

Student Success: Employability in higher education

Webinar transcript

Transcript

RUTH: Hello everybody and welcome to today's webinar. We're just going through the basic housekeeping so people can check their sound and make sure everything is in line. And I will we're just opening up and getting the audience settled and then we'll start the webinar and start the recording as well. So you're welcome everybody to the webinar. We're using the Zoom software webinar, so don't worry about your microphones or videos being on. It's all automatically covered for you and you will be able to communicate with us through the Q&A button, which is on the bottom of the screen and using a tablet it's usually at the top of the screen. We'll just give participants another minute to join us, if you are based in the UK it's a long time before office hours open. I know in other parts of the world it's opposite end of the day. It's the evening so, we really welcome everybody to today's webinar. As well as the webinar being visible. It's also being live captioned which you can turn on with the close captioned icon on the bottom or top of the screen. It's the CC icon. So it's live captioned and open to everybody and we'll also provide a transcript and recording after the session for you as well. So we are, the audience numbers are starting to settle. So just to repeat, the housekeeping for the session you are very welcome to the webinar on success in employability. Please freely to ask questions to the panel on Q&A. Because we're using the Zoom webinar the video and microphone are already muting and ready to work but again you will be able to ask questions through Q&A. Everything is being live captioned. So please feel free to turn the captions on. Which is the closed captioning icon on the bottom of the screen. We'll be recording the session and it will be circulated after today's session. We'll post in the chat some references and citations and linked to various places, but if you do in any questions feel free to put them in the Q&A. I'm going to hand over to Stuart Norton to officially start the webinar. So thank you very much and welcome.

STUART: Hello and welcome everybody to what is the first of two webinars as our colleagues from Oxford Brooks are running this session twice to meet our global membership base and thank you colleagues for that and if it's good morning, good afternoon and good evening, you're all very welcome to today. I am a senior advisor at Advance HE. So Dr Maïa Pal, Senior Lecturer in International Relations and Dr Andrea Macrae and Dr Maïa Pal the Associate Dean for Student Outcomes and Dr Roger Dalrymple. The review itself focused on peer review general articles. So most of you are familiar with the review. We'll drop a link to it in the chat so you can access it. But you may know there are a number of distinct and central teams identified in the research and these topics include measures of employability and employment and career planning and critiques and quality opportunity and assessment innovation. The review is timely and has added credence to the work. Recognising that this needs to be multidimensional and today's webinar really is to allow the authors to comment on areas they would wish to highlight, comment upon or draw attention to. And following the discussion there will be time for Q&A. So please use the question and answer function and we'll use it in the last 20 to 30 minutes and we will do our best to allow the authors to address questions. So delighted to hand over to Maïa who will take you through the next part of the webinar.

MAÏA: Thank you very much Stuart. So welcome to everybody. Good morning afternoon or evening and first of all thank you to Stuart and Advance HE for organising and hosting us today. And obviously to the fantastic team that I have been working on this project and feel very lucky to be here today. So Stuart has already run through the structure of the webinar but I will just go through short overview. And then each of us will talk a little bit about some key themes and insights and points of the dissection of the review and hopefully enough time for Q&A and your questions. So this is the broadest overview. We selected in final 580 journal articles and the selection process was perhaps trickier than we expected first. The literature has exploded and is so wide now in terms of discipline and content and specific studies and geographical locales. So a big part of the review was to make some tough decisions about how to select. So we created these three categories which helped to filter through the research. So these were a peer review general articles in employability and higher education between 2016 and 2021. Between employability related policy and/or practices and student outcomes. And generally we were looking at what works. So what was the most evidence impact based that we could find and went in a reverse to some extent. So still contain primary data analysis but seem to be less demonstrable and our final section contact broader horizon and a lot of other issues. So hopefully the data set will be there as a resource to rethink some of these categories and use them in different ways. So like any methodology it's a compromise. So most of the review is based on the key contact of demonstrable impact and here's a more complex map of codes and themes that we developed from this selection of 580. And specifically the 146 of the demonstrable impact. So there is about, I haven't counted them. About 20 or so themes or codes and those were then reselected into nine key themes we each distributed between ourselves and worked on more specifically. So there is a broad range and it shows us the wide range of topics, areas of focus, disciplines, angles that can be taken to research today and think about and understand employability. Just this I think for us was extremely helpful to try and see what is out there. So I am not going to explain them all in detail but hopefully you have a little bit of time while I am chatting away to have a read of them. So this is some of these arbitrary to some extent how we put them together and could be rejigged but I think they give us a really good sense of what is out there based already on previous work done on this issue. So, of these key themes, we had most frequently, the most frequent code or theme was skills attributes and identities and second came work and integrated learning and skills gap and alignment with market needs. Then we had quite a large theme on critique and I think an area that's particularly developing in recent years. And finally measuring employability and career planning which is a key area of research and interest. So here is just some info graphics on how the key themes were separated. Remember we had three categories of research, demonstrable impact and here we see a division between mostly skills, attributes and identities and entrepreneurial intent and mind set and competencies coming. In. Work integrated learning and a key aspect of this core search criteria we developed. So more focus on skills here on the range of different skills attributes identities that could be evaluated and smaller studies that were still in preparation for furthermore developed studies that would fit in the first category. And finally the broader horizons and here we have the category of critiquing and conceptualising and the other themes presented quite well. So this info graphic giving us a sense of the national context of the study we reviewed and this is focused on the DI domain. And the first thing to say is obviously this literature is dominated by the northern, western views on employability that to some extent we were discussing this yesterday, we felt from our perspective, especially with the view of all the different criteria, the three different criteria we used this was maybe more international representation than is shown on this map. So I think we were surprised there are a number of courses in English studies coming from across the world and some really

