. I will now contextualise this question and present preliminary ideas for the CCCs' enactment in Norway, first in guidance practices, and then in systems work.

Taking a social justice perspective, the practitioner groups upheld their recognition of each client as a particular strength of their guidance practices. They provided numerous examples, e.g. how recognition of challenging life circumstances, alternative life choices or informal competencies, had made clients feel supported, often resulting in their taking actions leading to improved life situations. Following this, I contend the CCCs already contribute to social justice, and the continuation of such practices constitutes one line of enactment. Moreover, the participants' ideas for further enactment included reaching out more actively to underprivileged groups, and to offer more comprehensive guidance processes. In both workshops, weaknesses in the adult education system were repeatedly pointed out as resulting in social injustices. One example is the failure of local educational authorities to follow up on their obligations to provide classes in demand. This situation poses ethical challenges; the practitioners feel uncertain about how they can best respond in client guidance meetings and give feedback through the system channels. This being such a "hot" topic, I recommend that the CCCs consider making adult education their first, specific issue for exploration of enactment in guidance.

Based on my workshop analyses, I have three additional enactment ideas for further exploration. They are all aimed at a stronger integration of structural and critical perspectives in the guidance practices, and the dissemination of such approaches through systems work.

First, I suggest that the practitioners explore to what extent their guidance discourses and tools appropriately include structural and critical perspectives. A place of departure could be to examine the Cognitive Information Process (CIP) model which is widely used and shared by the CCCs. The model includes four major elements: 1) self knowledge, 2) opportunity knowledge, 3) decision making strategies, and 4) articulation of and working with, “positive” and “negative” thoughts. I have limited knowledge of the model and have not observed guidance practices based on it. Still, I have a concern that structural and critical perspectives are currently weakly integrated, e.g. it could contribute to a “politics of responsabilization”. The cooperating CCC practitioners are intimately familiar with the model. I recommend that they critically evaluate it from a social justice perspective and consider whether and how critical and structural perspectives can be integrated or enhanced.

Secondly, I suggest the practitioners explore to what extent they are opening up to critical client responses. I was not able to assess this on the basis of the workshops. However, I have come to wonder whether e.g. a largely positive inclination to engage clients in widening their educational and work opportunity horizons, sometimes takes place to the detriment of opening up to other, more critical responses. For example: If a client experiences that educational authorities do not provide the courses they are obliged to, or, if a client suspects discrimination is the cause of sustained unemployment, there is a number of response options. One is primarily in line with the widening of opportunities horizons’ approach; to “put on a brave face” and seek out alternative educational or work opportunities. Another option is to challenge the practices, e.g. to seek legal support and consider legal redress. A third option is to seek backing to deal with the experiences, e.g. in support groups for discriminated persons. The practitioners’ role could be to facilitate and support any of these responses – or other responses that are identified in cooperation with the client.

Thirdly, I suggest the practitioners explore client group work. This could enable reaching out to more clients, and just as important, facilitating a sharing and challenging of knowledge as

well as stimulating a sense of community and support. More specifically, I suggest the practitioners further familiarise themselves with Simon et al.'s approaches; translate, adapt and trial the session outlines in school settings or other group work. This can prepare the ground for a subsequent integration of such approaches in individual client guidance.

Should the practitioners follow up on my suggestions, I further recommend that they, as part of their systems work, share these approaches with other practitioners, to facilitate enactment beyond their own client practices.

The practitioners themselves had many and specific ideas for target groups and settings in which they could perform their system role as trainers and *deliver professional reflexivity training* on social justice, e.g. regular meetings and annual seminars for school counsellors, and in their ongoing supervision of LWS practitioners. Another idea for systems work was to improve *access* to career guidance for all. More specifically, they reflected on the value of improved online provision and the establishment of several centres throughout the county. Both ideas would require increased funding. Additionally, the practitioners reflected around how they could *contribute to system changes* that would support justice. The CCCs' roles as coordinators and resource centres for other organisations provide them with an overview of cooperation and ways of working in the career field. Moreover, through their provision of free guidance for adults, they access many client stories, including stories that reflect system weaknesses. The practitioners articulated awareness around this "witness" function, and that they try to feed back into the system. Nevertheless, participants in both workshops expressed that it would be appropriate to turn up the volume on their system feedback, both locally and nationally, and to consider making their voices heard in media, with regard to social justice. In the before mentioned cases of educational authorities failing to follow up on their obligations to provide courses, or employers discriminating in recruitment processes, the practitioners could consider addressing the issues on a system level. For example, if they are in regular dialogues with the authorities and employers in question, they could raise the issues more generally with them and hopefully contribute to improved future practices. The centres' overview provides insights, yet their position is not wholly ideal for taking on the role as system critics. Their funding and very existence is precarious; the weaknesses they spot often related to how their key partners attend to their missions. Being part of public services, the CCCs are expected to direct their feedback internally and be

loyal to their superiors and partners in public. While there might be some scope for challenging this culture of obedience, their greatest scope for systems enactment seems to be through increased internal feedback, securing and increasing permanent funding to extend access and provision, and through facilitation of professional development for other practitioners.

The practitioners' position – scope for further enactment

While there were some variances within and between the workshop groups, a broader position could be identified, which was largely shared by all. This position combines elements of recognitive and distributive understanding of justice, and is open to some critical perspectives (Irving, 2010; Simon et al., 1991). The practitioners' role conception resonates most strongly with individualistically oriented liberal and progressive positions, with elements of conservative and radical positions (Watts, 1996). In other words, their shared position is characterised by a strong dedication to recognition of individual clients. They encourage critical thinking and supportive communities – for clients and practitioners. Their career concepts are holistic in the sense that they relate to the clients' whole life, and acknowledge the value of unpaid work. However, the practitioners expressed little support for a general decoupling of economic participation and distribution of goods in society, which, according to Irving, is part of a holistic career concept, and the recognitive and critical social justice perspectives (2010). Rather, the practitioners advocated that all who are able should take part in education and work life – given decent job conditions. This stance is more in line with a distributive perspective on justice. It is simultaneously more compatible with Simon et al.'s critical perspective, which upholds the value of increased participation in work life (1991). However, based on their formal mission as well as their personal inclinations, the practitioners have some reservations regarding exposed, radical advocacy roles like e.g. public demonstrations, criticising their superiors or partners in media, or attending meetings with clients, to challenge practices within other public services.

My overall impression is that the practitioners retain complexity and are able to balance different values and roles, according to the situation and their clients' articulated agendas. While there is a tendency towards an individualistic focus, their stances and practices generally appear to be fairly expansive, not reductive. In Appendix 8, further details are presented on the practitioners' position, and how this was explored in the workshops.

Conclusion

Summing up research question 3b, I contend the scope for the CCCs' addressing of social justice must be aligned to the practitioners' largely shared position, which builds on recognitive and distributive perspectives on justice, and are open to critical pedagogy. I have summarised my recommendations for the CCCs' addressing of social justice in Table 15 on the following page.

Recommendations to the County Career Centres

Table 15: Recommendations to the County Career Centres

Recommendations to the County Career Centres	
Ensuring appropriate foundation	1. Enhance professional reflexivity on social justice
	2. Secure appropriate and permanent funding
	3. Secure and exert an independent role
	4. Consider the CCCs’ role in enactment of social justice as part of a system of CEG services
Developing guidance practices	5. Review and pursue own ideas for socially just guidance practices; e. g. related to adult education issues
	6. Explore stronger integration of critical and structural perspectives in guidance practices
	7. Develop and offer group guidance, draw on Simon et al.’s approaches for this
Developing systems work	8. Enhance and deliver professional reflexivity training on social justice
	9. Review and pursue own ideas for improved access: enhanced online provision and establishment of more centres
	10. Share new guidance approaches (ref 5, 6 and 7) with other practitioners
	11. Explore how to provide stronger system feedback locally and nationally; adult education could be a first issue

Chapter 6:

Summary, critical reflections and recommendations

In this last chapter I will sum up major findings and arguments from my research. I will also reflect critically around its literature review, research methods and research questions. Finally, I will suggest some recommendations including scope for further work.

Summary

The primary objectives of my research have been to explore how CEG can address social justice, and to develop professional reflexivity around this. In the following I summarise findings and main arguments, according to my research questions.

