Abstract and Keywords

The career development field has produced theories from the Global North that have been imported and applied in the Global South countries. These theories were developed in different socioeconomic and cultural contexts than those of the Global South, which can generally be characterized by vulnerability and instability. Theories and practices must be contextualized if they are to be of assistance to the users of career development services. This chapter has two aims. First, by means of an intercultural dialogue proposal, it discusses the need to contextualize theories to assist people with their career issues and foster social justice. Second, it presents career theories and practices produced in the Global South (Latin America, Africa, and developing countries of Asia) and discusses their potential as an alternative to expand the mainstream career development theories from the North. Such theories can be understood as a Southern contribution to the social justice agenda.
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Introduction

This chapter discusses how career theories and practices produced in the Global South can expand the mainstream of career development theories that were largely developed in the Global North. The first part of the chapter presents the goals of the chapter and introduces and contextualizes the key issues. The second part addresses the need to contextualize theories and the importance of producing theories from the Global South, and it presents and discusses the intercultural dialogue framework for constructing contextualized theories. The third part provides some examples of theories from the Global South. The concluding statement summarizes the intent and focus of the chapter’s main arguments.

This chapter has two aims. First, by means of an intercultural proposal, it discusses the need to contextualize theories to properly assist people in their career issues and foster social justice. To do this, there is a need to analyse the impacts and outcomes of the theo-
Key Issues in Global Career Development Theories

The field of career development is characterized by theories developed in the Global North (United States, Canada, Western Europe, Australia, New Zealand, and developed countries of Asia), which have been imported and applied in the Global South countries (Africa, Latin America, and developing Asia). This geographical division of the world into two large blocks is useful because it divides the North and the South according to their socioeconomic and political features (World Bank, 2013).

A wide range of career development theories exist that have been developed over time. These range from traditional theoretical approaches (e.g., trait-factor, typological, developmental, and decision-making theories) to late twentieth-century theoretical approaches (e.g., social cognitive, contextual action, and systemic theories) and twenty-first century approaches (e.g., life design and the psychology of working theory). It is important to acknowledge that all of these theories derive from the Global North. They have, however, been used in contexts throughout the world (Arulmani, 2007; Maree, 2010; Ribeiro, Uvaldo, & Silva, 2015; Savickas, 2011; Sultana, 2017a).

The dominance of theoretical approaches produced in the Global North should be understood as a result of colonialisit positions (Benachir, 2017; Santos, 2014; Sarr, 2016; Sultana, 2018). This dominance is grounded on hegemonic globalization production modes, or top-down globalization (Santos, 2014). Theoretical approaches are social and cultural productions and, as a result, their premises and concepts are highly influenced by these factors. This configures a worldview and a conception of human beings, which frames what is seen as possible and desirable in life (Blustein, 2013; Ribeiro, 2016).

According to Mazawi (2007), this process has caused a knowledge deficit because it prevents people in the Global South from speaking on their own terms. In the career development field, it restrains those who may develop theories and concepts, and it forces them to reproduce imported and decontextualized theories from the Global North. This process has been labelled as global social injustice (Santos, 2014), epistemic injustice (Benachir, 2017; Fricker, 2007), or epistemic injustice of colonialism (Bhargava, 2013). It
prevents, hampers, or discourages theoretical production in the Global South due to the hegemony and lack of openness to emerging theories by the countries of the Global North, which makes it difficult for theoretical approaches from nontraditional contexts to emerge (Arulmani, 2007).

There is a need to challenge and critique the predominance of career development theories from the Global North over those from the Global South. The predominance of theories from the Global North universalizes, decontextualizes, and imposes a way of knowing and being (Arulmani, 2014a; Irving, 2010; McMahon, Arthur, & Collins, 2008) in which culture-specific assumptions from some contexts (emic approach), mainly from the Global North, are adapted and legitimized as concepts in the mainstream throughout the world (etic approach). This transforms the career development theories into imposed etic models that are inadequately applied to other cultures (Berry, 1989), which are grounded in a supposed official version of reality and which impose a dominant symbolic system (Irving, 2010; Leong & Pearce, 2011; Rascován, 2005; Ribeiro et al., 2015; Sultana, 2018). In this way, theories are presented that are “culturally biased, thus creating barriers in recognizing the needs of clients who come from a different culture” (Launikari & Puukari, 2005, p. 31)—for example, typological, social cognitive, and contextual action theories.

