

# A routine perspective on implementing reflective career conversations in education

Peter den Boer & Aimée Hoeve

To cite this article: Peter den Boer & Aimée Hoeve (2017) A routine perspective on implementing reflective career conversations in education, *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 45:2, 178-187, DOI: [10.1080/03069885.2016.1276280](https://doi.org/10.1080/03069885.2016.1276280)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03069885.2016.1276280>



Published online: 12 Jan 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 81



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

## A routine perspective on implementing reflective career conversations in education

Peter den Boer<sup>a</sup> and Aimée Hoeve<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>VET-College ROC West-Brabant, Etten-Leur, The Netherlands; <sup>b</sup>HAN University of Applied Sciences, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

### ABSTRACT

Reflective career conversations are a necessary instrument in the career guidance of students in vocational education. These conversations help students to learn from their (work) experiences and gain a better understanding of their motives on the labour market. Research shows that in a society in which change seems to become the only constant factor, knowing one's own motives in work is important. However, the introduction and implementation of reflective career conversations in Dutch vocational education is problematic. In this article, we introduce the concept of 'routines' to better understand the nature of these problems. The concept 'routine' allows us to understand in much more detail what is required to induce the necessary behavioural changes that are required from teachers, students and management. Recognition of the complexity of this process and the willingness to invest are necessary prerequisites to prevent reflective career conversations from becoming the next 'trick' or 'trendy innovation'.

### ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 3 December 2016  
Accepted 7 December 2016

### KEYWORDS

Implementation; routines; reflective career conversations; educational change; behavioural change; vocational education

### Introduction

In this article, we will argue that the introduction and implementation of reflective career conversations as a part of career learning in Dutch vocational education has a deep impact on existing educational practices in general and career guidance practices specifically. It can be regarded as a major innovation or transformation. We will use the concept of 'routines' to show the depth of this process and its consequences on how these processes of change should be understood, facilitated and managed. Without going into detail, we will use this concept to understand the current changes in career guidance concerning the introduction of reflective career conversations. This article, though, focuses mainly on the processes of change and less on the content of changes in career guidance.

We will show that the implementation of reflective career conversations as part of career learning demands a simultaneous process of change within and between the different layers in educational organisations. Not only do teachers have to learn new behaviour that contradicts their existing behavioural repertoire, their managers have to do the same. Moreover, managers have to develop a new repertoire to support the changes on the floor, while simultaneously going through this process themselves. The concept of routines allows us to describe the roles and behavioural patterns of teachers and managers more precisely than other concepts, providing a basis with which to interpret the impact that the introduction of reflective career conversations has on these individuals and on the interactions between them.

Several authors made the observation that change in education is difficult and often yields disappointing results (Meijers & Kuijpers, 2015; Nijhof & van Esch, 2004; Verbiest, 2011). This also applies to the introduction of reflective career conversations, not to mention the much broader concept of career learning.<sup>1</sup> Although it is clear what needs to be done, research shows few changes in daily practice (Den Boer, 2009; Mittendorff, 2010; Van Loon, 2011; Winters, 2012). Research also shows limited effects on students, even in situations where teachers were trained how to conduct these reflective career conversations (Kuijpers & Meijers, 2012, 2017) or where longer-term projects were started to organise reflective career conversations alongside work placement periods (Den Boer & Kuijpers, 2014). The main question in this article is: why are reflective career conversations in education not implemented as intended?

Our line of reasoning in this article is that implementing reflective career conversations in education requires a change in the routines of teachers. First, we will show that this is a difficult process and therefore requires a specific way of managing people and initiating learning processes. Next, we describe possible ways of intervening in routine change processes. We will show that a simultaneous process of changing the routines on both the levels of the teachers and management is needed. Routine change can thus be seen as a multi-layered phenomenon. Obviously, the simultaneous process of changing routines in both teachers and managers will also influence the interaction between them. As stated above, these processes, although already complex themselves, are complicated further by processes inside and outside the organisation, such as the reward-mechanisms used by governments. To understand the impact of the larger educational system, we attempt to make a connection between routine theory and systems' theory.