interesting case studies that gave us a very different insight that's the one that's dominant but obviously the literature remains in English dominant on this front but some really interesting study to watch out for and certain key relations developing analysis of employability. So I am going to hand over to Andrea for her slide. So I will catch you in a little while.

ANDREA: Thank you very much, so as indicated at the start of this section the next part of the webinar will be occupied by each of the coauthors just delving into one area of the review and I will select some insight that arose from the work integrated learning. In this review it's a broad term and it's interpreted following the conventions of the literature, work placements and internships whether they are paid or unpaid, things like live projects and simulations as well as much more broadly any extra curricular and intercurricular learning activities dedicated to enhancing employability. Those overlap and are addressed in more detail in other areas of the review such as the section on embedded versus nonembedded division. Our focus on placements and internships to begin with and I am going to be picking out some of what I think are some really interesting take away from the literature and spotlighting a handful of studies. So I will follow the literature in using the terms placements and internships fairly interchangeably. They are not consistently used. Many studies reported that from the perspective of participating students work placements do have a positive impact on their employability and study after study was returning the same result. Students were reporting taking part in work placements enhanced their skills and competencies and professional awareness. So this was consistent. Measuring the impact of placements in more objective ways remains methodologically tricky. It's hard to isolate a placement and it's difficult to measure nuances in skills development over the course of the placement. The data on this is a bit more mixed and it's more interestingly mixed in different national context and with different kinds of degrees and you can dig around that issue within the review if you are interested. To spotlight one study on placement and one that has transferable value. A study published in 2017 reported the positive impact of preplacement skills awareness activities and professional practices exercises. So this framing, around a placement to lead the student into it with very direct engagement. Part of the motivation for the study is students found it challenging to evidence the value of placement to their own professional development. These seem to help students engage more deeply with engagement of professional development. A 2020 paper explores how to increase the number of students that take up the placement and that's a stated challenge across a wide range of context. They test another strategy in which students who haven't originally elected to undertake a placement receive a communication from the staff that they are familiar with on the degree course which states they performed well enough and achieved highly enough to be eligible for a placement and this restates the gains of undertaking a placement and they reported a 12% rise in students undertaking a placement. But there seem to be clear benefits in institutions communicating they believe the students have the knowledge and professionalism to succeed. Also in 2020 they published an article which presenting a large scale investigation into the experience and perceived benefits of volunteering and the study engaged with students and the organisations with which they volunteered and their university and institutions. And the study revealed that all three stakeholder groups perceived both benefits, so in some places they are surprised by the benefits they haven't anticipated but also disappointments. And the authors in particular recommend the value of student volunteering can be increased through communication, collaboration and shared goal setting among those three stakeholder groups. The same recommendation is made by a few other studies in the work integrating learning section and particularly work placements and degree apprenticeships. The recommendation that

institution and provider collaboration in establishing the nature of the provision and clear communication among all parties regarding expectations targets, training, support, intended outcomes for provider and students. It's recommended in ensuring the students get the most out of it. Another recommendation for a lot of work integrated learning is there is genuine integration. There is integration between the learning. So the course content is engaged with what they are doing in their work integrated learning. There are issues with placements and internships particularly pertaining to ability and inclusivity. A couple more studies to highlight. Live projects offer a different form of work integrated learning and a 2018 by Gibson reported on the outcomes of a large two year initiative in which live specific projects were embedded within the curriculum and they are in partnership with 17 local partners and large organisations and hundreds of students took part in learning through life projects and 500 were surveyed on their experience and what they learned and gained from them in terms of their own skills development and professional identities and over 85% of those students reported gains in the same sub set of employabilities. In this case in particular the competency of creating problem solving and resilience. The majority of studies on entrepreneurial education specifically were focused on increasing entrepreneurial intent in students, that's students desire to become an entrepreneur. So most of the studies within the scope of the review focused on that as an outcome of entrepreneurial education. Fewer engaged with the broader value of entrepreneurial competency for any graduate professional role. There is a link at the bottom in you want to access that directly within the document. I am sure many of you are familiar with it. Some studies also investigate the differences in engaging with entrepreneurial education. One article published in 2018 reported on a study which found engagement in practical entrepreneurial tasks helped most students. However, the same study found when students develop a deeper knowledge about entrepreneurship and the risks and complexities involved this knowledge deterred some students. So the more they understood the more some were put off. The authors of the study don't find the outcome to be negative at all. They do encourage providers of entrepreneurial education to think carefully about the potential and appealing and alienating effect and how that provision is framed to maximise engagement. You can find these and other studies reported in the review itself. I will hand over to the Project Lead, Dr Roger Dairymple.