It is also worth noting that most of the Global North theories are usually grounded on freedom of choice (e.g., trait-factor; social cognitive, and life design theories). Although choice is constrained throughout the world in some way, limits on freedom of choice are often more clearly constrained within the Global South by socioeconomic conditions, religious values, and duties to the family (Arulmani, 2014b; Leong & Pearce, 2011).

Nevertheless, it is necessary to state that there is much writing from the Global North that contradicts the focus on the person and highlights the importance of context and structure, although these are less explored than the individualistic and psychological mainstream (Bimrose, McMahon, & Watson, 2015; Blustein, 2013; Cohen-Scali et al., 2018; Hooley, Sultana, & Thomsen, 2019; Sultana, 2017a, 2017b, 2018).

The Global South has therefore been importing theoretical approaches produced in the Global North and has been applying them in its countries. Nevertheless, the entire context in which these approaches were designed is not imported along with the theory. Santos (2014) defined this movement as localized globalism, which is understood as the specific impacts produced by transnational practices and imperatives on local conditions. This produces an incongruity between theories and practices (Lawrence, 2017; Ribeiro & Fonçatti, 2017).

In this regard, Ribeiro and Fonçatti (2017) summarized four ways in which career development theories can be comprised and employed in the Global South contexts. They argue that career development in the Global South could (1) import theories that were constructed in the Global North and apply them in Southern contexts with no changes (incorporation or reproduction without adaptation), (2) import theories that were constructed in the Global North and apply them in Southern contexts with some changes to address local peculiarities (adaptation), (3) ignore pre-existing theories from the Global North and
produce new theories from Southern contexts that are detached from what is produced in the mainstream of career development theories (refusal, isolation, and production), and (4) produce theories through an intercultural dialogue between dominant knowledge from the Global North and contextualized daily life knowledge of the Southern realities (intercultural dialogue through co-construction). The latter two ways of producing career development theories, in which the Global South may have the opportunity to propose theories, concepts, and practices, tend to be invisible to the mainstream of career development theories, and their contributions to the field are often overlooked and rarely seen. Nevertheless, there are exceptions, such as Arulmani, Bakshi, Leong, and Watts (2014); Cohen-Scali et al. (2018); Hooley et al. (2019); Irving and Malik (2004); and Sultana (2018).

Here, it is essential to mention that the theoretical approaches produced in the Global North have founded and consolidated the career development field. Despite criticism, these theories are the references from which Global South researchers and practitioners have underpinned their practices. This defines the usefulness of existing theories in the Global South. As previously noted, I do not propose replacing the theories of the Global North with theories from the Global South but, rather, enlarging them to enable them to have explanatory power in many different contexts. I aim to open space for a North–South dialogue that assumes the importance of both bodies of theory but does not impose one upon another.

**Constructing Contextualized Theories by the Global South**

**The Need to Contextualize Theories**

Blustein (2013) and Savickas (2011) stress that career development theories must be contextualized to avoid universalist concepts. However, such theories are often applied in Southern contexts with no changes to recognize cultural and social diversity.

There are three dominant ways in which theorists in the Global North seek to address context the diversity of client groups: (1) the construction of multicultural proposals in career development to indigenize the field through the adaptation of theories and practices relevant to the cultural characteristics of career development clients (Launikari & Puukari, 2005; Leong & Pearce, 2011; Savickas, 2011); (2) the emergence and consolidation of the narrative movement, which aims to foster storytelling and sense-making and to allow career development clients to understand the context and construct meanings through their own cultural references (Maree, 2010; Nota & Rossier, 2015); and (3) the growth and strengthening of the career guidance and social justice movement, which seeks to combat social injustices by expanding critical awareness through emancipatory strategies (Blustein, 2013; Hooley et al., 2019; Irving, 2010; McMahon et al., 2008).
Nevertheless, with certain exceptions, such theories ignore the need for theoretical production by those from nontraditional and nondominant contexts (Berry, 1989; Hooley & Sultana, 2016; Sultana, 2017a, 2017b, 2018).

The Importance of Producing Theories from the Global South

According to Benachir (2017) and Sarr (2015), building theories from nondominant contexts is a matter of reshaping civilization by two political and social actions: (1) producing knowledge and innovation and (2) fostering respect for others by being respectful of local epistemologies (Hooley & Sultana, 2016).