## **Why the introduction of reflective career conversations demands a change of routines**

### ***The concept of routines***

Nelson and Winter (1982) introduced the concept of routines in relation to organisational change. They define a routine as a collective recurrent activity pattern. Routines coordinate the actions and communication of the individual group members. Every routine is associated with a number of roles. Roles describe what a specific individual does and why. Roles can be defined as a specific norm that reflects social expectations with regard to behaviour in certain positions. The collective thus distributes roles that fit into the routines. In short, routines describe what is done by whom and why. It must be emphasised that this is partly tacit knowledge: people are not consciously aware of their routines (Hoeve & Nieuwenhuis, 2006). Routines develop because a group of colleagues repeatedly addresses their work in a similar way. Tasks are done in the same way, that is, the same option from a set of actions is chosen, the same sequence of operations is maintained with the same role division (Hoeve, Jorna, & Nieuwenhuis, 2006). Research by Gersick and Hackman (1990) shows that groups of people in new situations create routines very fast, usually unconsciously. Routines are reflected in the statements like 'this is our way of working well together', referring to the fact that members of the working community have a shared view on how the work should be done.

Schank and Abelson (1977) and Nootboom (1996, 2000) have modelled routines as conceptual networks, which they describe as being made up of branches and nodes. A branch refers to an action: for example in a retail shop a branch can refer to dealing with payment. It is important to note that such an action consists of a set of interchangeable operations. In our example 'dealing with payment' might consist of cash handling, but also of assisting a client while using an ATM- or credit card-machine.

A node refers to the transition between two actions. In that transition, the effect of the previous action (or previous branch) is assessed resulting in a decision about the appropriate next action and who should perform it. For example, in several retail chains it is customary that one vendor advises

the customer about a particular product, but a colleague cashier handles the payment. The power of routines is that these transitions happen almost automatically. Routines do not require conscious deliberation and negotiation about what should be done by whom.

Routines manifest themselves as recurring collective action patterns. This is what is visible to the observer: a team starts working without any obvious coordination about who should do what and when. Hoeve and Truijen (2008) argue that the collective action pattern is comparable, figuratively speaking, to the tip of the iceberg; and like an iceberg the larger part is out of sight. Collective action patterns are in fact rooted in a collective basis. On the one hand, this basis consists of established procedures, rules and the physical working environment, and on the other hand of a cognitive and a motivational part, which can be collectively viewed as a mental map of how to act.

Routines continue to exist as long as the team members comply with an existing pattern (Giddens, 1984). Employees tend to stick to an existing routine because it gives them some important benefits (Hoeve et al., 2006). First, as routines do not require conscious deliberation and negotiation about what should be done by whom, information processing and decision-making require fewer efforts from workers. Routines, then, free up mental resources for deliberate action and more complex decision-making. Second, team routines create a certain degree of social stability. As a division of roles is fixed in routines, team members know what they can and should expect from each other. Because employees clearly benefit from complying with existing routines, these routines are often used in a non-critical way. Even if the context requires a different approach, employees act in accordance with the standard approach (Egidi & Narduzzo, 1997).

Edmondson, Bohmer, and Pisano (2001) points out that changing of routines is a laborious process. The greater the uncertainty and complexity, the more people have a tendency to prefer the old routine (Heiner, 1983). Routines are a beacon of security that people cling on to. This is especially true in situations of continuous innovation where there is no time to adjust routines adequately to the new situation. Wenger (1998), however, showed that routines leave room for interpretation. Routines are flexible: they are followed as guidelines or default rules that allow for variation. Research by Feldman and Pentland (2003) confirms that routines are not as unchangeable as often suspected. As previously indicated, a routine is made up of branches and nodes. The nodes will determine whether the existing routine continues or changes. 'Routines involve people doing things, reflecting on what they are doing, and doing different things, or doing the same things differently, as a result of reflection' (Feldman, 2000, p. 625). However, this reflection takes place implicitly; it happens while working without specific time being allocated (reflection-in-action). This often results in the phenomenon of 'unfinished learning': the most immediate solution is chosen in the workplace, and not necessarily the most optimal one (Nieuwenhuis, 2006; Simon, 1979).

