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A substantial body of work exists on the definition of graduate employability and a number of frameworks identify lists of knowledge, skills and attributes that graduates should attain. However, substantial gaps still exist between the expectations of employers, graduates, students and staff about what, when and where requisite student learning should take place. In addition, very little research has been published about discipline differences in graduate employability.

The study reported in this paper was part of a large federally funded project on graduate employability. It explored the perspectives of stakeholders from multiple disciplines on graduate employability to identify areas of consensus, misalignment and opportunities for collaboration. The main issue presented here is adequacy of current employability frameworks in an Australian context.

Data were collected through a series of focus groups and interviews and analysed on themes drawn from an existing employability framework. Stakeholders were asked about their expectations, any perceived gaps and existing challenges. The adequacy of the employability framework was then assessed against the student and employer perceptions of employability and differences between disciplines.

Employability frameworks vary in organisation, theoretical underpinning and level of detail. The CareerEDGE framework was found to have a good fit with Australian employer views on graduate employability. Participants identified some general and discipline-specific issues/concepts outside this framework, but additional descriptors can easily be added to it. The framework is also easily updated as the conceptions of employability evolve. A further improvement to the framework would be addition of level of sophistication of student understanding.

Keywords: Graduate employability, employability framework, discipline differences

Background

A substantial body of work exists on the definition of graduate employability and a number of frameworks identify lists of knowledge, skills and attributes that graduates should attain. However, substantial gaps still exist between the expectations of employers, graduates, students and staff about what, when and where requisite student learning should take place. In addition, very little research has been published about discipline differences in graduate employability.

This paper reports on outcomes from a large federally funded project on graduate employability. The project explored the perspective of stakeholders from five disciplines: engineering, information and computer technology (ICT), life sciences, media and communications, and psychology. Stakeholders included teachers, students, graduates, employers and professional bodies. Their perspectives on graduate employability were explored to identify areas of consensus, any gaps and opportunities for development and
collaboration. The main issue presented here is the adequacy of current employability frameworks to drive curriculum renewal in an Australian context.

**Employability**

Many studies have been undertaken to define generic skills needed by employers. These have been defined in general (Barrie, Hughes, & Smith, 2009, Oliver, Whelan, Hunt, Hammer, Jones, Pearce, & Henderson, 2011) and specifically for engineering, life sciences and psychology (Engineers Australia, 2011, Gartland, 2008, Cranney, Provost, Katsikitis, Martin, White, & Cohen, 2008).

Employment outcomes are reported in Australia on a national scale by sector and gender. Employment outcomes for Australian graduates have been falling since the global financial crisis of 2007 (Graduate Careers Australia [GCA], 2014b). These figures are sometimes used as a proxy measure of “employability” (Bridgstock, 2009). However, graduates may be un- or under-employed due to factors beyond their control, as employment opportunities depend on sector, location and economic circumstances. Falling employment outcomes in the current economic climate should not be interpreted as falling levels of graduate skills and attributes.

Definitions of employability focus more broadly on whether a graduate has the ability to gain work or employment, independent of economic conditions. One commonly cited definition is:

a set of achievements - skills, understandings and personal attributes - that makes graduates more likely to gain employment and be successful in their chosen occupations, which benefits themselves, the workforce, the community and the economy. (Yorke, 2006).

**Employability frameworks**

When a phenomenon can be characterised by multiple descriptors, a framework may be built to organise the descriptors into categories. A framework is useful to teachers if it can help them organise learning objectives and make them more precise. Learning objectives are “intended student learning outcomes” or what we want our students to learn (Anderson, Krathwohl, Airasian, Cruikshank, Mayer, & Pintrich, 2014). Many frameworks have been developed for employability, primarily from the employer perspective. There is no consensus on the best framework, perhaps because the definition is contested. Most frameworks have become outdated as the definition of employability evolves.

One of the most well known is the USEM model of employability proposed by Knight and Yorke (2003). This model captures the idea that employability includes more than just generic skills. The four components of the model are Understanding, Skills, Efficacy and Metacognition. The model promotes good teaching practice. A weakness of the model is its scholarly language (Dacre Pool & Sewell, 2007). In addition, the category descriptors are rather general, leading to global learning objectives that are too broad to be readily implemented by curriculum designers.