1) *How can CEG address social justice?*

I have researched this question on the basis of a selection of texts (Irving, 2010; Irving, 2013; Rogers, 1977; Simon et al., 1991; Sultana, 2014). The authors of all texts voice concern about the potential for CEG to be oppressive and to reinforce injustice. However, their objective is for CEG to enact social justice. Broadly speaking, their suggestions relate to client empowerment and/or facilitating structural and system changes. For the latter, the integration of critical perspectives is advocated. Moreover, all authors promote an advancing of professional reflexivity. While empowerment is seen of vital importance, there are also strong claims that *individual* empowerment is insufficient, and at worst inadvertently oppressive (Sultana, 2014; Irving, 2013). Simultaneously, systems work is weakly integrated in current training, practice and professional role conception, thus major changes are needed for this to become a significant part of the profession's work (ibid). Several authors address the challenge of moving from rhetoric to action; yet, with the exception of Simon et al., their own vagueness about enactment serves to exemplify this challenge. Moreover, Irving's, Rogers' and partly Sultana's texts have reductive tendencies that weaken the strength and/or applicability of their arguments. In contrast, Simon et al.'s approach is highly applicable, and also avoids reductionism. It transcends dichotomous approaches to individual versus society, and to critical versus adaptive approaches to work life. Their position integrates strengths of several other positions, and largely transcends Watts' approaches to socio-political ideologies in CEG (Watts, 1996). Summing up, I contend that

CEG can contribute to social justice. However, it presupposes an advancing of professional reflexivity, stronger integration of critical and structural perspectives in guidance, and a strengthening of the profession's capacity for systems work.

2) Based on my introduction and response to research question 1: *How can I design a workshop that can enable Norwegian CEG practitioners to address social justice?*

To answer research question 2, I designed a one day workshop. In the pedagogical and analytical design, I drew on experiential learning theory (Kolb, 1984), person-centered philosophy (Rogers, 1994), critical pedagogy (Simon et al., 1991) and Kirkpatrick's four level model of criteria for evaluation (Kirkpatrick, 1976; Kirkpatrick, 1996; Praslova, 2010). The workshop's main sections are presented in Table 16. Learning assessment and evaluation were integrated in the workshop design, and learning materials developed for distribution (Appendix 5 and Appendix 6).

Table 16: Content of workshop sections - summarised

Workshop sections	
Section 1	Introduction
Section 2	Perspectives on justice: Introduction, application and review of four different perspectives on justice
Section 3	CEG's socio-political roles: Introduction, application and review of Watts' four approaches
Section 4	A pedagogy for enactment: Introduction and review of one session outline from Simon et al.'s critical pedagogy
Section 5	Enactment in CCC context: Review own practices, explore enactment and form responses
Section 6	Feedback on the workshop: Suggestions for further development Closure

3) Based on experiences with design, negotiation, delivery and evaluation of the workshop for two County Career Centres:

- a. To what extent is the workshop successful and suitable for further delivery?***
- b. How can the County Career Centres address social justice in Norway?***

To answer research question 3a, the workshop was delivered twice and reviewed with regard to the participants' *reactions* and *learning*. *Behaviour* and *results* achievements were also briefly discussed (Kirkpatrick in Praslova, 2010). According to reactions and learning criteria the workshop was highly successful. Nevertheless, it could be strengthened with a

specification of current Norwegian social justice issues and cultivation of Section 5 on enactment. The participants and the facilitator concurred in the relevance of the workshop for CEG practitioners, and that it is feasible to negotiate delivery in several sectors and settings.

With regard to research question 3b, I have argued that the CCCs are already enacting social justice through their strong dedication to recognition, practitioner reflexivity training and some system feedback. A feasible scope for their further enactment must be in line with the practitioners' perspectives on justice. This is based in recognitive and distributive understandings, and in opening up to elements of critical perspectives. The practitioners' civil servant status means that professional development work, empowering of clients and internal system feedback, are more feasible than direct, public action. There is a risk that CEG can be oppressive and inadvertently support injustice. However, I contend the CCCs already enact social justice, *and* that there is scope for a strengthening of the enactment. I have recommended that the CCCs work along three lines: securing an appropriate foundation, developing guidance practices and developing their systems work. Detailed recommendations were presented on page 52.

Critical reflections

Literature review

I read extensively before writing the literature review (see Bibliography), but making a text selection was necessary to go into any depth. The chosen texts provided a good basis for me to form my stance and develop a workshop. Nevertheless, if other positions and arguments could have been integrated somewhat more, it might have made the review richer. Moreover, the selection is skewed with regard to the authors' gender. Initially I included an article written by four women (Arthur et al., 2009). In the end, I made little use of it in my arguments, and excluded it to elaborate on the others. Not all the included authors refer explicitly to the concept of social justice, CEG and *career* guidance. This has impeded direct comparisons and involved some extrapolation on my part. Nevertheless, I uphold the value of bringing in these contributions; Rogers due to his strong position in the field, and Simon et al. due to their ability to transcend the other positions and to provide specific resources for enactment.

Research questions

Reviewing my research questions, I consider it a strength that they relate to, and integrate theory and practice. Research question 1 made it possible for me to go deep into the literature. Questions 2 and 3a have allowed for the creation and evaluation of a product with practical use, and which I feel confident to adapt to a variety of settings. Questions 2 and 3 built the case for cooperation with practitioners, and this has contributed to a necessary grounding and contextualisation of the enactment issue.

Starting out with this project, I had strong, but not quite worked through, concerns about CEG's socio-political role. This showed up in a general scepticism which I felt counterproductive for my work. Through the exploration of my research questions and the cooperation with practitioners who have proved highly capable of nuanced thinking, I see the issues more clearly and nuanced, and feel ready to address social justice in constructive ways through my professional role.

On a more critical note, my number of research questions could be questioned. Fewer questions would have allowed for deeper discussions. I considered omitting my last research question for this purpose, but finally, I decided I wanted to prioritise a contextualisation of enactment. My initial research question 3b related to Norwegian CEG in general, rather than the CCCs exclusively, but it turned out to be too general. However, had I managed to answer this broader question, it would have made my work relevant to wider audiences.

Research methods

I will now reflect briefly on some general weaknesses in my chosen methods, and move on to consider specific weaknesses in my research, relating this to the central concepts of validity and reliability (Denscombe, 2007: 297-298).

Work based and action research is subject to the critique of not being objective (Biggam, 2008: 84). However, with reference to my epistemological position, I contend objectivity is not achievable in any social sciences, and not a challenge specific to my research strategies. Nevertheless, it demands that potential bias is considered, and that the researcher clarify her position, so that others can consider its influence on the research (Ahern, 1999). I have aimed for this throughout the dissertation. The local character of work based and action

research further subjects it to the critique that its findings cannot be generalised. However, I concur with Denscombe, who refers to Lincoln and Guba, to argue that the concept of *transferability* is more relevant to qualitative research than generalisability (Denscombe, 2007: 299). Here, it is appropriate to discuss to what extent findings *can* be *transferred* to other instances, even if it cannot be claimed that they *are generalisable*. Consequently, I have sought to do this when I have used the findings from two CCCs to consider potential enactment by CCCs generally, thereby extending the relevance of my research.

Validity

According to Biggam, *validity* relates to the *appropriateness* of research strategies, data collection and analytical frameworks pertaining to the research objectives (2008: 127).

Denscombe further emphasises that validity is related to the accuracy and precision of the data (2007: 296). Overall, I contend that my research methods have been valid.

Nevertheless, my design has not complied fully with ideals for my chosen methods.

According to Judith Bell, “a literature review should give a picture of the state of knowledge, and of major questions in your topic area” (Bell, 2010: 112). While my review gives a picture of fundamental questions, it is not absolutely definitive, as other and more recent contributions exist. Similarly, my research does not fit exactly into the typical descriptions of work based or action research. Delivering the workshops from a student status slightly obscured the work based dimension. Moreover, relating the research to other organisations and roles than my own, I was not the unequivocal insider researcher commonly referred to within these research strategies. Furthermore, going outside my own organisation, I have reduced my opportunities for following up. Hence, the project is subject to a common weakness in action research; it risks ending up as a “one-off” happening, rather than a continuous cycle of development (Denscombe, 2010: 129). However, being a “semi-outsider”, I might have countered another common critique: researcher myopia (Denscombe, 2010: 132-133). According to action research ideals, participants should be involved at all stages (Denscombe, 2010: 136). Ideally, I would have involved the practitioners more in the analyses and recommendations around further workshop delivery, as well as on their potential enactment. However, I knew they could not prioritise such a comprehensive cooperation and settled for giving them the opportunity to read and provide input, without assuming they would have the time for this.