Sultana (2017a) contends that this is an unprecedented opportunity to “articulate ways of ’thinking’ and ’doing,’ career guidance differently” (p. 8) and a challenge to look at “mainstream ‘western’ approaches to career guidance and to view them ’otherwise,’ filtered and inflected through the lens of different cultures, life orientations, economic contexts and the everyday conditions in which life is lived” making efforts to “reconceptualise the field and to make it meaningful in a different regional context” (Sultana, 2017b, p. 8). Therefore, localisms “serve the interests of social justice” (Sultana, 2018, p. 48).

Arulmani (2007), Leong and Pearce (2011), and Sultana (2017b) stress that the contextualized theories in the career development field are needed to accommodate the particular characteristics from underdeveloped and developing countries, such as the large majority of Global South countries. In this regard, Sultana (2017b) contends that there is a great need for “providing a space and an opportunity for the South to speak, and to do so on its own terms” (p. 7).

The Intercultural Dialogue Framework for Constructing Contextualized Theories

Leong and Pearce (2011) argue that theoretical approaches should be more inclusive and should incorporate differences in social class, race/ethnicity, and gender/sexuality, among other things. They should also interrelate the cultural validity of Global North models with the cultural specificity of nondominant contexts, such as the Global South. The need to include and give due importance to local contexts, as well as relating them to the global contexts, is an issue on which several authors agree, including Arulmani (2007), Benachir (2017), Khalil (2015), Maree (2010), Rascován (2005), Ribeiro (2018), and Ribeiro et al. (2015) from the Global South and Blustein (2013), Duarte and Cardoso (2018), Hoo-ley and Sultana (2016), and Irving (2010) from the Global North. Thus, research and practice activities in the career development field should be culturally tailored to be locally relevant (Fan & Leong, 2016).

Sarr (2015, 2016) highlights that the Global South should leave the status of informants or subjects of case studies to assume the position of producers of recognized and legitimized knowledge. In this regard, both criticism of dominant discourses and new ways of approaching reality are urgently requested. This would require an epistemic decentralization or an epistemological break and a decolonization of knowledge, in which the hege-
monic rationale was deconstructed and there was reinvention of discourse (Imorou, 2017). Such a new approach would require the reconstruction of the epistemic imagination, the restructuring of metaphors for the future, and the exploration of other ways of understanding local and global context.

The interconnection between local and global is a key issue for thinking about theoretical proposals from the Global South. It is “both universal and culture-specific in that it considers the universality in the basic questions and differences in answers” (Pitkänen, 2005, p. 127), thus avoiding cultural relativism that prevents the dialogue among different cultures by the lack of commonly accepted principles (Matilal, 1991).

This raises the question of how to build contextualized theories capable of associating local and global—in other words, how to interconnect global concepts, generally produced in the Global North, with local singularities. This aims to reconstruct concepts and make them locally relevant and potentially applicable in many contexts.

As a general principle, Santos (2014) proposed the intercultural dialogue rationale, which aims to boost co-construction of theories and corresponding practices by means of an association between different knowledge and know-how from distinct contexts (e.g., the Global South and the Global North). Here, it is essential to mention that no kind of knowledge can be privileged over the other, and neither can the resulting knowledge be universalized because production of knowledge is always incomplete and any universalizing claim is false. A theoretical and conceptual reconstruction is always required and should be carried out in a dialogical manner with the context (Freire, 1975; Hooley & Sultana, 2016; Martín-Baró, 1994) or in co-construction with the context (Nota & Rossier, 2015). These processes have to be “forged with others, not for others” (Freire, 1975, p. 32).

Santos (2014) titled this process the ecology of knowledge and argued that all knowledge is always incomplete and should be constructed by means of a comprehensive dialogue among all the social actors involved (a so-called intercultural dialogue). Silva, Paiva, and Ribeiro (2016) therefore averred that “valid knowledge is therefore contextualized knowledge; it is valid when it considers cultural differences and political differences. . . . It should be oriented toward reality, which is taken both as a starting and an arrival point” (p. 48), which is a view stated by Freire (1975) and Martín-Baró (1994).