### ***Routines in education and requirements for change***

The general routine that has evolved in education over the last centuries is comprised of a teacher providing knowledge in a way that is understandable – and nowadays also appealing – and students consuming this knowledge. The quality of this process is checked by regularly testing the reproduction of knowledge acquired by students, thus establishing whether the students have understood this knowledge. With the introduction of competency-based education (CBE) in the Netherlands in the first decade of this century, attitudes were introduced as an important part of vocational education in addition to knowledge and skills. Although this allows students a little more room to contribute some of their own interpretations, the existing routine has not fundamentally changed: teachers provide knowledge, demonstrate skills and model attitudes, while students are required to reproduce these correctly.

Until the beginning of this century, the general routine in career guidance in the Netherlands was, and very often still is, one of either testing and giving advice and/or the use of classroom material (books and worksheets) directed towards students answering such questions as: 'who am I, what am I capable of and what do I want?'. Luken (2009) shows the weaknesses of these approaches,

using empirical data about school and labour market success and participants' satisfaction about guidance and counselling, both in education and labour. Theoretically, these weaknesses can be understood as the effects of the change from an industrial to an information or knowledge-oriented society (Sennett, 1998). In the latter, standard biographies, in which career paths are relatively stable and predictable, are no longer the main pattern of living. In order to find their way in society, school and the labour market, young people need to develop a career identity. This identity should enable them to become (more) aware and self-directed and thus cope with the new challenges of society and the labour market (Luken, 2009; Meijers, 1998; Meijers & Lengelle, 2015, 2016; Wijers & Meijers, 1996).

Based on this research, a new approach has been introduced in career guidance in the Netherlands during the first decade of this century; two conceptions are key here. One is that students gain experience in the field of work they are interested in, in order to understand what working in this field means to them, for example, by organising placements in full time (pre-) vocational education. The second idea is that, in order to gain knowledge from this experience, reflection on this experience is necessary. Research shows that only the combination of experiences in practice and the reflection on these experiences results in student learning (Den Boer, Jager, & Smulders, 2003; Meijers, Kuijpers, & Bakker, 2006). Therefore, in career guidance, both practical experiences and reflective career conversations are needed. The quality of these conversations is decisive. Reflective conversations should help students to gain insight into their basic motives in the field of work (Den Boer et al., 2003; Kuijpers & Scheerens, 2006; Meijers et al., 2006). From experience we learned that directly asking students about their motives or values, does not work. Students are unable to answer such questions, as they find motives and values too difficult to articulate. A more successful approach 'takes a detour', by asking students about recent concrete experiences, narrowing these experiences down to specific events and helping them to give meaning to what they have experienced by comparing these with other relevant experiences (for a more detailed description, see Meijers & Lengelle, 2015, 2016). This requires new behaviour from teachers and counsellors. Those in guiding roles should listen to their students with an open mind and accept that only the students themselves can assess whether the extrapolated meanings are relevant; indeed they should refrain from giving advice, offering diagnosing opinions and providing assessments.

That said, studies show that reflective career conversations are almost completely absent in educational contexts (Den Boer & Kuijpers, 2014; Kuijpers & Meijers, 2012; 2017; Kuijpers & Scheerens, 2006; Mittendorff, 2010; Van Loon, 2011; Winters, 2012). In their conversations with students, counsellors predominantly provide information and give advice (Mittendorff, 2010; Winters, 2012), while they should actually allow students themselves to give meaning to their experiences by asking them questions about actual happenings and allowing students to draw their own conclusions.

In order to understand this more fully, we will compare the old routines in career guidance and in vocational education in general with the demands now placed on teachers and counsellors in the new era. Basically, in the old routines, the teacher or counsellor controls both the content and organisation of the class or the conversation: they operate in a 'sending' and 'control' mode while the student is in the 'receiving' or 'consumption' mode. In a classical situation of knowledge transfer this is normal or to a certain extent even necessary. In the new career guidance routine the teacher or counsellor still controls the organisation of the conversation in the sense that it is the teacher who invites the student for the conversation and the teacher asks the questions. However, the teacher only partly controls the content of the conversation and has almost no control over the outcome.

The knowledge a student acquires in a career conversation is personal, not generic, transferable and reproducible. This knowledge is important for the student in order to develop an understanding of his or her own motives, which ultimately give direction to his or her career. The teacher has no prior knowledge of the insights the student has to acquire as these take shape during the dialogue. At best, the teacher recognises something from his or her own experience, but unlike in a regular teaching environment the teacher must *not* share this knowledge.