ROGER: Many thanks and it's great to talk in more detail about the work. So yes, I was particularly struck in the material in the review window, this 2016 to '21 window, on the material on measures and measuring of employability. And it became increasingly clear to me the act of measurement in this area is an act of definition and meaning. So you can see in the title there. Measures and meanings of employability. Those indicators across national sets and regions that we take to be most pertinent when evaluating the effectiveness of pedagogically of employment. They necessarily make assumptions and take a stance on what we take employability to be. So what is really interesting is the tradition of measuring by these extrinsic indicators. So excellence framework and graduate survey and those are two examples. So time elapsing between graduation and first graduate level job or level of salary on first appointment in the work place. Or degree of mobility or flexibility within the work place. The more objective measures are increasingly being supplemented and perhaps even eclipsed by a tradition that defines employability in much more subjective personal terms, about an individual's own perceptions about sustainable contribution to the workforce and to the wider world. So three particular dimensions stood out. So how their transition into the work place is one that's congruent and they end up doing what they were expected to do and do something that was meaningful to them and a notion of horizon fit. It's often measured in that more human resources notion of horizon fit. So did someone who studied

Geography get a job in a geographic unit? Are there continuities of meaning and purpose? And those kind of continuities of perception and of meaning are things that are there. On the left-hand side I have those indicators and for each national context there would be others that might be supplied as those nationwide, region wide measures of employability. In the middle of a compass held by the individual, what their own sense of social contribution and sustainable employability means for them. And concerned for it all to fit and be meaningful. In the light of that there are three articles from this review window that I would draw colleagues' attention to. So the first, if I may, it's Jackson and Wilton 2017 comparative study of perceived employability among undergraduates and their notions of career, self-management. So their sense of autonomy and alignment of their values. It was made between business school graduates in Australia and in the UK and a study that found students largely made career decisions that are reasonably congruent with their expectations and aligning with their values. So their career choice status varied with age, stage of study and perceived employability and the need for universities to equip students to take into themselves the apparatus of career management in a meaningful way and in a way that thinks highly about congruence and what I would find meaningful in transitions through career stages. Likewise from a French context, consider early career values and individual factors of objective career success in a large cohort of students from a French business school. So again, the inner and outer, those objective measures that these individuals have objective career success. But how does it come into dialogue with the inner and what do these individuals find meaningful? So these authors conducted a quantitative analysis, so the finding suggested that membership of the job market amongst these graduates, it was, where it was most aligned with individual values and self-concept and a sense of empowerment to be mobile within that market and seek out work that was increasingly and personally meaningful. There was, as you might expect, higher levels of satisfaction. Higher empowerment also to change setting and move through the labour market. And then thirdly, reports are quite chastening findings, on the outcomes for doctoral students when the inner and outer don't line up. So bringing it down very much to the level of an individual. And these authors ask us to think what happens in such a context as highly specialised doctoral study where a large cohort of students training largely in the hard sciences and specialist technological areas of expertise were finding the specialist knowledge they were acquiring was not translating into job roles. There was end decoupling happening at state level and reprofiling and repurposing. These authors ask us to ponder what happened to those individuals whose specialist subject knowledge and higher educational experience doesn't translate into the kind of role. So it's viewed as the third cycle and doctoral students are considered as early career researchers and it has all sorts of insights for undergraduate employability because of the sense of how far our individual findings on congruence. Between with what they have been invested in doing for their three or more years and then that role they go on to take up. So these authors take the idea down to the level of the individual rather than the organisation. What was I expecting to do and what was I expecting to gather up and take with me into the labour market. And did it happen and if it didn't happen a certain amount of psychological disintegration happens. While it's focused on 30 personal interviews with doctoral students. It shows a trend that's there in that area of measurement and measures of employability that's acknowledging the subjective measures. So on that note brings us on to some of the questions of differential access and employability opportunities I will hand over to my colleague Dr Shirley Shipman.