Thus, an intercultural dialogue framework is a potential way to construct contextualized theories that embed different contexts and social practices without the supremacy of one over another. Such a framework is driven by a deep sense of incompleteness without the intent of completeness. In general, an intercultural dialogue takes place between two culturally and politically distinct people or groups of people (e.g., researchers from a Global South country and researchers from a Global North country) with different ways of being human and living in the world, which guide their thoughts and activities. This kind of social relationship may allow the deconstruction and reconstruction of socially instituted meanings and generate changes (e.g., theoretical renew or new theoretical approaches).
This framework demands and assumes “both mutual recognition of different cultures in a given cultural space and readiness for dialogue through processes of co-construction” (Silva et al., 2016, p. 47) in an exchange between different knowledge and different cultures. It is necessary to stress that intercultural dialogue must be a mutual decision, not unilateral. Thus, the choice for one of the four ways in which career development theories can be comprised and employed in contexts of the Global South, as Ribeiro and Fonçatti (2017) state, must be up to each researcher or practitioner; otherwise, it will be a new kind of imposition.

In this regard, Hooley et al. (2019) propose five signposts toward a contextualized and socially just career guidance: conscientization; the naming of oppression; questioning what is normal and problematizing assumptions and power relations; encouraging people to build collective actions; and working at a range of levels from personal to global, and vice versa.

Inspired by the previous discussion, by the intercultural dialogue framework proposed by Santos (2014), and by the previously mentioned five signposts, this chapter proposes some specific principles that can be adopted to support the construction of contextualized theories in career development. First, at the epistemological level, it is important to reconstruct the main concepts of the career development field and to prioritize interdisciplinarity (Rascován, 2005; Ribeiro, 2016, 2018). Second, social and cultural context must be included in career development theories and practices (e.g., issues of the intersectionality of gender/sexuality, social class, and race/ethnicity; Blustein, 2013; Ribeiro, 2018; Ribeiro & Almeida, 2019). Third, group-based interventions and communitarian strategies should be added to the traditional one-to-one work with persons in order to properly meet both prevailing individualistic cultural models in the Global North and predominantly collectivistic cultural models in the Global South (Arulmani, 2007; Maree, 2010; Rascován, 2005; Ribeiro, 2016; Sultana, 2017a). Finally, it is extremely important to construct a political and ethical project for career development (González Bello & Ledezma, 2009; Ribeiro, 2018; Sultana, 2017b).

Santos (2014) terms this process as counterhegemonic or bottom-up globalization, defining it as cosmopolitanism. In this globalization mode, a spirit of openness with respect to all the important actors is fostered, and an attempt to build a transnational knowledge is accomplished in defending the interests that are perceived as common. The knowledge is produced by interaction, not by imposition. This process generates hybrids (Latour, 1993) or a mestizo knowledge (Santos, 2014)—that is, innovations stemming from local and global relations.

According to Ribeiro (2017), these innovations are relational, emerge differently from the norm, and may be considered unusual by the mainstream. On the one hand, they can be culturally and socially legitimized and be incorporated in time into the dominant symbolic system (e.g., the mainstream of career development theory) as hybrids (Latour, 1993). On the other hand, they may not be culturally and socially recognized and continue to be regarded as unusual by the mainstream. For example, the majority of career development
Theories produced in the Global South are disregarded by the mainstream of the field. In conclusion, hybrid understanding and intercultural dialogue should be basic principles for constructing contextualized theoretical approaches in career development.

The next section presents examples of theoretical productions from the Global South as a brief overview of contextualized theoretical approaches, which may be considered alternatives for expanding the mainstream of career development theories.

**Examples of Theoretical Productions from the Global South**

This section provides examples of theoretical productions and corresponding practices from the Global South produced in Argentina and Brazil (Latin America), China, India, and Indonesia (Asia). Note that these are not the only examples; however, they portray the way theoretical approaches have been proposed in the Global South.

In China, Confucian interpersonal relatedness, family orientation, and the sacrifice of self to contribute to the group are key factors for career construction. In that sense, Chinese traditional cultural values play a pivotal role in career construction, and the career development practitioner must be aware of this. Thus, a culturally inclusive approach is under development, focusing on the influences from collectivism, on emergent conflicts between collectivistic and individualistic Chinese values, and on the importance of field experience and oral tradition (Fan & Leong, 2016; Tien & Wang, 2016).