In retrospect, I consider it a weakness that I did not realise at an earlier stage that my initial research question 3b was too wide. One consequence was that I had to bother the practitioners with a second round of consents. However, my being alert and going through with a second round, could be considered a testimony to my dedication to an ethically sound research practice. Moreover, I contend my rephrased research question strengthened the validity; that the coherence between my field evidence and research question 3b became tighter.

In an effort to ensure the accuracy of my workshop data, I provided the participants with evaluation summaries and drafts of Chapters 4 and 5 for them to read through and comment on. The feedback I received was positive, and there were no suggestions for changes.

Reliability

Reliability relates to the *trustworthiness* of findings and is based on the transparency of the research process (Biggam, 2008: 127). I contend my findings are reliable. My literature review is verifiable; anyone can consult the texts it is based on and consider it. The findings from the workshop are well documented in main texts and appendices. The transcriptions of the workshop recordings provide further documentation. However, I have decided against publishing these, as it would involve a detailed exposure of the participants. With regard to the participants' positive feedback, it could be questioned whether it could be the result of politeness or a fear to undermine the centres' relations to the NULG. Two observations run counter to this. First, one manager assured me their feedback would be candid; that they have a critical inclination to the extent that they have questioned whether they are too critical. Secondly, these professionals have not held back on constructive criticism of the NULG's work on other occasions.

Recommendations

I will start out by proposing possible extensions of this research project. To keep it fairly short, I have summarised some suggestions under three main headings in Table 17.

Table 17: Summary - Scope for further work

Pedagogical development work – developing and trialling further resources
1. Design new workshop resources that a) specify and relate social justice to current, Norwegian issues, b) strengthens the workshop Section 5 on enactment
2. Develop more refined resources for reflexivity work
3. Translate and adapt appropriate resources for enactment, developed in other countries
4. Review and further develop the most commonly used and individualistically oriented guidance tools, to better integrate structural and critical perspectives
5. Develop resources that can strengthen CEG’s capacity for systems work and advocacy
6. Develop self help resources on social justice, that can be used without external facilitator, or following a workshop
Additional strategies for addressing the issue
7. Make use of internet. Examples: Publish articles and share pedagogical resources on www.veiledersforum.no (Norwegian web resource for career counsellors, edited by NULG). Raising issues in relevant web forums
8. Negotiate access for workshop delivery in new sectors, e.g. higher education and rehabilitation organisations, as well as schools and Labour and Welfare Services
Further research
9. Analyse discourses in Norwegian CEG guidance sessions from a social justice perspective and seek to further develop inclusive and critical discourses

Further recommendations

I will conclude by outlining some additional recommendations that pertain to opportunities for me to bring learning from the research into my work at the National Unit for Lifelong Guidance (NULG). Generally speaking, I can seek opportunities to deliver elements from the workshop in different contexts¹⁰. More specifically, I have identified four particularly relevant processes coming up in the near future:

- 1) Development of national ethical guidelines for career guidance at the CCCs in 2015
- 2) Joint seminar on social justice for career practitioners at the CCCs and the Master's degree students in career guidance, in November 2015
- 3) Following up of a white paper on lifelong learning and exclusion that NULG has been involved in, and which will be published in the spring of 2015.
- 4) Following up of OECD's recent recommendation which the Norwegian government has committed itself to: "Apply a whole-of-government approach to establish a comprehensive career guidance system, covering all stages of lifelong learning, and providing high quality services" (OECD, 2014b: 17).

Most likely, I will be involved in all of these processes, and I recommend that I/the NULG, take the opportunity to address social justice issues. As for the following up of government policies, it is to be expected that they will – similar to other contemporary policies – primarily be underpinned by an economic rationality that relates to a distributive perspective on justice. This will frame and affect the potential social justice enactment by Norwegian CEG. It remains to be seen what will be the scope for the NULG and the broader profession, to exert influence upon these upcoming processes. All the same, I recommend being on the alert for opportunities to preserve and advance social justice in this work.

¹⁰ I have already initiated this: Through my work role, I volunteered to deliver parts of the workshop at a national forum for 28 organisations engaged in Norwegian CEG, in March 2015. This was well received, and might generate demand for further delivery in various sectors.

List of references

- Ahern, K. J. (1999) 'Ten Tips for Reflexive Bracketing', *Qualitative Health Research*, 9(3), pp. 407-411.
- Alliger, G. M., Tannenbaum, S. I., Bennett, W., Traver, H. and Shotland, A. (1997) 'A meta-analysis of the relations among training criteria', *Personnel psychology*, 50(2), pp. 341-358.
- Arthur, N. (2008) 'Qualification standards for career practitioners', in Athanasou, J.B. & Esbroeck, R. (eds.) *International handbook of career guidance*. New York, NY: Springer, pp. 303-323.
- Arthur, N., Collins, S., McMahon, M. and Marshall, C. (2009) 'Career Practitioners' Views of Social Justice and Barriers for Practice', *Canadian Journal of Career Development/Revue canadienne de développement de carrière* 8(1), pp. 22-31.
- Bassot, B. and Reid, H. (2012) 'Reflexivity', in Schiersmann, C., Ertelt, B.-J., Katsarov, J., Mulvey, R., Reid, H. & Weber, P. (eds.) *NICE Handbook for the Academic Training of Career Guidance and Counselling Professionals*. Heidelberg, Germany: Network for Innovation in Guidance and Counselling in Europe/Heidelberg University, pp. 179-183.
- Bauman, Z. (2001) 'Globalization and the new poor', in Beilharz, P.M. (ed.) *The Bauman Reader*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, pp. 298–333.
- Bell, J. (2010) *Doing Your Research Project: A guide for first-time researchers in education, health and social science*. Fifth edn. Maidenhead, UK: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Biggam, J. 2008. *Succeeding with Your Master's Dissertation*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill/Open University Press.
- Bjørnskau, T., Dahl, E. and Grøgaard, J. B. (1997) 'The Work Approach in Norway - Aims, Measures and Results', *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, pp. 136-154.
- Crotty, M. (1998) *The foundations of social research: meaning and perspective in the research process*. London, UK: SAGE.
- Denscombe, M. (2007) *The Good Research Guide for Small-scale Social Research Projects*. Third edn. Maidenhead, UK: McGraw-Hill Education/Open University Press.
- Denscombe, M. (2010) *The Good Research Guide for Small-scale Social Research Projects*. Maidenhead, UK: McGraw-Hill Education/Open University Press.
- Eurostat (2012) *Eurostat newsrelease: At risk of poverty or social exclusion in EU27*. Available at: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_PUBLIC/3-08022012-AP/EN/3-08022012-AP-EN.PDF (Accessed: 24 June 2014).
- Finansdepartementet (2009) *NOU 2009: 10 Fordelingsutvalget*. Oslo, Norway: Departementenes servicesenter.

- Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R. and Worthen, B. R. (2012) *Program Evaluation. Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines*. Fourth edn. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Flyvbjerg, B., Landman, T., Schram, S. (2012) *Real social science: applied phronesis*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Fraser, N. (1997) *Justice interruptus: Critical reflections on the "postsocialist" condition*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Freire, P. and Freire, A. M. A. (1998) *Pedagogy of the heart*. New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Gale, T. (2000) 'Rethinking social justice in schools: how will we recognize it when we see it?', *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 4(3), pp. 253-269.
- Gale, T. and Densmore, K. M. (2003) *Engaging teachers: Towards a radical democratic agenda*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.
- Hammond, M. and Wellington, J. (2013) *Research methods: the key concepts*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hodkinson, P. (2008) *Understanding career decision making and progression: Careership revisited*. John Killeen Memorial Lecture. Available at: http://www.crac.org.uk/CMS/files/upload/fifth_johnkilleenlecturenotes.pdf (Accessed: 2 April 2015).
- IAEVG (2014) 'IAEVG Communiqué on Social Justice in Educational and Career Guidance and Counselling', *International Journal of Educational and Vocational Guidance*, 14, pp. 154-155.
- Irving, B. (2013) *Re/constructing career education as a critical social practice: Pushing the discursive boundaries of possibility. Paper presented at the IAEVG Conference, Montpellier, France, September 2013*. Available at: <http://scholar.google.no/scholar?hl=no&q=3.%09Barrie+Irving%3A++Re%2Fconstructing+career+education+as+a+critical+social+practice%3A+Pushing+the+discursive+boundaries+of+possibility&btnG=> (Accessed: 2 July 2014).
- Irving, B. A. (2010) '(Re) constructing career education as a socially just practice: an antipodean reflection', *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance*, 10(1), pp. 49-63.
- Jones, A. (1999) 'The limits of cross-cultural dialogue: Pedagogy, desire and absolution in the classroom.', *Educational Theory*, (49), pp. 299–316.
- Kirkpatrick, D. (1976) 'Evaluation of training', in Craig, R.L. (ed.) *Training and Development Handbook: A Guide to Human Resources*. Second ed: New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Kirkpatrick, D. (1996) 'Invited reaction: Reaction to Holton article', *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 7, pp. 23–25.
- Kolb, D. (1984) *Experiential learning: experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Krumboltz, J. D. (2009) 'The happenstance learning theory', *Journal of Career Assessment*, 17(2), pp. 135-154.
- Kunnskapsdepartementet (2010) *Tildelingsbrev 2010 til Vox, tillegg 2: Etablering av enhet for nasjonal koordinering av karriereveiledning*. Oslo, Norway: Kunnskapsdepartementet.
- MacIntyre, A. (1984) *After virtue*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- MacIntyre, A. C. (1988) *Whose justice? Which rationality?* Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- McIlveen, P. and Patton, W. (2006) 'A critical reflection on career development', *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance*, 6(1), pp. 15-27.
- McMahon, M., Arthur, N. and Collins, S. (2008) 'Social justice and career development: Looking back, looking forward', *Australian Journal of Career Development*, 17(2), pp. 21-29.
- NAV (2015) *Utviklingen på arbeidsmarkedet*. Oslo: NAV. Available at: <https://www.nav.no/no/NAV+og+samfunn/Kunnskap/Analyser/Arbeid+og+velferd/Arbeid+og+velferd/Utviklingen+p%C3%A5+arbeidsmarkedet.355576.cms> (Accessed: 1 April 2015).
- OECD (2002) *OECD Review of Career Guidance Policies. Norway: Country Note*. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/pdf/M00031000/M00031827.pdf>. (Accessed: 2 January 2014).
- OECD (2014a) *OECD Skills Diagnostic Report 2014 Norway*. Available at: <http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/KD/Vedlegg/Internasjonalt/UNESCO/NorwayDiagnosticReportCorrectedVersion.pdf> (Accessed: 5 September 2014).
- OECD (2014b) *OECD Skills Strategy Action Report Norway*. Available at: http://skills.oecd.org/developskills/documents/OECD_Skills_Strategy_Action_Report_Norway.pdf (Accessed: 22 February 2015).
- Parekh, B. C. (2000) *Rethinking multiculturalism: Cultural diversity and political theory*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.
- Parsons, F. (1909/1989) *Choosing a vocation*. Garrett Park, MD: Garrett Park Press (Original work published 1909).
- Piketty, T. and Goldhammer, A. (2014) *Capital in the Twenty-first Century*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Plant, P. and Thomsen, R. (2012) 'Career guidance in Denmark: Social control in a velvet glove', *Orientación y Sociedad*, 11, pp. 1-17.
- Plant, P. and Valgreen, H. (2014) 'The flip side: Career guidance policies and social control', *Journal of the National Institute for Career Education and Counselling*, April 2014(32).
- Praslova, L. (2010) 'Adaptation of Kirkpatrick's four level model of training criteria to assessment of learning outcomes and program evaluation in Higher Education', *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 22:, pp. 215-225.

- Robson, C. (2002) *Real World Research: A Resource for Social Scientists and Practitioner-Researchers*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Rogers, C. (1951) *Client-centered therapy: Its current practice, implications and theory*. London, UK: Constable and Limited Company.
- Rogers, C. (1977) *On Personal Power: Inner Strength and Its Revolutionary Impact*. New York, NY: Delacorte Press.
- Rogers, C. R. (1994) *Freedom to learn*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Simon, R., Dipbo, D. and Schenke, A. (1991) *Learning work. A critical pedagogy of work education*. New York, NY: Bergin & Garvey, Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Sosial- og helsedepartementet (1995) *St. meld. Nr. 35 (1994-95), Velferdsmeldingen*. Oslo, Norway: Statens Forvaltningstjeneste.
- Stanbury, D. (2010) 'The kindness of strangers', *Education + Training*, 52(2), pp. 100-116.
- Stjernø, S. and Øverbye, E. (2012) *Arbeidslinja: arbeidsmotivasjonen og velferdsstaten*. Oslo, Norway: Universitetsforlaget.
- Sultana, R. G. (2014) 'Career guidance for social justice in neoliberal times', in Arulmani, G., Bakshi, A.J., Leong, F.T.L. & Watts, T. (eds.) *Handbook of Career Development. International perspectives*. New York, NY: Springer, pp. 317-333.
- Svalund, J. (2013) *The impact of institutions on mobility, labour adjustments and cooperation in the Nordic countries*. Available at: http://www.fao.no/index.php?option=com_zoo&task=item&item_id=6847&Itemid=923 (=nb).
- The Higher Education Academy (2012) *A marked Improvement. Transforming assessment in higher education*. Available at: https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/sites/default/files/A_Marked_Improvement.pdf (Accessed: 9 November 2014).
- UNDP (2013) *Human Development Report 2013*. Available at: http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/reports/14/hdr2013_en_complete.pdf (Accessed: 1 June 2014).
- Utdanningsdirektoratet (2011) *Generell del av læreplanen*. Available at: <http://www.udir.no/Lareplaner/Kunnskapsloftet/Generell-del-av-lareplanen/> (Accessed: 15 March 2015).
- Watson, M. (2010) 'Career psychology in South Africa: Addressing and redressing social justice', *Australian Journal of Career Development*, 19(1), pp. 24-29.
- Watts, A. G. (1996) 'Socio-political ideologies in guidance', in Watts, A., Law, B., Killeen, J., Kidd, J. & Hawthorn, R. (eds.) *Rethinking careers education and guidance: Theory, policy and practice*. London, UK: Routledge, pp. 351-366.

Bibliography

- Arthur, N. (2005) 'Building from Diversity to Social Justice Competencies in International Standards for Career Development Practitioners', *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance*, 5(2), pp. 137-148.
- Arthur, N. (2014) 'Social justice and career guidance in the Age of Talent', *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance*, 14(1), pp. 47-60.
- Arulmani, G. (2010) 'Career counselling: A mechanism to address the accumulation of disadvantage', *Australian Journal of Career Development*, 19(1), pp. 7-12.
- Bassot, B. (2012) 'Upholding equality and social justice: A social constructivist perspective on emancipatory career guidance practice', *Australian Journal of Career Development*, 21(2), pp. 3-13.
- Bates, I. (1990) 'The politics of careers education and guidance: A case for scrutiny', *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 18(1), pp. 66-83.
- Bengtsson, A. (2014) 'Enterprising career education: the power of self-management', *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 33(3), pp. 362-375.
- Blustein, D. L., McWhirter, E. H. and Perry, J. C. (2005) 'An emancipatory communitarian approach to vocational development theory, research, and practice', *The Counseling Psychologist*, 33(2), pp. 141-179.
- Colley, H. (2000) 'Deconstructing realism in career planning: how globalisation impacts on vocational guidance', in Colley, H. & Roberts, K. (eds.) *Careers guidance constructing the future: a global perspective*. Stourbridge, UK: Institute of Career Guidance.
- Hertzberg, F. and Sundelin, Å. (2014) 'Counseling between recognition, justice and difference: the significance of power asymmetries, communicative projects and unintended consequences in career counseling of immigrants in Sweden', *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance*, 14(1), pp. 89-102.
- Irving, B. A. and Malik, B. (eds.) (2005) *Critical reflections on career education and guidance: Promoting social justice within a global economy*. Abingdon, UK: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Kjærgård, R. (2012) *Karriereveiledningens genealogi: Den suverene stats regulering av det frie utdannings-og yrkevalg*. Institut for Uddannelse og Pædagogik (DPU), Aarhus Universitet, Aarhus, Denmark.
- McCash, P. (2006) 'We're all career researchers now: breaking open career education and DOTS', *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 34(4), pp. 429-449.