SHIRLEY: Thank you Roger and it's really great to be with you all and it's a joy to talk about some of the things we have been researching, so intentionally for the last few months. So a particular

area of interest for me has do with inequality of access to employability of enhancing activities but also to the labour market ultimately. It does tie into some of the things Andrea talked about as we go through the chat to you now. So what I want to do is explore this inequality of access through linking this to employer recruitment behaviour. So to take a different approach to this. But one point to know in the discussion in the literature are the predominant concerns we discovered, were barriers to employability enhance the activity and to the labour market for lower socioeconomic students. So the focus of my chat will be about lower socioeconomic students because that was the focus of the literature. So first of all to reflect on some ways in which employers act, it may seem obvious to say. But employers are the gate keepers to the labour market. So I want to talk about employer recruitment behaviour and impact or implications on particular students. Because unless we understand what employers are looking for we're not able to equip students to enter into the labour market. So at the time of our study the Finish employer study provided a twoyear window for students to find employment if they wanted to remain in Finland. However, they struggled to obtain work through the formal recruitment processes. The students had expended considerable effort in seeking employment through formal processes but ultimately most of the students found it through informal networks and through making contact to the employers. Many others had left. However, there was survey information that showed a low percentage of finish nationals also obtained through the processes. So that evidence was available beforehand, before the student were actually putting in so much effort to apply for jobs through the formal recruitment processes. Other studies highlight employers requirements for soft skills for example critical thinking. On the impact of employers recruitment practices on transnational students educated in Australia. But I want to pay attention to practices impacted on lower socioeconomic students. So one part of this study surveyed 100 of the largest graduate employers in the UK. And they found 40% of those employers were very unlikely or not at all likely to recruit students without relevant work experience. In a study in the US in 2021, found or confirmed in enter institutional placements are more often likely to lead to work with the placement employer than students own arranged placements. And just another, those points are about placements and work placements. But another finding in the hiring process employers maybe looking at technical skills, they may be looking at degree results but also they look at a cultural match between candidates and firms, and unfortunately this can lead to the exclusion of many bright students from lower socioeconomic background. So why is this important for us to know that the largest graduate employers 40% of them are unlikely to recruit students without work placement experience. Why is it important to know institutional placement lead to work with the placement employer than students own arranged placements? So I want to just look at a few points from the studies which lead us to consider this inequality of access for lower socioeconomic status students. So firstly a study found that students may lack career identity before they start their degrees, they have no idea what sort of professions they might engage with. And they lack knowledge about particular professions because no one in their own sphere operates in those professions. So they don't have access to find out about those careers and the types of careers they may enter. They also have less understanding of the role of particular forms of capital other than human capital. So human capital is what students gain through their subject knowledge and the skills they gain through their degrees. But they have less understanding of the roles of, the important roles of other forms of capital such as social capital and ability to use social networks. And were unaware of the importance of internships. But in order to obtain work experience as we see many employers are seeking, they also lack social and economic capital. So they lack awareness and knowledge of the need for work experience. They lack knowledge of particular professions. They lack socio and economic capital. So working class students struggle

to mobilise social and economic capital to obtain work experience. So they don't have the networks available to set up their own work experiences which may enable them to consider more about their future careers but also to develop understanding of the career they may want to join. That finding was also echoed the inability to mobilise social networks and financial capital to enable them to take time to engage with such opportunities. And additionally these students lack time because they may be working in paid employment along side their studies. And this again is a finding. Similarly students may understand the importance of extra curricular activity in engagement for future employment. So the way in which extra curricular opportunities may help them to develop particular skills or find out more about for example pro bono work and the sorts of opportunities that gives students to develop professional faces skills. And time for important voluntary work and Andrea was talking to us about that. Layman also found some working class students may come into university. So some don't have the understanding or knowledge of the professions they may want to enter or may not even think about particular careers because they don't have that knowledge. Where as some students who did join, for example students that might want to become doctors or lawyers Layman found these students over the course of their degree shifted their occupational goals. So they may have had higher and less aspirations start of the programme. Actually it was to do with the fact they were unable to access opportunities to gain experience within those professions or relevant work experiences. Just by way of contrast to show you the difference between these opportunities for lower socioeconomic status students and higher middle class students, research with students from different social classes and found with higher middle class students, they used work placements as a means of opportunity stacking, so they used their social capital and their social networks to gain work experience for internships. And they would add to those through the networking they made in those placements or utilising university resources to create opportunities for themselves and ultimately to access high status. Or elite internships which gained them valuable employment compared with students that didn't know they needed to take these opportunities. So just want to make a comment and add just one thought about the gender impact of employability and interventions. So a finding was that work placement in social science situation, students were far more likely to arrange their own work placements. So one of the important things coming out of Moss Pecs research was the inter institutional placements being those arranged by universities with employers. Rather than students arranging their own more often led to working with the employer. So more likely to be arranged by the students themselves than by the institutions then happens is, that actually indirectly has an impact on gender because there are more female or women social science students than men. So, how can we overcome this. There is clearly an issue with access to employability opportunities. I think in the literature review we refer to them in one of the sections as high impact measures, these measures where students if they take a work placement or undertake volunteering or engage with appropriate extracurricular activities enable students to breakthrough some of the barriers they might otherwise encounter. The first thing is awareness raising and career planning and support and the role of professional experts services is really valuable in liaising with employers. Work placements, the studies show institution involvement in promoting placement is really important. It's also important these types of placements are important for enabling students without that professional understanding and without the habits to develop professional habits of employer. When we were mentioning earlier that the hiring process is often a cultural match between candidates and the firms and therefore a best fit for the firm. Extracurricular activities making sure they are time bounded and that's just one example. I think it's probably time to hand over to Maïa, I left a whole raft of information out there. And obviously you can sift and read more about it in the review. But over to my colleague Maïa who you have already met. So I won't introduce her again.