Moreover, in the long run the purpose of reflective career conversations is to allow students to become aware and self-directive, to gain more control over his or her own learning. Ultimately, this is also in the interest of the teacher: after all, students who *need* knowledge are more motivated to learn than students who study only to pass their exams. But, it is important to point out here that in this new form of guidance, the teacher initially loses control over the motivation of the pupil.

Finally, a career conversation will end with an investigation of the most appropriate next step in the development of the student. This can be about an activity in school, but also an internship, the choice of a different training programme or even a different school. For the career of the student, it is irrelevant whether this next step agrees with curriculum or educational planning. Student and teacher together will have to outline the steps that will help the student in his or her career and, of course, lead to qualification. So here too, it is not the teacher who explains to students what is expected of them and who corrects students if they do not comply with the rules. The teacher has to think along with the student – how the student can arrive where he or she wants to go and can acquire a qualification on the way. These ‘disadvantages’ clearly show that the introduction of reflective career conversations in education demands different behaviour of both students and teachers than in the existing and still dominant routine aiming at the reproduction and assessment of knowledge and/or competencies. This creates uncertainties for both teachers and students, and therefore often evokes resistance.

This resistance becomes manifest in a number of different ways. The principles and ideas behind reflective career conversations are often converted into a ‘tool’, such as a format or questionnaire. This tool is then used to pre-structure the conversation or is even used for the student to fill out at home as a ‘reflection report’. Such a tool undermines the basic idea behind reflective career conversations: instead of a conversation that helps the student to gain insight into his or her motives by giving meaning to recent experiences, the conversation quickly turns into an assessment about the extent to which the student has insight into his or her motives or talents. In other words, the new routine has been adapted or incorporated into the existing routine. In the change from conversation to control, the core of the innovation is therefore lost. On the organisational level, the resistance often takes the form of questioning the contribution of reflective career conversations to output and outcomes, effectiveness and efficiency: ‘how do reflective career conversations improve our success rate, diploma rate, ranking, etc?’ are the types of questions that arise. These are legitimate questions and in the end the introduction of reflective career conversations probably will contribute to output, outcome, effectiveness and efficiency. However, these are not the initial or primary goals of reflective career conversations.

It is naive to regard resistance as unwillingness or ignorance. Resistance shows that the people involved understand that they are being asked to do something that does not fit into their existing routine. In such situations, we all are inclined to resist (Baker, Greenberg, & Yalof, 2007) or convert the desired new behaviour into already existing routines rather than the other way around. Learning new routines takes time and effort and it puts social stability under pressure. These risks and efforts are worth considering. Discarding the effort and risks of introducing a new routine is justifiable. What is not justifiable is discarding the new routine because the existing routine is accepted as ‘a given’.

## Managing routine changes

The successful introduction of reflective career conversations requires new behaviour of teachers and teacher teams. We have shown that routine changes bring about uncertainty and chaos. Routine changes should be considered radical change processes. In this section, we will discuss how routine changes can and should be managed. First, we will discuss the possible managerial interventions to induce and support routine changes at the teacher level and discuss the potential of the professional dialogue as the most promising intervention. Next, the professional dialogue will be elaborated upon. Lastly, we will look into the often conflicting roles of the management regarding

professional dialogues and we can then reflect on the desired managerial routines which can strengthen professional dialogues and routine change.

### Intervening in routine change

There is little empirical research on the process of routine change in contemporary labour organisations (Hoeve et al., 2006). Therefore, little is known about the factors that stimulate or impede routine change. However, Wenger (1998) has shown that routines to a large degree are the outcome of socio-cultural negotiations in the community: both the nature of the work that has to be done and the composition of the working community have an impact on routine formation. Therefore, it seems appropriate to intervene in the nature of the working community in conjunction with the content of the work. Pentland and Feldman (2005) point out that organisations often deliberately attempt to capture routines in rules or standard operating procedures. However, the effort to take control over the work process by means of procedures is very ineffective in professional organisations where the autonomy of the workers is substantial.