- McCash, P. (2008) *Career studies handbook: Career development learning in practice*. Available at: https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/sites/default/files/Career_Studies_Handbook.pdf. (Accessed: 3 April 2015).
- McCash, P. (2011) *Designing a generic career studies module*. Available at: http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/study/cil/about/cilteam/pmccash/ccms_career_studies_example_08_11.pdf (Accessed: 2 April 2015).
- McMahon, M., Arthur, N. and Collins, S. (2008) 'Social justice and career development: Views and experiences of Australian career development practitioners', *Australian Journal of Career Development*, 17(3), pp. 15-25.
- Mignot, P. (2001) 'Anti-oppressive practice', in Gothard, B., Mignot, P., Offer, M. & Ruff, M. (eds.) *Careers guidance in context*. London, UK: Sage, pp. 117-132.
- Nassar-McMillan, S. C. (2014) 'A framework for cultural competence, advocacy, and social justice: Applications for global multiculturalism and diversity', *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance*, 14(1), pp. 103-118.
- Plant, P. (2005) 'Guidance policies: The trojan horse', *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance*, 5(2), pp. 101-109.
- Plant, P. and Thomsen, R. (2012) 'Career guidance in Denmark: Social control in a velvet glove', *Orientación y Sociedad*, 11, pp. 1-17.
- Richardson, M. S. (2012) 'Counseling for work and relationship', *The Counseling Psychologist*, 40(2), pp. 190-242.
- Roberts, K. (1977) 'The social conditions, consequences and limitations of careers guidance', *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 5(1), pp. 1-9.
- Roberts, K. (2005) 'Social class, opportunity structures and career guidance', in Irving, B. & Malik, B. (eds.) *Critical reflections on career education and guidance: Promoting social justice within a global economy*. Abingdon, UK: RoutledgeFalmer, pp. 130-142.
- Roberts, R. (1980) 'An alternative justification for careers education: A radical response to Roberts and Daws', *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 8(2), pp. 158-174.
- Sultana, R. (2014) 'Pessimism of the intellect, optimism of the will? Troubling the relationship between career guidance and social justice - Springer', *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance*.
- Sultana, R. G. (2011a) 'Lifelong guidance, citizen rights and the state: reclaiming the social contract', *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 39(2), pp. 179-186.

Sultana, R. G. (2011b) 'On being a 'boundary person': mediating between the local and the global in career guidance policy learning', *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9(2), pp. 265-283.

Watts, A. G. (2010) 'Social exclusion and career development: A United Kingdom perspective', *Australian Journal of Career Development*, 19(1), pp. 30-35.

Appendices

Appendices 3-7 + 9 were originally in Norwegian. They have been translated to English to be included in the dissertation.

Appendix 1 Research project timeline

Month	Process
April – May 2014	Write draft: Research proposal Locate further literature
June 2014	Finalise research proposal including ethical consent form
July – November 2014	Write drafts: Chapters 2-4 October: Send requests for workshop delivery and cooperation with two County Career Centres, followed by signing of consent forms
December 2014	Finalise workshop presentation, evaluation and learning materials Trial workshop at two County Career Centres
December 2014 – February 2015	Write drafts for Chapters 5 and 6
March 2015	Finalise all chapters and appendices Early March: Send drafts to practitioners at the County Career Centres for validation, two weeks deadline for feedback

Appendix 2 Glossary

CEG: career education and guidance

CCCs: County Career Centres. In the last decade, 38 public CCCs have been established in Norway, covering all but two counties. These centres provide free guidance to adults, are resource centres for practitioners in schools and public Labour and Welfare Services (LWS), and coordinate and facilitate cooperation among relevant parties in the counties, including employers. The centres are founded on a partnership between the LWS and educational authorities in each county. The NULG has a responsibility to follow up and support these centres in particular.

LWS: Public Labour and Welfare Services, called NAV in Norwegian. More info here:

<https://www.nav.no/en/Home/About+NAV/What+is+NAV>

NULG: The National Unit for Lifelong Guidance. This is part of Vox, The National Agency for Lifelong Learning in Norway, which is a subsidiary to the Royal Norwegian Ministry of Education. <http://www.vox.no/English/Lifelong-guidance/>

Work approach policy: The objective of the work approach policy is to enrol more people in work life and reduce the number of people receiving public benefits. This entails that work should be the first preference, and that policy measures and programmes are designed with the intention to reinforce this preference.

Appendix 3 Workshop information and consent form

Project title:

Career education and guidance - contributing to social justice? Facilitation of professional reflection on the socio-political roles of career education and guidance

Combined Information sheet and consent Form

Thank you for taking the time to read this sheet and for expressing interest in participating in the workshop I will facilitate. Below you will find information about the project, and a consent form.

I will need to submit signed consent forms for all workshop participants to my university, so I kindly ask you to sign one of the form copies and return it to your manager by the 14th of November. You can keep the other copy. The consent form is inserted on the last page of this document.

Project information

Background

This workshop project is part of my master dissertation work at “Career Education, Information and Guidance” at the University of Warwick in the UK.

In the master project I will explore the following questions:

1. Can career guidance contribute to social justice, and if so: how?

Can career guidance contribute to the equalisation of life chances among citizens, regardless of social background, gender, ethnicity, religiosity etc? Many career guidance practitioners are motivated by this objective, and the issue is engaging several international researchers and professional organisations. On the other hand, some researchers claim that career guidance in its effect rather contributes to increased injustice and the legitimisation of social stratification. These are central issues in the literature review of my master dissertation. In the workshop I will present different approaches to justice and the socio-political role of career guidance, and facilitate joint reflection around these issues in a Norwegian context.

2. How can professional reflection be stimulated with regard to the contribution of Norwegian career guidance to social justice?

This is exactly what I want to trial out through designing and delivering a workshop on the issue. I will invite experienced career guidance practitioners to take part in and evaluate the

workshop: to what extent the chosen perspectives and pedagogical approaches are conceived as appropriate, and whether the participants have further ideas about how these issues can be addressed. The research project will provide input and time for you, as participant and me as facilitator, to reflect on our professional roles. I have a cooperative perspective on the workshop, and it does not involve any kind of evaluation of the participants or the centre they are working at.

Information about the researcher:

I am currently a part-time student at the University of Warwick. I am also working in the National Unit for Lifelong Guidance, in Vox. I have previously worked in career guidance and education at the University of Oslo, and prior to this with guidance at a shelter for abused women, and as an independent coach. My original training has been in social sciences and coaching.

What is involved in taking part?

Together with your colleagues, you will be asked to take part in and evaluate a workshop that I facilitate. The workshop stretches over six hours, including breaks, and will take place within your normal work hours at your work place.

After the workshop you will be requested to review it in an anonymous form.

Throughout the workshop I will respect and safeguard the personal privacy of all participants. Should you, nevertheless, find it problematic to participate, you will be at liberty to withdraw at any time during the workshop, without any consequences for further cooperation with me, or the National Unit for Career Guidance.

How were you selected?

I wanted to cooperate with career practitioners at the County Career Centres, due to your professionalism and knowledge of Norwegian career guidance and education in several sectors. Your particular centre was approached because I know that you are strongly engaged in professional reflection and development.

What happens to the information you give?

I will use the experiences and feedback from the workshop to reflect on the research questions of my master dissertation. In order to retain and process the experiences and feedback from the workshop, I will make a sound recording of it. Recordings, my notes and your reply to the post evaluation form, will be kept strictly confidential. The research material will be stored in my private office at home. Your name, contact details and signed consent form will be retained in confidential archives at the University of Warwick and will only be used in the assessment of my completed piece of work. These materials will be confidentially destroyed after 10 years.

Some of the data you supply may appear in my master dissertation and additional publications, such as academic articles. If this is the case, all such results will be strictly anonymous.

You may contact me at xx xx xx xx or at xxx.xxx@hotmail.com¹¹ to discuss any questions you may have with regard to the project.

This project has been subject to ethical review, according to procedures specified by the University, and is allowed to proceed.

I confirm that I will keep the research under review, and report to the University on any ethical problems or risks arising, which were initially not apparent.