MAÏA: Thank you Shirley. So I am going to close off the discussion of various themes by focusing on the theme that I worked on the most. And that I am particularly interested in. Which was critiquing and conceptualising employability. And it was obviously a tricky theme in the sense that we had to a little bit, push aside or contacts of emerging impacts and evaluations and broader horizons because this team was concentrated on the broader horizons mostly. So the criteria of what works didn't quite apply for this theme as it did for others. So the idea was to get an overall sense of the key concepts across all the criteria. And there were four themes or areas that I, that we thought were particularly significant in this theme. Which I have listed here. So the first marketisation and subject and value and capital of university life and employability remodeled. So I don't have time to go through each in detail. But just to maybe pinpoint a few things, marketisation being a key issue and more in terms of the higher education sector. So a lot of the concerns around the measuring and ranking and criteria used by universities and how they are using employability markers. And a lot of the studies from a range of approaches and contexts signaled a problem of inconsistency to some extent between the universities expectations, the reality of the job market, the employers, the students experience et cetera. And this linked to a key issue, the range of stakeholders concerned by this field and the way in which different study tried to bring in all stakeholders into the play of their analysis. But also sometimes tried to focus more on each of them and noted the significant differences between some of these stakeholders. So it's a concern in the UK and quite significant changes in the last ten years. So a big chunk of the literature. The way in which changes and concerns about employability affect students and how they relate themselves to others and thinking about the different stakeholders involved and students and graduates across the time Spain and some studies trying to look for at the longer term of the effects of this agenda. We can think of perform work of performability and a lot of analysis of the varied methodologies and ideas being used. I don't have enough time to go in detail but related to that the value and capital of university life and a lot of studies trying to open up how we understand the way students and graduates are affected by significant changes in the labour market and the financial crises being a key marker here historically about specific changes as well. So some interesting conceptual innovations and remodeling employability and thinking about some larger grand scale studies across various countries. And large quantity of data and surveys and to say something helpful and useful and provide some conceptual models to do so in the future. And broadly we found that there were some kind of two large range of approaches being used. Baseline approach to understand employability, but also being criticised and much elaborating on since due to the work especially of significantly Advance HE and their embedding employability framework. So human capital being a micro economic. Where as the embedding employability approach is more about broadening the types of capital that are evolving and being affected by this agenda and finally a growing and interesting range of critical approaches being developed. So we kind of noticed this across all themes obviously. And much more work could be done in trying to analyse this properly. But I guess this was a good starting point for us. And I just want to give this a bit of concrete meaning through looking at how some of these approaches and concepts apply to the particular area of career planning and support. So I mentioned something stakeholders earlier on and I mentioned something about whose job it to shape the agenda and I think it's important debate there in the literature. But, the debate on stakeholders illustrates it in a helpful way. So a lot of the literature acknowledges that career guidance expertise still remains valued and an important area to be leading employability initiatives. And interesting literature divided this between personal and individual attributes of career guidance. So for example the study here 2020 focused on 392 students in China. Focused more on, established the importance of career guidance, career support but also the way in which students had to develop personality traits and we saw

differences between career guidance in various different geographical context. Where North America focused on the structural factors of career guidance. So focusing on 433 students both in the UK and Australia and they are focusing on the context actual structural factors and talking about some of the inconsistencies and how to mitigate those in the future. And finally I guess as an interesting study 2020 looking at quite detailed 74 Pakistan universities and they are mentioning the problem of career guidance often being modeled on western or northern ideas of employability and the need to bring in more local, indigenous focus on employability and notions of life and work should also be shaping those ideas. So that's a way in which some of these different concepts and approaches come into play for specific area of employability. So I think I will leave it there and I give Andrea the floor for the last slide.