A second possibility for routine change is the composition of the working community (Hoeve et al., 2006). It is conceivable that routines will change by forming new teams. However, deliberate intervention in the composition of work communities might not lead to the desired outcome. As stated earlier, new working communities tend to form new routines quickly. But in chaotic situations, it can be expected that new and vulnerable working communities will not take the time to develop new routines but instead they will copy existing routines from a known situation. To regain (social) stability as soon as possible they would even rather take on an existing 'bad' routine than put effort into developing a new more optimal routine. Moreover, creating something new out of chaos is very demanding and it takes a lot of effort for people to recover from – such processes can lead to personal crises as people are challenged or deprived of their identity through the loss of established roles.

Intervening in the composition of the working community is also risky if we take into account the phases of routine change. Routine change takes place in three phases: loosening existing routines, developing new routines and anchoring new routines (Homan, 2005; Nooteboom, 2000). Changing the composition of a working community might help to break up existing routines. The forming of a new community brings about chaos and uncertainty, which is conducive to the creativity that is needed for the development of new routines (Homan, 2005). However, the same chaotic situation is not conducive to the anchoring of the new routines. The last phase requires an adaptive learning process that benefits from a certain tranquillity and safety. Intervening in the composition of a working community can provide an impetus to foster exploration, but can become an obstruction in the phase of implementation. Consequently, further investigation is needed to explore to what extent and under what conditions interventions in the composition and nature of a work community can be fruitful.

A third possible line of thinking regarding the change of routines can be derived from sociological theories on structuring human actions. Routines structure collective action and distribute roles that fit those routines. As such, routines are an important source of the legitimisation of behaviour. Such implicit sources may oppose change if they are understood as fixed rules of action from which it is impossible to deviate. Argyris and Schon (1996) speak in this context of 'defensive' routines. According to Giddens (1984), we can overcome defensive routines by making explicit the implicit nature and origin of the source, thus making people aware of this nature and the origin of a specific pattern, and also making people aware of possible errors interwoven in such a pattern.

A similar line of reasoning can be derived from a more cultural approach. As routines incorporate implicit norms and implicitly direct behaviour and work attitudes, they can be viewed as operationalisations or 'materializations' of culture. It is therefore worthwhile to look into a more culture-oriented approach to change. Bommerez and van Zijtveld (2004) discern seven stages of openness of organisational culture, ranging from apathetic and angry – stages 1 and 2 – to full of joy and full of life's energy and passion – stages 6 and 7. Based on their cultural state organisations can be creative (possible in the high stages of culture), proactive (possible also in the middle stages) or reactive which is

the only option in the lower stages. Bommerez and van Zijtveld (2004) emphasise that most educational organisations function at the lower cultural stages and therefore can only react to what groups like the government, the board and parental organisations demand. The basic response to change of this type of organisation is defensive (cf. Argyris & Schon, 1996). To allow organisations to shift culturally from the lower to the higher stages, dialogue is the only means available (Bommerez & van Zijtveld, 2004; Wierdsma, 2014).

Following socio-cultural theories, a promising intervention is to organise dialogues in which explicit reflection about existing routines is made possible and also put effort into making desired new routines explicit in terms of desired behavioural patterns and role divisions. Moreover, the concept of routine itself can help to structure dialogue in chaotic innovation processes, because the routine structure can be used as a lever for critically reflecting on the contemporary action patterns and systematically tracking improvements. Guiding questions for the dialogue and critical reflection are for example: 'Does the current routine still apply to changing situations faced by workers?' and 'Is it possible to combine two separate routines into one?'. Wierdsma (1999) proposes a professional dialogue in which management and people from the shop floor mutually discuss the content and the organisation of work and the necessity of changing (parts) of routines. Such a dialogue about the meaning of current routines is essential for the development of a shared understanding of the changes required.

### **The conflicting role of management in routine change processes**

The professional dialogue can be seen as an important tool for management to facilitate routine change. In a professional dialogue:

1. Management can articulate the 'why' and preserve the 'what'. Management understands the external pressures that make routine changes necessary (the 'why') and simultaneously allows teachers to learn how to translate the innovation into suitable daily practice *and* safeguard that the design of the innovation is in line with how it was meant to be (the 'what').
2. Management continuously monitor the implicit or explicit negotiations of the new routines in order for learning to take place. This means that instead of asking how many reflective career conversations have taken place, management should ask what these conversations were about and whether teachers or counsellors have the impression that students have learned from them – in other words whether the conversations yield what was intended.