Consent Form

1. I have read and received from xxx in the above Information Sheet, relating to the following project: "Career education and guidance – a contributor to social justice? Facilitation of professional reflection on the socio-political roles of career education and guidance".
2. I have had explained to me the purposes of the project and what will be required of me, and any questions I have had, have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to the arrangements described in the Information Sheet, in so far as they relate to my participation.
3. I understand that participation is entirely voluntary; I have the right to withdraw at any time during the workshop, and that this will be without detriment to my cooperation with the researcher or the National Unit for Career Guidance in the future.
4. This project has been subject to ethical review, according to procedures specified by the University and has been allowed to proceed.
5. I have received a copy of this combined Consent Form and Information Sheet.

Name:

Signature:

Date:

¹¹ Contact information is removed here to adhere to course guidelines not to disclose the name of the student in the dissertation work

Appendix 4 Workshop consent form II

The second round of consents was undertaken by the following e-mail text, which was sent to the managers first, and then to all participants:

Subject: Regarding research consents – quick clarification?

Hi,

I have a question for you, subsequent to the workshop on social justice.

After working on my analysis, I have come to realise that in addition to evaluating the workshop, I would like to write about how the County Career Centres can contribute to socially just CEG practices in Norway – through your client work and training of other practitioners. However, since I did not initially ask for your explicit consent to write about this, I would now like to clarify with all participants whether you find it ok.

If I were to write about this, I would refer to the participants' ideas on how CEG can address social justice. I would also argue that any ambition, related to the centres' contributions in this regard, would need to be in line with those perspectives on justice that resonated most strongly in the practitioners' groups; the re-cognitive and distributive justice perspectives. Moreover, I would want to reference some of the participants' statements, to illustrate their understandings and ideas. The centres and the participants would be anonymous; I would only state that I have cooperated with two County Career Centres, and mention how many people took part in each of the workshops.

No matter how you respond to this request, I plan to send you my texts that relate to the workshops, before I submit my dissertation. I know you are very busy and do not assume that you will have the time to read it. However, as I have invited you to cooperate, I do want to give you the opportunity to read and comment on the text before I submit it.

Summing up, I wonder whether you will give your consent to my referencing from the workshop, in order to reflect on the potential role of the County Career Centres in addressing CEG in Norway?

I have started writing to you as manager of the centre, and if you find it ok, I will send a similar e-mail to your staff members.

With the submission of the dissertation coming up soon, I would appreciate if you could respond as quickly as possible. And please feel free to contact me if you have any further questions regarding this. I regret the inconvenience for you with this second round of consents.

Kind regards,

Appendix 5 Workshop evaluation form - template

Sheet no 1: Evaluation form

During the workshop: Please use numbers 1-5 to indicate your perception of the different workshop sections with regard to the degree of comprehensibility, relevance, and ability to stir engagement: 1 indicates not at all and 5 indicates fully comprehensible, relevant or engaging.

After the workshop: please fill in the form electronically with your numbers as well as comments where you have qualitative feedback.

	Compre- hensible	Relevant	Engaging	Comments
Four perspectives on justice				
Introduction - Perspectives on justice				
Exercise - Perspectives on justice: representations				
Exercise - Perspectives on justice: Relate the perspectives to the CCC, LWS and schools				
Four socio-political roles for CEG				
Introduction – Watts’ approaches/roles				
Exercise - Prepare brief talks according to “your” role				
Exercise- Relate roles to practices at CCC, LWS and schools				

Critical pedagogy				
Introduction - Simon et al.'s position and test session				
Exercise - Review Simon et al.'s test session for Rådgivernytt				
Enactment in context				
Brief introduction				
Exercise – Enactment: Review of practice, exploration of enactment and forming of responses				
Immediate feedback on the workshop				
If you have any comments to the block on immediate feedback on the workshop, you can write them here:				
<i>General comments to:</i>				
Practicalities and structure				
Overall pedagogy				

Style of delivery/facilitation by seminar leader	
Any other comments	

Summaries and exercises

Workshop on CEG and social justice

Sheet 2

2a Summary: Four perspectives on justice (Irving 2010, 2014)

Perspective and related “career” concept	<i>Justice defined, What is the objective, what characterises a just society?</i>	<i>How should social justice be achieved?</i>	<i>Who should social justice benefit?</i>
Retributive “Career” is construed as being of our own making, influenced by individual drive, determination and latent talents – we make our own ‘luck’	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Material and social goods/opportunities commensurate with talent and effort 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Through open competition and (government) protection of life and property 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Individuals who contribute (economically) to society
Redistributive “Career” is constructed by the individual, accommodates other life roles and desires, but is construed primarily as an economic concept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Material and social goods/opportunities basic to social life 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mixed economy - Proportional distributions to individuals/groups - Those who do not secure their own income receive basic support – at least for a period of time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dis-advantaged individuals/ Groups
Recognitive “Career” is constructed in relation to the desires of self, family and community, and may <i>not</i> include economic participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Positive self-identity, self-development and self-determination for all - Diversity is valued 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Through democratic processes that include the interests of the least advantaged - Equitable distribution of goods not driven by labour market participation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All people; differently experienced among and within different social groups
Critical social justice – “Career” is constructed as holistic, and it is recognised that it is always in a state of flux and can take multiple forms – including those that might challenge the state	As in recognitive plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Real participative democracy - Positively accommodates the views and desires of diverse groups - Positive recognition of diversity and differences - A valuing of all for who they are, and for their social contribution, not their economical contribution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fostering a critical political citizenship, cultivating dialogue and a culture for internal and external critique of own and others’ practices - Equality in recognition and the equitable distribution of goods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All people; differently experienced among and within different social groups

Exercise 2b: Finding representations – perspectives on justice

What representations can you think of that could be related to each of the four perspectives?

Perspective	Representations (e.g. organisations, individuals, statements, commercials, sayings, stories, religious texts, song lyrics...)
Retributive	
Distributive	
Recognitive	
Critical social justice	

10 minutes in pairs, 10 minutes presentations/dialogue

Sheet 3

3a Summary: Watts' approaches to CEG's socio-political ideologies/roles

	Core focus on society	Core focus on individual
Change	<p>Radical - social change</p> <p>For everyone to have a good career society must change. Not sufficient to help individuals progress= "shuffling of the cards"</p> <p>Might involve making individuals see their challenges as group challenges, rather than individual challenges</p> <p>Counsellor role: advocacy; fighting alongside and for unprivileged, to change structures in order to increase justice and opportunities for all</p> <p>Example: challenge educational systems/local school practices that push students out</p>	<p>Progressive - individual change</p> <p>Extend horizons of opportunity, raise aspirations</p> <p>Empowerment, assertiveness training</p> <p>Use of role models</p> <p>Support to progress</p> <p>Counsellor role: pro-active</p> <p>Example: support women in advancing to leading positions</p>
Status quo	<p>Conservative - social control</p> <p>Sociologically inspired, <i>function</i> of guidance - might be different from intention</p> <p>Guidance on the basis of the needs of the labour market, emphasis on "being realistic"</p> <p>Social inequality is masked in a language of individual choice and the dignity of work</p> <p>Counsellor role: assist individuals in adapting to the needs of the labour market, "gatekeeper"</p> <p>Example: highly qualified immigrants who are encouraged to reduce their ambitions in order to achieve a job</p>	<p>Liberal - non-directive</p> <p>Inspired by Carl Rogers</p> <p>Assist individuals in making career choices according to their abilities, skills, interests and values</p> <p>Different values and interests means it is possible to "win" in different ways</p> <p>Counsellor role: facilitative</p> <p>Example: guidance according to the client's values – which might reproduce systematic differences, e.g. dominance of women in care work</p>

Exercise 3b:

Representing socio-political roles in a plenary debate on CEG's roles. What should CEG contribute to in Norway?

You will be assigned one of the four roles which you are asked to act out in a plenary debate. Feel free to exaggerate slightly, have fun 😊.

1. Prepare to deliver two 1-minute introductions by answering the following questions according to your attributed role,
 - a. What should be CEG's contributions in a Norwegian context, what is the point of having a public CEG provision? Exemplify.
 - b. What should we do more of within Norwegian CEG? What should we stop doing?

The facilitator can be called on for (your) assistance in the preparations.

2. Delivery of your introductions. The facilitator will ask all participants to deliver their first introduction. Feel free to relate your arguments to the previous introductions. When all participants have delivered the first introduction, you will be asked to proceed with the second one.