Several groups have recently developed lists of employability skills that are systematic and detailed (Oliver, 2011, Jackson 2013, Smith, Ferns, & Russell, 2014) with multiple descriptors/categories and up to 45 items relevant to employability. Smith et al. (2014) compared the lists and found gaps, generalities and vagueness in several of the frameworks. A weakness of their own list is that it has not been developed as a framework. However it could easily be developed into one.
Another well known model is the Dacre Pool and Sewell (2007) CareerEDGE framework. It has categories and sub-categories. Its strengths are that it is systematic, comprehensive and detailed, facilitating identification of specific learning objectives. Its five categories reflect common organisational structures in higher education institutions. Its fit to current practice allows pragmatic implementation of incremental change. Like the other frameworks, though, it has a number of gaps. Smith et al. (2014, Appendix A) identified a number of specific gaps in the CareerEDGE framework, in careers development (such as “recognise the politics of a workplace environment”), and in generic skills (such as “collect analyse and organise information “and “recognise ethical practice in the workplace”). The framework is readily adapted by addition of new sub-categories.

A taxonomy is a kind of framework where the categories form a sequence. A framework with hierarchical categories was developed by Barrie (2004, 2006) for generic attributes. Its hierarchical sequence scaffolds learning outcomes appropriate to year-level as well as discipline differences. The strength of this framework is that it provides a logical pathway for gradual development of attributes. In combination with a detailed employability framework, this could be an effective approach for curriculum renewal for employability.

In summary, a number of employability frameworks have been developed that vary in organisation, theoretical underpinning and level of detail. With further development, these could be shaped to support curriculum renewal.

**Discipline differences**

By definition, generic skills and attributes are independent of the discipline. Few studies have reported on discipline differences in conceptions of employability. One study found the “very different understandings of graduate attributes” expressed by academics was as broad within as between disciplines. Academics from very different disciplines expressed similar conceptions of graduate attributes, while those within the same discipline expressed very different conceptions (Barrie 2006). How generic attributes were taught depended on their relationship (from precursor to enabling) to discipline knowledge and led to adoption of a two-tiered structure of university- and discipline-level attributes (Barrie 2004). Another study reported generic attributes are highly context-dependent (Jones 2009), but only reported the academics’ perspectives.

**Employer perspectives on employability**

Graduate Careers Australia (GCA) has surveyed Australian and New Zealand employers since 2005, publishing results annually as part of the Graduate Outlook series (GCA, 2014a). Employers are grouped into six gross sectors. The data show that employer expectations of graduates are constant over time and vary little between sectors. The most recent report (for 2013 graduates) shows that employers in all sectors except Manufacturing rank “Interpersonal and communication skills (written and oral)” as the most desirable skill. Manufacturing ranks it second (GCA, 2014a, Table 7).

In terms of selection criteria for graduates, the differences between industry sectors are limited to differences in ranking. For example, “Work experience” is ranked as the third most important criteria (out of 10) by Construction/Minning/Engineering (CME), compared to sixth by Communication/Technology/Utilities (CTU), while “Emotional intelligence” is ranked fourth by Government/Defence/Health (GDH) but only eighth by both CME and CTU. “Teamwork” is ranked of lesser importance by all sectors (from fifth to eighth). Generally,
while most employers share the same understanding of employability attributes, there may be a different emphasis between disciplines or sectors on an attribute’s relative importance.

The ranking of communication and teamwork skills from Australian and New Zealand employers is somewhat different to other discipline-focused or international studies. Arnold, Loan-Clarke, Harrington, and Hart (1999) reported that retail and finance employers in the United Kingdom (UK) ranked personal drive, initiative and teamwork more highly than communication. Jackson (2013) reported that communication and teamwork are consistently ranked the most desirable skills by employers in Australia and the UK. Gabric and McFadden (2001) reported that operations management employers ranked communications top and teamwork fourth of 15 general skills and abilities. Some differences between these reports may be attributed to differences in sample size and survey instrument, but the findings suggest overall that employers value the same employability skills, with variation in ranking of importance dependent on sector or discipline or location.