This seems a straightforward way to facilitate routine change on the shop floor. Yet, professional dialogues are not standard practice in school organisations for two reasons. The first is that contemporary management practices do not foster a culture of dialogue. In contemporary organisations, efficiency and control are key elements in the management of current educational organisations, as the large sum of public funding has to be accounted for within society. This is also known as the 'new public management' (NPM) approach (Barzelay, 2001). What is important here is the notion that top-down organised systems resist change in the way they are organised, namely top-down. External pressures on the organisation are passed on from top to bottom as well. In situations in which routines need to change at the operational level – as is the case with the introduction of reflective career conversations in (vocational) education – it is the task of the layers above the shop floor to make sure these can happen. In the NPM culture, successful innovations are well-planned processes that are protected from interference. The role of the management is to ensure that interferences from other parts of the system at any level are not translated into tasks or assignments for teachers and teacher teams. At a management level, these interferences should be either 'held up' ('not now') or converted into measures inserted in the current routine change. In the NPM culture, the notion of a professional dialogue with the shop floor does not fit into the daily repertoire of managers.

The second reason that professional dialogues are not standard practice in school organisations is that innovation is often denoted as a project, which inhibits these being viewed as on-going collective sense making processes. Research into large-scale innovations that specifically aim at routine changes at several levels in the organisation, shows these kind of routine-based changes are usually organised as projects at the periphery of the organisation, often with external funding, due to the fact that they are costly and the outcomes are uncertain (Den Boer & Teurlings, 2014). Externally funded projects have to finish within a certain time frame and have to be accounted for, since public money is at stake. However, routine change requires open space for learning and collective sense making, rather than planning and (re)producing already known behaviour to attain known goals. Unfortunately, restricted time frames and accountability usually mean that standard routines are used by project managers. Interestingly, the project organisation of innovation rather appeals to an NPM culture instead of them fostering open dialogue and collective sense making.

## Conclusion and discussion

We have argued that the implementation of reflective career conversations is an extremely complex process. We showed that the implementation of such conversations requires new behaviour from teachers and therefore new routines from teacher teams. This new desired routine incorporates a focus on learning from personal experience and not on generic knowledge reproduction, and on allowing students to gain control over their learning.

The introduction of career conversations in education interferes radically with existing routines. Developing new behaviours and associated routines takes time and energy. A frequently observed response to proposed changes is that working communities try to incorporate elements of the proposed changes into the existing routines. New situations are thus addressed with the old, slightly adjusted, routines (Verbiest, 2011). This is not necessarily a matter of laziness but foremost the efficient use of limited time and mental space.

It is clear from the above that routines on the shop floor will not change automatically. External pressure often creates an urgency that helps to induce the envisioned change and foster a process of collective sense making focused on the future external demands on the organisation. It is obvious that management would take the lead in these processes and fulfil a pioneering role. But they should do so in dialogue with the (whole) organisation. Organising professional dialogues seems to be the most promising alternative. A professional dialogue requires that management takes the lead in starting a collective process of sense making by not just communicating the new (strategic) objective ('what'): a new view of education, in which reflective career conversations are considered important. Instead, the focus in the dialogue should be on collectively understanding the 'why'. The introduction of reflective career conversations must solve a problem. It must be clear what this problem is, why this is a problem which an educational organisation needs to solve and what possible solution(s) would be most successful.

However, conducting a professional dialogue requires new behaviour of managers, too. It is not standard repertoire in the dominant NPM culture. Rather, the dominant project approach to innovation instead strengthens the existing managerial routines based on efficiency and control and does not foster managerial repertoires that would invoke collective sense making processes and dialogue.

Implementation of reflective career conversations requires a simultaneous process of routine change at different organisational levels, and coordination between those layers. The coherent routines at different levels of an organisation are to be regarded as a system. Senge (1990) showed that factors at the system's level are critical to the success or failure of organisations, the so-called fifth discipline. Each system aims to keep existing mechanisms, including its culture, implicit norms and actual behaviour – the routines – in place as a means of survival. From a routine perspective, this is easy to explain: routine change is time-consuming and strenuous. It requires unlearning old behaviour and learning and anchoring new behaviour. In many innovation projects, there is little time and

attention for such learning processes, due to the fact that participants' attention is primarily geared towards the content of the innovation and not towards these necessary learning processes. Development of new behavioural patterns – individually and collectively – is not accounted for within most innovation budgets. Under time and budget constraints, incorporating new behaviour into existing routines is simply a less strenuous and therefore seemingly effective strategy, a strategy most people will follow instead of putting time and effort into developing a new routine.