ANDREA: Thank you very much Maïa. So I just wanted to spent one minute flagging the data set as its own resource. So on the same web page there is the data set itself which is a large excel spreadsheet that includes the abstract key words and reference details for all 580 articles that's included in the literature review. It's organised in a domain and there is a back end formula sheet which is he can ignore and the impact sheet we have also included the national context that the studies took place in. There are different ways of searching the data. You might want to look for particular authors and key words and journal titles or you might want to look for abstract that contains a particular word or phrase and there are different ways to search the data base. You can use the standard excel box, you can highlight a column and use the find function and you can also sort and filter rows according to different criteria such as author name. And there is guidance on how to use the data set along side the data itself. So we're really pleased to share that resource with you and helps people to explore the signal shot of the current scholarship that bit further thank you.

MAÏA: Okay. That was the last part and we'll hand it back to Stuart and thank you for listening and please any questions that you have.

STUART: Thank you all for such a comprehensive and interesting webinar and the sense of richness and colour that you have added to the text is really, really helpful. And enjoyable and thank you for highlighting your data set because that's a phenomenal resource for researchers and students and Advance HE. We do have a few questions and I encourage any colleagues with further questions to drop them into the Q&A function and the authors listen answering some of these and we'll come back to one or two and get more context on those and share with the wider group well. The first question is just in terms of the different noted between levels. The question refers to level 6 and 7. Just conscious for the nations level 7 is part of undergrad. So any specific difference between undergraduates and postgraduates in terms of employability and literature.

ROGER: The level is not universal. So please colleague that posted the question come back if it doesn't ideas your query. It was interesting to find increasing attention paid to development of levels 7 postgraduate employability and in that example I gave, UK level 8. Work and academic environment and with as a result a more coaching and mentoring or orientation between the rapport between staff and students and the role of the supervisor is akin to being a work mentor

and looked at the commonalities in that relationship and the pedagogy in that role has all sorts of potential. You are empowering and inducting them into ways of working and perhaps setting up the conditions in which they succeed and empowering them to succeed. There is work on that and there is work on how far can you accommodate that same sense of work related elements and placements in level 7 which would tend to be shorter one year or 18 months programme of study rather than longer term three year study. Yes, I mentioned Tan and if colleagues do consult the data set or download the review and search on postgraduate and on mentoring there you can find a good deal there on those themes. I think we're back to you, Stuart.

STUART: Thank you Roger and just to remind colleagues, the need for the literature review itself to be focused around what works. So it's not to say there aren't other areas but there was a strict criteria that has to be applied. It doesn't mean it isn't there and that's something we encourage colleagues to take forward as well. In a similar vein there was a question asked whether there was any difference noticed in the literature available to ourselves between home and international students. If there was any differences that became apparent.

SHIRLEY: I think there was a section on transnational education and I think the studies we came across essentially divided between studies about the benefits of transnational education for students returning to their home country if you like. And the experiences of international students in terms of seeking employment within the labour markets of the country where they had gone to study. And the benefits for students who are studying overseas and returns to their home countries seem to be quite evidence in the studies. A significant demand in the workforce for individuals capable of thinking transnationally and demonstrate cultural awareness. So students who undertake transnational study and return to home countries benefit from the experience of cultural awareness and that's particularly the case where students have undertaken work placements within those countries. And often those students may return back to their home countries and if we look back to what Roger was saying about cognitive and congruence, there seems to be a benefit in studying abroad and maybe taking some work experiences there. Because the students then, some of the study show that the students come back and actually change their career paths as a result. Or change their course of study as a result which I found an interesting finding. But one study, I am just trying to find this, in Canada, there had been an understanding that students with overseas education are actually more entrepreneurial than home students in creating start ups. Which is also an interesting finding. And this study explored that, started from that premise and it did seem that students who returned home had a more entrepreneurial ability and were engaged in creating start ups. Bringing back entrepreneurial ability and international cultural awareness, the experiences of students studying overseas and then seeking work subsequent to their studies seems to be slightly more mixed. I also mentioned the study in Finland and how those students found it more difficult to access the labour market and to obtain careers within the country and many went home. There is another study, an Australian study who looked at employment outcomes of international students who graduated from Australia and these students were studying in nursing and accounting and engineering and hoped to pursue careers in nursing or accounting and engineering. But few students achieved those goals. So one of the things other than surveys and interviews with these students was to survey the employers and find out where they weren't recruiting the students. There was a skills shortage and a lack of labour, there was a recognised skills shortage in these areas but even though the employers were not recruiting the international

students. The employers selected based on grades and technical skills and work experience but they held the belief this could not be at the expense of the important soft skills and their ability to integrate into the organisation. So all of the firms mobilised a discourse but they wanted to recruit students who fitted with the culture of their organisation. And who had a western worker habitat. So the idea that the students would have critical thinking and independence and communication skills and good interpersonal relationships. Which may not have been such prized attributes for other international students. So while the studies developed the technical aptitudes, there was a perceived lack of employers in terms of the subskills. So the ways the students had been demonstrating them. Yeah, I think that's all I want to say on that. I don't know if any of my colleagues want to say any more.