Many industry sectors have professional associations that represent graduate members, but relatively few accredit undergraduate degrees. Two accrediting bodies involved in disciplines investigated in this study were Engineers Australia (EA) and the Australian Psychology Accreditation Council (APAC). In addition to discipline knowledge, understanding and skill, graduate engineers require ‘personal and professional attributes’ including ethics, professional accountability, communication skills, creativity, being pro-active, ICT skills, management of self, team skills and leadership (Engineers Australia 2011). Psychology bachelor programs focus on discipline knowledge and skills, but should also develop generic attributes of critical thinking and communication skills (Australian Psychology Accreditation Council 2010). The requirements of these accrediting bodies sit within current Employability frameworks. They require generic skills relevant to other disciplines.

**Approach**

The study reported in this paper was part of a large federally funded project on graduate employability. It explored the perspectives of stakeholders from multiple disciplines on graduate employability to identify areas of consensus, misalignment and opportunities for collaboration. It mapped discipline differences in perceptions of employability in stakeholders using the CareerEDGE framework. This paper focuses on findings concerning the adequacy of current employability frameworks in an Australian context.

This study was underpinned by a qualitative research methodology. Data from stakeholders in five disciplines were collected in focus groups run with open and frank discussion surrounding real-world problems, issues and practices (Krueger & Casey, 2009). The data reported here were collected from three disciplines (engineering, life sciences, and media & communications). These disciplines were selected to represent one each of a professional, science and humanities discipline. Each focus group discussed a set of research questions. This paper reports on responses by employers and students to the question “What do employers want?”.

Employers were drawn from the industry/sector networks of the research team. Employers and professional body representatives from the discipline sectors were invited by email to attend an Industry Forum. At the Forum, participants joined discipline specific focus groups of an hour in length. In total five focus groups were attended by 43 employers and professional body representatives.
Students were drawn from penultimate and final years of relevant programs from three Australian Institutions (RMIT University, Monash University and University of Southern Queensland) at multiple campuses (ICT: RMIT and Monash, Caulfield and Monash, Clayton; Psychology: RMIT and USQ Springfield). Participants were recruited by email. Each focus group was an hour in length. In total thirteen focus groups were attended by 55 students.

Focus group questions were semi-structured and presented informally to promote discussion. Each focus group was run by a member of the research team who was not directly involved with teaching the students.

Each focus group was recorded and transcribed verbatim. Data analysis was carried out by one team member and reviewed by two others. Transcriptions were analysed thematically in NVivo using a qualitative approach based on themes drawn from the CareerEDGE framework (Dacre Pool & Sewell, 2007). This framework was chosen as it has systematic categories and detailed subcategories and is easily adapted to include new sub-categories. Sub-categories that emerged but were not present in the framework were initially coded as ‘other’. These were then discussed by three of the research team, and allocated to an appropriate category. These are shown in Table 1 with an asterisk.

Selected quotations of students were also analysed for level of sophistication. Students’ understandings of employability were analysed to identify whether students focused on acquisition of only one or two elements of employability, or whether students could give a ‘more nuanced and contextually dependent descriptions of appropriate practice and conduct’(Wilson et al., 2013). Student comments were then categorised as less or more sophisticated.

**Results**

Themes relevant to employability identified by study participants (students and employers) for selected disciplines are shown in Table 1. The categories are based on the CareerEDGE framework (Dacre Pool & Sewell, 2007). Additional sub-category items not explicitly included in the original framework but identified in the study’s focus groups are indicated with an asterisk. Further details for students are given in our forthcoming paper (Jollands et al., 2015).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Life sciences</th>
<th>Media and communications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career development learning</td>
<td>Business acumen*</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career planning</td>
<td>X●</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of industry and job market</td>
<td>X●</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>X●</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passions and interests</td>
<td>X●</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professionalism*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment processes preparation</td>
<td>X●</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>X●</td>
<td>X●</td>
<td>X●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Themes identified by students (x) and employers (■)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Life sciences</th>
<th>Media and communications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree subject knowledge,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understanding and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptable</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics*</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation and creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership*</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifelong learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work ethic</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working under pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligence</td>
<td>Self awareness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self management</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness of others</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing others</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Themes not explicitly included in the CareerEDGE framework.