The lesson to be learned is that as long as a system can meet the requirements of the environment within the existing routines, it will not change fundamentally. Indeed, it can take a long time before the urgency for changing routines is truly felt.

## Note

1. The concept of reflective career conversations refers to the specific conversational techniques used in order to induce and support reflective processes in an individual. The reflective processes first of all relate to a person's motives, that which propels someone in life, especially in labour. For more information about these specific conversational techniques, we refer to Meijers and Lengelle (2015, 2016) and Kuijpers and Meijers (2015). The concept of career learning entails learning for one's career. The realisation of that encompasses an educational environment that is practice-oriented, dialogue-oriented and demand-oriented simultaneously (Kuijpers, Meijers, & Bakker, 2006).

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

## Notes on contributors

**Dr Peter den Boer** is lecturer at the VET college 'ROC West-Brabant'. His fields of interest are career guidance and career learning, teacher team learning, educational change and organisational change.

**Ir Aimée Hoeve** is senior researcher at the Research Centre Quality of Learning of the HAN University of Applied Sciences in the Netherlands. Her research interests focus on workplace learning and routine change, development of vocational expertise, design of hybrid learning environments and co-makemanship VET and industry.

## References

- Argyris, C., & Schon, D. (1996). *Organizational Learning II: Theory, method and practice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Baker, D., Greenberg, C., & Yalof, I. (2007). *What happy women know: How findings in positive psychology can change women's lives for the better*. New York, NY: Rodale.
- Barzelay, M. (2001). *The new public management: Improving research and policy dialogue*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Bommerez, J., & van Zijtveld, K. (2004). *Flow en de kunst van het zaken doen*. Eemnes: Nieuwe Dimensies.
- Den Boer, P. (2009). *Kiezen van een opleiding: van ervaring naar zelfsturing. Can it be done?* Etten-Leur: ROC West-Brabant.
- Den Boer, P., & Kuijpers, M. (2014). Vijf jaar werken aan keuzeprocessen: opbrengsten en bottle necks. In F. Meijers, M. Kuijpers, K. Mittendorff, & G. Wijers (Eds.), *Het onzekere voor het zekere. Kwetsbaarheid als kracht in loopbaandialogen* (pp. 61–81). Antwerpen: Garant.
- Den Boer, P. R., Jager, A. K., & Smulders, H. R. M. (2003). *Beroepsdilemma's als sleutel tot betekenisvol leren*. Wageningen: Stoas Onderzoek.
- Den Boer, P., & Teurlings, C. (2014). *"De pdsa levendig maken". Rapport externe ondersteuning HPBO-project TEC2020*. Ede: HPBO.
- Edmondson, A. C., Bohmer, R. M., & Pisano, G. P. (2001). Disrupted routines: Team learning and new technology implementation in hospitals. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *46*, 685–716.
- Egidi, M., & Narduzzo, A. (1997). The emergence of path-dependent behaviors in cooperative contexts. *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, *15*, 677–709.
- Feldman, M. M. S. (2000). Organizational routines as a source of continuous change. *Organization Science*, *11*, 611–629.
- Feldman, M. M. S., & Pentland, B. T. (2003). Reconceptualizing organizational routines as a source of flexibility and change. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *48*, 94–118.