10 minutes individual preparations, 10 minutes in plenary

Sheet 4

4a Summary of Simon et al.'s critical pedagogy, "Learning Work"

(Simon et al., Mc Cash)

Objective: "to enhance the ability of students to increase their effective participation in determining the practices that define their working lives" (p. 8).

Simon et al. sought to

1. - raise the students' awareness that that work is socially and politically constructed
2. - problematise experience and taken for granted understandings about society and ourselves
"Pedagogy of possibility", nurture hope.
3. - encourage questioning, debate and critique
- facilitate a respectful and safe learning environment in which divergent views can be articulated and examined
Education is not about transmission of truths from teachers to students, but about enabling the students to think for themselves.
4. - counter what was seen as an over-individualising tendency in some career development programmes
- encourage cooperation and joint solutions rather than competition

4b Example sessions - Career planning and tests

Aim: To facilitate the participants' development of a perspective on how to use vocational tests in the context of career planning (pp.154-8).

Part 1: Test-taking and discussion

1. The facilitator picks two standard occupational inventories for the class to use, e.g. the interest explorer on www.vilbli.no, Vip 24 and WIE.
2. When the participants have completed the test, the facilitator asks the group to share their thoughts and consider some questions, for example:

How did the test make you feel?

Any contradictory questions?

Any differences between male and female responses?

Any items that did not make sense to you?

Any differences between the two tests?

Any thoughts on the suitability of the listed jobs?

Part 2: Field survey

Students are asked to assess the degree to which people follow a systematic, rational procedure in choosing their jobs or careers.

1. Assignment: students are asked to interview two people in work life to obtain information about how they chose their particular line of work. To do this the class is invited to design some questions, such as:

Can you tell me how you came to be working as an X at Y workplace?

What seemed most important at the time you were making these decisions?

What alternatives were available?

2. Once the interviews are complete, the class is invited to compile this information, using posters, so that all members of the class can consider the survey results.

Part 3: Class debate

1. Together the class should consider the following questions:

What factors influenced the respondents' choices?

Were the choices largely the result of rational planning and deliberation, or a result of circumstance or luck?

Would a more systematic approach to career planning have been of any use to the people surveyed?

How were their decisions affected by things that happened outside their life at work?

2. Finally, each participant should (then) be asked to assess the value of test-taking in career development.

Summary of session outline

1. Despite possible concerns about testing, the participants are encouraged to *encounter* the test in order that they can adjudicate it partly on the basis of this personal experience.
2. The session is *structured* in order to enable the participants to question everyday realities about testing. Simon et al. do not assume that people will be able to do this without assistance.
3. There are structured *questions* for the participants to consider in all three parts of the activity.
4. There is a *sharing* of results so that all participants can benefit from the field visits each has undertaken.

Exercise 4c: Prepare a review of Simon et al. for *Rådgivernytt*

- Prepare a review of Simon et al.'s general approach and outline for a session on tests and career development
- Imagine the review is for "Rådgivernytt", the magazine for Norwegian school counsellors
- You are not going to write the review, just start working on it by considering strengths and weaknesses, using the table below
- Contrast this approach with "traditional" test sessions in which the tests are used exclusively to explore, reflect and name personal interests and characteristics
- It does not matter if you do not get to do a full analysis – just start noting some points on strengths and weaknesses to discuss in plenary
- *Work in pairs for 10 minutes, further reflection and sharing in plenary for 15 minutes*

Strengths	
Weaknesses	
Further comments	

Sheet 6

Immediate feedback on workshop

I would appreciate your immediate feedback to the questions below. The feedback can relate to theoretical content and level, pedagogic design, style of delivery or other issues.

Please spend 9 minutes to start reflecting on these questions and make notes for yourselves.

We will then have a plenary dialogue based on the same questions,

1. What were the strengths of the workshop?
2. What were the weaknesses?
3. Do you have any suggestions for changes that could make the workshop better?
4. Any other comments?

Appendix 7 Workshop feedback forms – summary

Numbers 1-5 indicate the experience with the different workshop blocks with regard to the degree of comprehensibility, relevance, and ability to inspire engagement: 1 indicates ‘not at all’, and 5 indicate ‘fully comprehensible, relevant or engaging’. The figure in the first line of each column is the average from workshop 1 (W1), the figure in the second line is the average from workshop 2 (W2), and the bold figure in the third line is the average of the two workshops. The figure next to the heading of each block is the average of all the average figures within the block. Number of participants: W1: 4, W2: 5

	Compre- hensible	Relevant	Engaging	Comments
Four perspectives on justice – average total figure: 4,86				
Introduction - Perspectives on justice	4,75 4,6 4,68	5 4,8 4,9	5 4,8 4,9	W2: Highly interesting. A little too fast? Slightly difficult to grasp the content. The last two perspectives (recognition and critical social justice) were the most difficult, as these seemed more out of touch with realities at face value. Sum for theoretical introduction: 4,83
Exercise - Perspectives on justice: Representations	5 4,4 4,7	5 4,8 4,9	5 4,6 4,8	W2: Very exciting and a little difficult! Nevertheless fun to match the perspectives against sayings and other associations☺ Challenging to categorize, but the table gives a good picture of different perspectives. Highly interesting to see oneself and one’s own practice in relation to the perspectives. Challenging and good exercise. Sum for this exercise: 4,8
Exercise - Perspectives on justice: Relate the perspectives to the CCC, LWS and schools	4,75 5 4,86	5 5 5,0	5 5 5,0	W2: Exciting, and very good visual effect with the voting tags! Sum for this exercise: 4,95
General comment on the block on justice perspectives				W2: Awareness stimulating and thought provoking; important for us to reflect more on, given that we work with people. Spurs reflection on the “work division” within our field from rehabilitation companies, organizers of LMI courses, the career centres etc...and what role the career centres should take on, considering the whole picture.

Socio-political roles in CEG – average total figure: 4,84				
Introduction – Watts’ approaches/roles	5 4,6 4,8	5 4,6 4,8	5 4,8 4,9	<p>W2: Interesting! Would have liked to be introduced to the broader picture here; are there other theorists who have made career guidance role typologies, or is it only Watts?</p> <p>I rated 4 on relevance because in my opinion one role is missing – placed in the middle of the diagram and which maybe has some elements from all of the roles. At the same time I do understand that the roles are more clearly presented in this way, in order that they can be discussed and identified.</p> <p>Sum for theoretical introduction: 4,83</p>
Exercise - Prepare brief talks according to “your” role	4,75 4,8 4,78	4,5 4,8 4,65	5 5 5,0	<p>W2: A great deal of fun and highly engaging (and this is a bunch of people who do dare to throw themselves into it☺)</p> <p>Fun. Made the topic more understandable and vivid.</p> <p>Sum for this exercise: 4,81</p>
Exercise - Relate roles to practices at CCC, LWS and schools	4,75 5 4,88	4,75 4,8 4,78	5 5 5,0	<p>W2: I found it highly interesting to use typologies in order to discuss career guidance practices. In this way it became more specific, and easier to see WHAT we actually choose to take our elements from – our eyes were opened to the fact that there is not only one role that is reflected in our practice; simultaneously it has been very useful to become able to articulate what we actually do – to get some theoretical “pegs” for our practice☺</p> <p>Slightly challenging to place, as roles are fluid and you can adopt several throughout dialogues.</p> <p>The exercise was very much awareness raising and clarifying.</p> <p>Sum for this exercise: 4,92</p>
General comment on the block on socio-political roles:				<p>W2: Everything contributed to awareness-raising and was thought provoking and instructive. It inspires continued discussions at our centre, and</p>

				to become more aware of where we stand, individually and as a community.
Critical pedagogy – average total figure: 4,64				
Introduction - Simon et al.'s position and test session	4,75 4,8 4,78	4,5 4,4 4,45	4,25 4,8 4,53	W1: Not very relevant to our everyday work with adults, yet interesting (score 3 on relevant and engaging) W2: Good! Maybe you could have told us more about the reasons why you have chosen these theorists and this session? A definite strength that this theoretical perspective is so specific with regard to practice. Great! Interesting session on tests. I rated 4 on relevance because this test session might require a highly competent session leader, but except for that seems very good☺ Sum for this theoretical introduction: 4,59
Exercise - Review Simon et al.'s test session for Rådgivernytt	5 4,8 4,9	4,5 4,6 4,55	4,5 4,8 4,65	W1: Not so relevant to our everyday work with adults, yet interesting (score 3 on relevant and engaging) W2: Interesting, resulted in good reflections! Good exercise – useful to talk about this together. Sum for this exercise: 4,7
				W2: General comment on the block on critical pedagogy: This spurred important discussions; however I wished for the researcher to clarify or define the use of the word “test” versus “explorative tools”. Still, it was very interesting.
Enactment: Review, exploration and forming responses – average total figure: 4,91				
Brief introduction	5 5 5,0	5 5 5,0	5 4,6 4,8	W2: Very brief, little to comment on. Brief, but good introduction. Brief, but fine. Sum for this introduction: 4,93
Exercise – Enactment: Review of practice,	5* 5 5,0	4,88 5 4,94	4,88 4,6 4,74	W1: Good to relate the issues to one's own practices.