MAÏA: Just a point in terms of career support and planning mentioned as well. Some of the studies raise the issue of international students. But try and be aware of the geographical cultural ethnic differences between ideas around that. So just a small point.

ANDREA: I would like to add a point. The point about the interesting correlation between transnational students and entrepreneurial intention does very much reflect the data with regards to transnational students having those kinds of attributes and behaviours that are typical to entrepreneur. Such as being more comfortable with risk and resilience. So some of the entrepreneurial behaviours and attributes but it study in 2019 looked at patterns in entrepreneurial behaviours across students. So that's an interesting one to look at and also just a side note. Shirley mentioned a couple of disciplines. So can you put out stuff related to particular disciplines. We tried to do that and trying to draw out which studies related to which discipline but so many of them were multidisciplinary because it became redundant because in almost every case we had to make a long list. It's just a reflection of what was in the material that the review covered.

SHIRLEY: Just to add to the comments I was making about the recruitment habits of the Australian employers and international students didn't have the western habitat and the critical think abilities. There is another study where students who had been educating by overseas institutions within Malaysia had developed those skills. So there are clearly ways in which personal attributes can change over the course of the degree. And maybe there was an issue with the way this the processes worked in terms of being able to identify some of these soft skills more easily that we could just factor into our planning and employability interventions.

STUART: Colleagues thank you. That's a fantastic level of detail in those answers there and really helpful to provide that context as well and it highlights just how international your literature review is. There are a number of success that are specific. Did you identify literature around X or Y. I will ask you if you can respond to some of those directly in the Q&A because they are more specific to individuals rather than the groups. Not to say they are any less but it's something that's helpful in terms of time. There is a question I would like to put it to you, Maïa and it's around your point around stakeholders leading the way and whether you see employers pushing universities into more effective and accessible employability planning or whether HEIs are reaching out more proactively to employers. Both or neither. So that's to you specifically Maïa.

MAÏA: Yeah, I have been reading that question and just thinking how best to answer it, it really raises the points about who should be driving this agenda and how? It's very difficult to answer for every context. So I would want to qualify my answer to specific cases. But I think generally and I hope my collaborators will come in if they have a different view on this but my sense on the work we have done on this is that it's very discipline specific. For example if we think of business schools, a lot of the literature on employability does emerge from business schools. And those will have a more connected link with employers and a two way relationship with employers. And an applied and vocational higher educational settings. And there was a few studies on sport as well bringing in perhaps more employers views into the frame and practices. It's going to depend on the discipline clearly. I think there is still, the sense from what I got anyway, this idea of even in key Australian universities are struggling to have a very organic and just in time relationship between employers and universities, so there are some inconsistencies. It's not necessarily all being thought through in parallel. So I think universities are trying to find new ways and different ways of bringing in employers or it's not just employers but perhaps practitioners, people who are in the resolving door of practice and education. And trying to find new ways of integrating those through work integrated learning and placements, et cetera. So that's the way these are happening more than a top led institution or arrangement. But as Shirley was saying, the problem is that reinforce a lot of the existing inequalities because until universities organise their placements we can't ensure students are coming into these with the same leveling of their own capital and their own access to particular networks through parents or families. So it's difficult because at the same time we want that level of equality opportunities, bringing in employers more into the governance of this is very problematic on many levels and the academic voice tend to be less represented but it's getting stronger in this field in many respects. And also what is questions about when we let employers drive and shape curricular. So it's a tricky one. So I hope that answers to some of your concerns and I was looking up some specific studies on this. So there are a number of studies on our section on embedded and nonembedded work that do surveys of employers and universities senior executives. So from 2017 looking more at the role of sport for employability and looking at survey of 5,837 graduates. So that's a study for you to look at. Focusing on different types of work experience and hopefully those are some directions for you to have a look at.

STUART: Maïa thank you so much and thank you all colleagues for taking the time to respond to a number of questions coming up in the chat. There is one last question, I can see Shirley is typing to respond to it. This is specifically around any best practice approaches or anything identified in the literature. I would like to roll it into a secondary type question which is around where there any other areas of near miss or case studies that didn't quite make it because of the bar that was set in terms of the literature but perhaps points towards it that you think either require further investigation or encourage colleagues to explore or search for. So whoever would like to take that question in both parts or individually.