According to Fan and Leong (2016) and Hwang (2009), value conflict is the key issue for career development in China, and some strategies have been developed to deal with the challenge of proposing a culturally inclusive approach. The main strategies are identifying value conflicts between Confucian cultural heritage and Western individualism, constructing psychometric instruments for assessing them, and using a “model of situational self-relation coordination for Chinese clients to handle interpersonal conflicts” (Hwang, 2009, p. 930). Although it was designed for the Chinese contexts, the culturally inclusive approach suggests a way to build knowledge that may allow it to be applied to any contexts in which value conflict is the key issue.

In Indonesia, the Semar puppet counselling model was developed based on Javanese culture and using a puppet (Semar), which is a part of the cultural heritage of Indonesian ancestors, to discuss human nature and behaviour (Habsy, Hidayah, Lasan, & Muslihati, 2019). A puppet in Indonesia contains the noble values of wisdom of the inner world of Java society. Thus, a person is not a monad but, rather, part of the Javanese personality derived from God. In Indonesian society, people are interconnected with each other, and family is the basis for life. The practitioner is therefore considered as somebody who has an honourable parent’s position in life and uses the performance of Semar as a shared way to help clients face problems and plan the future. Semar and his children give teachings on how to deal with the fragmented conditions of the current life by organizing feel-
ings and cognition in words and actions to solve the arising problem. This model aims to foster a transition process from a person in crisis to the healthy person of Java, which is grounded on the noble values of Semar.

In India, Gideon Arulmani (2007) highlighted the importance of “an intuitive and experiential approach to reality . . . over objective observations and measurements” (pp. 71–72), as well as the need to associate the material and spiritual and also the temporal and metaphysical (see Arulmani, Kumar, Shrestha, Viray, & Aravind, this volume). He has developed a cultural preparation process model that is “offered as a framework that would allow the context to define career development” (Arulmani, 2014a, p. 101) because outside the context in which the career concept is produced, any attempt for understanding it would be made impossible. The model “proposes that while the socializing forces of enculturation create a cultural preparation status equilibrium in relation to career development, the forces of acculturation alter this equilibrium” (Arulmani, 2014a, p. 101). In this model, the role of the career development practitioner should be to understand the process that affects the cultural preparation status equilibrium in order to assist the career development client to re-engage with work and career.

In Argentina, Sergio Rascován (2005) proposed a critical, complex, and interdisciplinary paradigm. First, it is a critical paradigm because every theory and practice in career development should privilege an emancipatory rationality by highlighting the power relations in which career construction unfolds. Second, it is a complex paradigm because it not only focuses on personal issues but also aims to reach the vocational complexity, which is constructed at the intersection of health, education, work, and subjectivity. Finally, it is an interdisciplinary paradigm because career vocation is a field with many phenomena, not a single object. In other words, it is an inextricably interwoven set of social, cultural, political, and personal issues.

The main aim for career development is identifying the social system areas (health, education, and work) in which psychosocial bonds are fragile (vulnerability diagnosis) and trying to help in re-establishing social protection without neglecting the attention addressed to the person. It intends to help the people who are vulnerable in their social and employment situation “to achieve educational and labour goals through sharing support and acting as intermediary for the relationships between them and the community actors and institutions” (Ribeiro et al., 2015, p. 202). That is the main reason why the proposed paradigm embraces a preference for communitarian career development practices through “shares of support and intermediation of the relationships between counselees and community actors and institutions” (Ribeiro et al., 2015, p. 198).

In Brazil, there are two relevant proposals with different ways of producing theory and practice in career development. The former is designed without reference to the mainstream of career development produced in the Global North (the refusal manner of producing theory) and the latter by an intercultural dialogue between the Global North and contextualized theories from the Global South (the co-construction manner of producing theory).
First, Silvio Bock proposed a sociohistorical approach for career development grounded on historical and dialectical materialism and inspired by Paulo Freire’s (1975) ideas. It aims to raise awareness about the sociohistorical context as well as the place people occupy in the power relations in which they find themselves, in order to search for ways of transcending it. For this purpose, group-based interventions are conducted (Ribeiro et al., 2015).

Technically, this approach uses activities and debates as intervention strategies to discuss social issues from television programs, newspaper reports, and internet resources (e.g., YouTube videos) and, most important, from the clients’ narratives about their own social realities. These activities and debates take place in small groups or in classrooms at school. The career development model is based on three moments of discussion: (1) exploring the meaning of a choice; (2) undertaking a career development activity; and (3) providing information and using this to improve the clients’ self-knowledge. All debates need to be contextualized by the social contexts of each client. The practitioner plays the role of an intermediary to foster the conscientizing process and help the client develop a critical understanding of the social and labour market reality (Bock & Bock, 2005).