exploration of enactment and forming of responses				<p>W2: I experienced that it was a little difficult to answer!</p> <p>Very useful. Nice to get an opportunity to talk about our strengths. Looking forward to working further with the ideas....</p> <p>Difficult and inspirational. Great with perspectives on justice; challenging because our format is so small (researcher comment: they normally provide 1-3 individual guidance sessions and are not set up to follow clients over time)</p> <p>Sum for this exercise: 4,89</p>
Averages with regard to comprehensiveness, relevance and ability to stir engagement	4,86	4,78	4,83	Average sum for workshop: 4,82
Immediate feedback on the workshop				
<i>If you have any comments to the way feedback was facilitated, you can write them here:</i>				
<p>W1: Satisfied. Nice blend of exercises and theory.</p> <p>W2: Good idea to have our own evaluation form available throughout the workshop; gave us room to note our immediate thoughts while everything was still very clear in our minds.</p> <p>Informative and professionally stimulating; gives inspiration to practice.</p> <p>Useful, gave me “a-ha” experiences; I am so much anchored within the field of <i>guidance</i> and have a way to go with regard to seeing our centre in the different perspectives and myself as a professional (and) career guidance counsellor.</p> <p>Maybe I felt a lack of attention to the field in its entirety; that there are many actors working in different formats, and that there will necessarily be a “work division” between these, in the sense that clients who have extensive need for help and support do not fit into the career centre format, but they are safeguarded by other welfare measures like e.g. rehabilitation organisations.. The workshop would probably have been strengthened if some reflection around these issues were integrated. The career centres are “general” and open to all citizens, in contrast to measures targeted at specific groups and individual measures with strong compensatory elements. When aiming to illuminate social justice I find it a bit too narrow to look at the career guidance in the career centres only – in order to get the full picture of the role of career guidance with regard to social justice, the entirety of the field and the supplementing actors must also be taken into consideration.</p> <p>The participants’ feedback was very well facilitated</p>				
<i>General comments** to:</i>				

Practicalities and structure	<p>W2: Good that appropriate time was used on breaks.</p> <p>Very well facilitated, well structured, clearly set out scheme.</p>
Overall pedagogy	<p>W2: Very nice combination of theory, self reflection, working in small groups and sharing in plenary!</p> <p>Good pedagogical approach. Friendly and competent “teacher”.</p> <p>It worked really well to use Kolb’s learning cycle. You were very clear on intentions throughout the workshop – very good.</p> <p>Worked very well. Good balance. Made a complex issue understandable and relevant to our everyday work.</p> <p>Pedagogically successful workshop due to the balancing of theory and exercises, and well and inspiringly mediated – in a relaxed way. This made us participate actively in relating to and evaluating our own practice and how it can contribute to justice.</p>
Style of delivery/facilitation by seminar leader	<p>W2: Extremely agreeable facilitator☺. You have a calm but clear way of being, listening very well to all of us while sharing, and it was a very good experience to be in a workshop led by you!!</p> <p>Superb! Calm, but with good progression. Clear and non-judging. I experienced that you had a nice, explorative and neutral style.</p> <p>It was facilitated very well; the course leader provided a good structure, gave understandable mini lectures on theory, and this was related to our practice. We were listened to and were engaged. Short breaks, but it did not matter. Felt dynamic, with progression and no room for getting bored.</p>
Any other comments	<p>W2: I would have appreciated to get even more assistance to see the different theorists in relation to the major theoretical perspectives within career guidance (if this had been possible); there were many names that I was not able to recognize/place immediately. In this way we could have gained more insight into why you chose to present what you did. However, this comment is given just because I want to be constructive and give you something more to work with – altogether this has been a great day with exciting content and good learning!! Thank you so much for inviting me/us to take part in this☺. Best of luck with your remaining work on the dissertation!!</p> <p>Slightly longer breaks? ☺ (Researcher’s comment: they had been joking about how they always receive feedback on their own courses that there are not long enough breaks.)</p> <p>Keep up the good work☺.</p>

*In the first workshop these reflections were separated in two exercises; however the participants advised me to merge them. I have calculated an average from the two exercises in the first workshop

to indicate an average of the exercises related to reflection on own practice with clients and other practitioners. There were minimal variations in the responses on the two exercises from the participants in Workshop 1. ** These comments are primarily from the participants in workshop 2. In workshop 1 we had plenty of time for qualitative feedback in the workshop and there were few additional comments in their evaluation forms. In workshop 2 several participants needed to leave early, hence there was less time for qualitative feedback.

Appendix 8 Extended info on the practitioners’ position

The workshop participants were asked to share their thoughts on which of the four justice perspectives presented by Irving (2010) that are most strongly reflected in the guidance practices at their career centre, and which resonated most strongly with them personally. Moreover they were given sets of “voting tags” to distribute accordingly onto the different perspectives on a flip. The total distribution of tags from both workshops is presented in following table. The figures are absolute numbers of votes, with exception of the last column.

	Me personally	Career Centre practices	Sum for perspective	Sum for perspective, in %
Retributive	2	3	5	9
Distributive	8	7	15	28
Recognitive	13	16	29	54
Critical social justice	4	1	5	9
Total number of votes	27	27	54	100

Given the low number of participants, these figures should be used with caution. Nevertheless, they could be seen as an indicator that the strongest scope for enactment might be within the recognitive and partly distributive perspectives on justice. This was further backed up by the shared reflections; recognition was at the heart of the

practitioners' dialogues. The reluctance regarding a decoupling of economic distribution and participation in work life seemed to be the reason for a limited support to the critical social justice perspective according to Irving; moreover the practitioners commented that this position felt unrealistic and somehow alien. In contrast, Simon et al.'s stance and pedagogy - which could be seen as a specific critical social justice approach but with a stronger attention to increasing participation in work life - received broad support¹². The participants expressed that they valued the pedagogy; the critical thinking, challenging taken for granted understandings, contextualising of careers and fostering of cooperation and community. They could envision themselves taking on a role to facilitate such career education, or support teachers in doing so. Hence, the practitioners seemed comfortable to take on quite a critical and radical role as classroom teachers, but much less comfortable with other versions of a radical role, involving exposed advocacy. Working with Watts' approaches, the practitioners did not cast any votes, but shared their reflections around how the roles related to their work. The individualistically oriented liberal and progressive roles received the strongest support. However, the participants argued that the conservative position is unreasonably negatively cast in Watts' approaches, and that it is in the clients' best interest that the CEG role includes elements of this position¹³. They contended that loyalty to their clients should include encouraging them to evaluate the realism of their career plans versus labour market demands. Moreover, one participant expressed how "getting a decent, if not fantastic job" was valuable with regard to reducing financial worries, building self confidence and liberating energy for other issues, e.g. to engage in society in other ways. As for the radical role, awareness and indignation over structural and systemic challenges to social justice were expressed by the participants, and reflections shared as to how they could strengthen their feedback in the local and national system concerning this. The practitioners' reservations about the radical role may have been fuelled by my choice of illustrations. My PPT slide was illustrated with people carrying banners in a demo; something they did not see themselves doing in their professional roles.

¹² One of the participants considered this part of the session less relevant as they are not currently involved in career education. However, this participant joined in an appreciation of the approaches that Simon et al. offer.

¹³ I believe this partly positive attitude towards the conservative position might be linked to the generally fairly decent work conditions in Norway

Appendix 9 Workshop presentation slides

Contact author for access to presentation slides: kristinmidttun@hotmail.com