Table 1 shows that the students and employers from all three disciplines readily identified a wide range of issues/concepts relevant to employability. Their lists showed few discipline differences. They also show a good fit with the CareerEDGE framework. One discipline difference is that Life Sciences employers identified a much narrower list of issues than the students and other employers. This may reflect the homogeneity of career paths for Life Science graduates: typically, ‘laboratory technician’ is the first graduate position, with a narrow position description focused on repetitive experimental work.

Students and employers identified some themes not explicitly listed by Dacre Pool and Sewell (2007). These themes were grouped under the following new sub-category titles: business acumen, professionalism, ethics and leadership. Similar gaps in the CareerEDGE framework were found by Smith et al. (2014, Appendix A).

Business acumen might fit in either Career development or Generic skills. It reflects comments about skill in making correct decisions in a business context. Employer comments included “It’s almost a basic requirement for a designer to understand the business strategy and how design fits into it” (Media & Communications employer, 2014). Student comments included “you kind of set your own wage most of the time but you don’t know how to handle those conversations. Or how to ask for more…” (Media & Communications student, 2014).

Professionalism is a broad concept that includes exercising specialist knowledge and skills with judgment, identifying as a member of a community based on shared practices and values, and having a sense of responsibility and service (Wilson, Åkerlind, Walsh, Stevens, Turner, & Shield, 2013) that also might fit in either Career development or Generic skills. Employer comments included “well it’s kind of how do you behave professionally” (Engineering employer, 2014). Student comments included “They’re going to get stuck with commitment
and responsibility and 9 to 5 work hours at the very least” (Life Sciences student, 2014) and “we did have a course that was meant to be focused on professional...well core professional practice that was meant to help us prepare for the industry” (Media & Communications student 2014).

Ethics is included in many frameworks but is omitted from the CareerEDGE framework. Employer comments included “You know what do you do out on a project when you don’t think something is right and you know whoever it is the client, the contractor, the bank, you know whoever it might be is telling you you’re talking rubbish and to go away and just ignore it type of thing, what do you do in that situation” (Engineering employer 2014). Student comments included “They had a few courses and like ethical issues and legal issues” (Life Sciences student 2014) and “if anything the attitude is that it’s already unethical and it’s just about working round ethics, especially if you’re going to work with the media company” (Media & Communications student 2014).

Leadership is also included in many frameworks but is omitted from the CareerEDGE framework. Leadership is often confused with management. However, leadership is about directing, motivating and inspiring others, while management is about co-ordinating people and resources to achieve goals (NSW Government 2014). Employers did not comment on leadership, except for one ICT employer who commented “students might think that you absolutely have to have leadership, whereas you might be looking for sort of 2 to 3 years out, not necessarily looking for the grooming of the leadership positions at that stage”. Student comments included “I think employability should depend on developing other transferable stuff like your leadership qualities” (Engineering student 2014) and “It’s like an ability to take control, understand what need to be done” (Life Sciences student 2014).

Some concepts were not mentioned by students or employers. These might be interpreted as gaps in employability knowledge. For example, “numeracy” was not mentioned explicitly by any students or employers. It seems unlikely that engineering or science students believe that employers do not value numeracy, so they may think of it as a foundation skill required on entry to university, like English ability (Barrie, 2004).

Overall, these students have substantial factual knowledge about what employability means. Their lists of issues/concepts were similar to those identified by employers. These outcomes are similar to findings of previous studies with business students (Arnold et al., 1999, Gabric & McFadden, 2001, GCA, 2014a, Jackson, 2013). There is a high degree of similarity in the perceptions of employability among students from different disciplines, which has not been previously reported. Employers had similar conceptions of employability, except Life Sciences employers were looking for a narrower range of generic attributes in graduates, and did not expect graduates to have career development learning.