- Gersick, C. J. G., & Hackman, J. R. (1990). Habitual routines in task-performing groups. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 47, 65–97.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Heiner, R. A. (1983). The origin of predictable behaviours. *American Economic Review*, 73, 60–95.
- Hoeve, A., Jorna, R., & Nieuwenhuis, L. (2006). Het leren van routines: van stagnatie naar innovatie. *Pedagogische Studiën*, 83, 397–409.
- Hoeve, A., & Nieuwenhuis, A. F. M. (2006). Learning routines in innovation processes. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 18, 171–185.
- Hoeve, A., & Truijen, K. (2008). Een model om zicht te krijgen op teamroutines. *Onderwijs & Ontwikkeling*, 10, 14–18.
- Homan, T. (2005). *Organisatiedynamica: Theorie en praktijk van organisatieverandering*. Den Haag: SDU Uitgevers.
- Kuijpers, M. A. C. T., & Scheerens, J. (2006). Career competencies for the modern career. *Journal of Career Development*, 32(4), 303–319.
- Kuijpers, M., & Meijers, F. (2012). *Leren luisteren en loopbaanleren. De effecten van een professionaliseringstraject voor mbo-docenten*. Woerden: MBO Diensten.
- Kuijpers, M. & Meijers, F. (2017). Professionalizing teachers in career dialogue: An effect study. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 45(1), 83–96.
- Kuijpers, M., & Meijers, F. (2015). Professionalizing teachers in career dialogue: An effect study. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 43, 83–96.
- Kuijpers, M., Meijers, F., & Bakker, J. (2006). *Krachtige loopbaangerichte leeromgevingen in het (v)mbo: Hoe werkt het?* Driebergen: Het Platform Beroepsonderwijs.
- Luken, T. (2009). *Het dwaalspoor van de goede keuze. Naar een effectiever model van (studie)loopbaanontwikkeling*. Tilburg: Fontys Hogeschool.
- Meijers, F. (1998). The development of a career identity. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 20, 191–207.
- Meijers, F., & Kuijpers, M. (2015). *Loopbaanleren in school en praktijk: de dialoog*. Woerden: MBO Diensten.
- Meijers, F., Kuijpers, M., & Bakker, J. (2006). *Over leerloopbanen en loopbaanleren. Loopbaancompetenties in het (v)mbo*. Driebergen: Het Platform Beroepsonderwijs.
- Meijers, F., & Lengelle, R. (2015). Career learning: Qualitative career assessment as a learning process in the construction of a narrative identity. In M. McMahon & M. Watson (Eds.), *Career assessment: Qualitative approaches* (pp. 41–49). Rotterdam: Sense.
- Meijers, F., & Lengelle, R. (2016). Reflective career dialogues. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 30(3), 21–23. doi:10.20853/30-3-636
- Mittendorff, K. M. (2010). *Reflective career conversations in senior secondary vocational education* (Ph.D. thesis). Eindhoven School of Education, Eindhoven.
- Nelson, R. R., & Winter, S. (1982). *An evolutionary theory of economic change*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Nieuwenhuis, A. F. M. (2006). *Vernieuwend vakmanschap: een drieluik over beroepsonderwijs en innovatie*. Enschede: Universiteit Twente.
- Nijhof, W. J., & van Esch, W. (2004). *Unraveling policy, power, process and performance: The formative evaluation of the Dutch Adult and Education Act*. 's Hertogenbosch: Cinop.
- Nooteboom, B. (1996). *Towards a cognitive theory of the firm: Issues and logic of change*. Groningen: University of Groningen – SOM Research Institute.
- Nooteboom, B. (2000). *Learning and innovation in organizations and economies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pentland, B. T., & Feldman, M. S. (2005). Organizational routines as a unit of analysis. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 14, 793–815.
- Schank, R. C., & Abelson, R. P. (1977). *Scripts, plans, goals and understanding: An inquiry into human knowledge structures*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Sennett, R. (1998). *The corrosion of character: The personal consequences of work in the new capitalism*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Simon, H. A. (1979). Rational decision making in business organisations. *The American Economic Review*, 69, 493–513.
- Van Loon, F. (2011). 'Actions speak louder than words?' Reflection in reflective career conversations at the AKA training: *Making the abstract concrete*. London: Roehampton University.
- Verbiest, E. (2011). *Leren innoveren. Een inleiding in de onderwijsinnovatie*. Antwerpen: Garant.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wierdsma, A. (1999). *Co-creatie van verandering*. Delft: Eburon.
- Wierdsma, A. (2014). *Vrij-moedig positie kiezen: moreel leiderschap in vitale netwerken*. Breukelen: Nyenrode Business Universiteit.
- Wijers, G., & Meijers, F. (1996). Careers guidance in the knowledge society. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 24, 185–198.
- Winters, A. (2012). *Career learning in vocational education: Guiding conversations for career development* (Ph.D. thesis). Catholic University of Leuven, Leuven.