Second, in Brazil, the intercultural approach for career development proposed by Marcelo Ribeiro blends the epistemology of social constructionism, mainly inspired by the life design paradigm (Nota & Rossier, 2015) and psychology of working theory (Blustein, 2013), from the Global North with contextualized theories from the South, including critical pedagogy (Freire, 1975), the psychology of liberation (Martín-Baró, 1994), and the vulnerability and human rights framework (Paiva, 2005), among others (Ribeiro, 2016, 2018; Silva et al., 2016). It is based on two main principles—intercultural dialogue (Santos, 2014) and hybridism (Latour, 1993)—and some theoretical and practical underpinnings, including relational ontology (Blustein, 2013), narratability (Nota & Rossier, 2015), critical consciousness (Freire, 1975), diatopical hermeneutics (Santos, 2014), discursive validation (Winslade, 2005), and being subject of rights (Paiva, 2005). It aims to help people understand the place they occupy in the power structure in which they find themselves and to become aware of these structures and seek possibilities to transcend them. The career development practice is based on narrative construction, the identification of social discourses in these narratives, the deconstruction of both, and the reconstruction of a narrative that considers the intersectionality issues for career construction. It embeds communitarian agents and contexts into career development work by making them actively participate in the career development client’s career construction (Ribeiro, 2016, 2018; Silva et al., 2016).

The career development practice can be done individually or in small groups of 5–12 persons. The main tools are dialogues between practitioners and clients or group of clients, project construction, and communitarian debates with the people close to the client and living in the same kind of context to build a way for expanding dialogue, negotiating meanings, avoiding idealized projects, and integrating differences.
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It is central for the intercultural approach that practitioner acts like an intermediary: “Instead of only assisting in an individual career construction process, s/he should foster the communitarian networks in order to explore the existing and potential career construction opportunities” (Ribeiro, 2018, p. 140) in the client’s contexts. This involves linking the career development process to the client’s life narrative and working projects and also to the client’s home community experiences, and it consequently defines career development as a communitarian strategy (Rascován, 2005).

The intermediary position “supports the hybrid intervention’s rationale according to which knowledge is built on the relationship of all the social actors involved in a given context” (Ribeiro & Almeida, 2019, p. 609), and the practitioner–client relationship extends to all client relationships with the world. This is necessary because the practitioner is not part of the client’s world, and the client needs to make use of the resources of their home community to co-construct meaningful working life projects.

It is important to highlight that the previously discussed approaches are just a few examples. There are more theoretical and technical proposals from the Global South, including transitional guidance for meaning of life from Latin America (Brunal, Vásquez, Mora, Borja, & León, 2018) and the integrative qualitative and quantitative approach from South Africa (Maree, 2018).

Conclusion

Sultana (2018) states that “context matters” (p. 48), and the Global South should speak by its own terms. In that sense, the Global South has been producing contextualized theories and practices in two ways, as argued by Ribeiro and Fonçatti (2017): refusal and co-construction. The former describes the proposals by Bock and Bock (2005), Habsy et al. (2019), and Rascován (2005); the latter explains propositions presented by Arulmani (2007, 2014a), Fan and Leong (2016), Hwang (2009), and Ribeiro (Ribeiro, 2016, 2018; Silva et al., 2016).

The proposals partly address the specific principles that can be adopted to support the construction of contextualized theories in career development. All include the social and cultural context in their career development theories and try to reconstruct concepts and practices. However, group-based interventions and communitarian strategies are more frequent in Latin American proposals, and family and spiritual dimensions are more frequent in Asian proposals.

A possible criticism of all the discussed theoretical approaches from the Global South is that they need to analyse whether they are universalizing concepts and practices from their own specific contexts and doing the same thing they consider problematic and oppressive: imposing a way of knowing and being through the theoretical approaches.

In summary, the Global South has the power to help renew and democratize the field of career development, but this process should be primarily a joint action with the Global
North by means of an intercultural dialogue so that both universality of basic and common issues and difference in the answers, and also resultant practices, can be considered.
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