ROGER: If I lead off there. I am conscious from some of our case studies there is a whole raft of material we're certain down the line with a bit more validation and peer review and aggregation of more data over time will be filtering into this peer review data set and will be contributing all sorts of aspects to the picture. So there are all sorts of innovative things going on around embedded and nonembedded and quite dynamic models of engaging and employability in the curriculum. In terms

of some of the specific examples, if I hand over to colleagues. Shirley was typing I thought. Maybe this was a different one.

SHIRLEY: It was a cop out. I was referring to the embedded nonembedded section in the literature review. I think the sections that I focused on if I am honest were not so much about innovation. But I do think if I can make a plug for Stuart and Roger's case studies, that does contain examples of innovation. They are really worth looking at and going forward we're going to need to be looking at, as Stuart and Roger mentioned the longitudinal study.

MAÏA: There is an interesting study and that was really another way of bringing students from the UK, South Africa and Belgium on line in a collaborative on line project of augmented learning focusing on one specific module and looking at the global aspects of these complex case scenarios and various resources. And they had students working together in teams across these different institutional context and it was a really fascinating study. This was before on line learning because of COVID and this was a really interesting study to be doing considering how far we have got with on line tools.

ROGER: One other would be heart 2019 looked into disciplinary study as a means of embedding employability. So bringing cohorts together and thinking outside disciplinary knowledge in terms of translational skills. I think that tip of the iceberg metaphor is where I both start and end. We're conscious of more practitioner studies out there and some reported in blogs. And we're concern and optimistic in time there is a lot of very creative and innovative practice that will start filtering into the peer review.

SHIRLEY: There is a couple of examples of use of assessment to link assessment and skills development but enabling students to articulate what they have been doing using self reflection as a practical assessment. So that's the application of knowledge to real life situation. So worth having a look at couple of those examples in the assessment section.

STUART: Colleagues, thank you so much. We're exactly at 8:30 British summer time! It leaves me to thank you all. Thank you for finding the time and thank you for your efforts, it's a major addition to the thematic area of employability and I think that's no mean feat. You have provided a comprehension narrative to the literature from 2016 to 2021 and it offers many avenues to explore and today shown a spotlight for a range of those areas. And linked to next year's symposium in the chat as well as a range of our other activities. I do have a form that's also gone into the chat which we'll ask colleagues to complete. This is part of our student success member benefit area work. There is a huge range of activity going on and I can just see that my colleague Ruth just shared that in the chat. We have a range of summits and the ultimate aim of this review is a catalyst to our update to our student success framework series. And employability being one thematic area and we have a range of summits coming up and look to future focus and areas of challenge, priorities, support et cetera. Which ultimately will lead to the update of the framework series. Employability doesn't sit alone and pointing to authentic assessment. So we'll continue to drive thought

Student Success: Employability in higher education

Podcast transcript

leadership as well as looking at demonstrable impact. Colleagues thank you so much, it's been absolutely fascinating and very enjoyable and looking forward to welcoming you back this afternoon for UK time. And thank you all. I wish you well and look forward to seeing you later. Thank you to everyone that could attend today. It leaves me to say goodbye. Thank you.



Contact us

General enquiries

+44 (0) 3300 416201
enquiries@advance-he.ac.uk
www.advance-he.ac.uk

Media enquiries

+44 (0) 1904 717500
communications@advance-he.ac.uk
www.advance-he.ac.uk/contact-us

   @AdvanceHE

Advance HE helps HE and research be the best they can be.

We are a member-led, sector-owned charity that works with institutions and higher education across the world to improve higher education for staff, students and society. We are experts in higher education with a particular focus on enhancing teaching and learning, effective governance, leadership development and tackling inequalities through our equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) work.

Our strategic goals to enhance confidence and trust in HE, address systemic inequalities and advance education to meet the evolving needs of students and society, support the work of our members and the HE sector. We deliver our support through professional development programmes and events, Fellowships, awards, student surveys and research, providing strategic change and consultancy services and through membership (including accreditation of teaching and learning, equality charters, knowledge and resources).

Advance HE is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales no. 04931031. Registered as a charity in England and Wales no. 1101607 Registered as a charity in Scotland no. SC043946. The Advance HE logo should not be used without our permission.

© 2021 Advance HE. All rights reserved.

The views expressed in this publication are those of the author and not necessarily those of Advance HE. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any storage and retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. Such permission will normally be granted for non-commercial, educational purposes provided that due acknowledgement is given.

To request copies of this report in large print or in a different format, please contact the Marketing and Communications Team at Advance HE:

+44 (0) 3300 416201 or publications@advance-he.ac.uk