The CareerEDGE framework is a useful tool to map discipline differences in stakeholder perceptions of employability. The framework is sufficiently detailed to cover almost all of the stakeholders’ conceptions of employability. The framework is adaptable, and is easy to extend when new concepts emerge. The new concepts identified in this study were business acumen and professionalism (allocated to the category of career development learning), and ethics and leadership (allocated to generic skills). Adaptability is a useful feature of this framework as perceptions of employability continue to evolve.
While students from different disciplines show a high degree of homogeneity in perceptions of employability, some difference was apparent in the level of sophistication of their understandings.

Other studies have identified heterogeneity in sophistication of student understandings within a student cohort. One study of students’ understanding of professionalism identified variation characterised as ranging from simplistic ‘expertise as certainty’ to the more sophisticated ‘expertise as judgment’ (Wilson et al., 2013). Another study found that skill development outcomes from a capstone course varied significantly among students: each student appeared to develop skills to different depths depending on their role in the team, attributed to not taking on roles outside their area of comfort (Keller 2011).

This study identified that level of sophistication of students’ understanding of employability varied with discipline. In particular, the Media & Communications students consistently displayed more sophisticated understandings of employability. Their program is a creative, industry-based program characterised by multiple intense linkages between students, staff and industry, especially in the final year (Morieson et al. 2013). Some examples of student comments are given below to show the progression of students’ understandings from simple (one or two concepts) to sophisticated (multiple concepts with multiple links between concepts). Italicised phrases in each quotation indicate the employability concepts. The relevant sub-category from the CareerEDGE framework is included in brackets.

When asked about communication skills:

I don’t know, just communication skills [communication] to show you can talk to people you don’t know [awareness of others] (Engineering student, 2014).

Like really passionate [passions & interest] for your work and they really like design and there also looking for people who can speak well [communication] about their work, because you actually have to speak to the client [communication] and you explain the client why is your solution good [critical thinking] and you have to rationale with the client so you have to communicate yourself really well [communication] and let the client understand because the client will not be from a design background and would understand what are you trying to say [awareness of others]. So you have to explain it in simply way [communication]. (Media and communications student, 2014).

When asked about networking opportunities with industry:

so given the importance that is place in these meetings and making connection [networking] with these meetings, perhaps the Uni could organise some sort of industry night, those sort of things more frequently, in order to develop these things which obviously so important in terms of graduate employability. (Engineering student, 2014).

we’re doing seminar where people have to network [networking] and we have to get people in to do seminars [communication/networking] and every week there are about 3 or 4 possibly employers that we’re in contact with [communication] and our groups are in contact with employers as part of this project [communication] so any… we have some great industry contacts through that
Current employability frameworks are not adequate to identify depth of student understanding (in terms of level of simplicity or sophistication). Current frameworks can be used to identify stakeholders’ breadth of understanding of employability issues, but further development is needed to include depth of understanding. Building on the work of Barrie (2004, 2006), employability frameworks could be improved by adding a hierarchical sequence that scaffolds learning outcomes appropriate to year-level as well as discipline or other differences.

Conclusions

A framework that is useful for teachers in renewing curriculum for employability must be coherent, systematic, detailed, comprehensive and specific. No existing employability frameworks have all these characteristics. The CareerEDGE framework maps Australian student and employer views on graduate employability well, but has some gaps (business acumen, professionalism, ethics and leadership). A strength of the framework is that it is adaptable: it can be updated simply by adding further sub-categories as perceptions of employability continue to evolve over time.

Another weakness of existing frameworks is that they do not identify stakeholders’ depth of understanding of employability issues. Their categories are not taxonomic, that is, they have no sequential hierarchy. Existing frameworks could be improved by incorporating a hierarchical sequence that scaffolds learning outcomes appropriate to variables such as year level, task complexity, pedagogical approach or discipline differences. A sequence with a continuum of level of sophistication of understanding, from “remember, understand and apply” to “analyse, evaluate and create” (Anderson et al., 2014) or from precursor to complement, translate and enabling (Barrie 2004), could assist teaching staff to identify scaffolded learning objectives suitable for different year levels in different disciplines.
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