



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Marketing graduate employability: understanding the tensions between institutional practice and external messaging*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/154600/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Divan, A, Knight, E, Bennett, D et al. (1 more author) (2019) Marketing graduate employability: understanding the tensions between institutional practice and external messaging. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 41 (5). pp. 485-499. ISSN 1360-080X

<https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080x.2019.1652427>

© 2019 Association for Tertiary Education Management and the LH Martin Institute for Tertiary Education Leadership and Management. This is an author produced version of an article published in *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Marketing graduate employability: Understanding the tensions between institutional practice and external messaging

Do the narratives of employability constructed by higher education institutions for marketing purposes differ from the conceptualisation and/or the realisation of employability within those institutions? The study reported here drew on interviews with 16 senior academic and student support staff who were tasked with developing student employability at one of nine institutions in Australia, Canada and the UK. We then compared the interview data with content analysis of the employability narratives on those institutions' websites. We employed Holmes' conceptions of employability as possessional, positional or processual to analyse how the interviewees conceptualised employability and the presentation of employability on the institutional websites. We found that most institutions' employability marketing narratives were inconsistent with the institutional practice reported by staff. We explain this tension in the context of two competing characterisations of higher education: a university-student transaction view; and a learning view. We emphasise the need for internal and external narratives to align and advocate the need for engagement in a constructive and critical dialogue involving all stakeholders.

Keywords: graduate outcomes, graduate employment, marketing, higher education, student experience

Background and context

Across the world, higher education systems are evolving in a way that aligns the economic prosperity of a country to the skills and knowledge its graduates attain from their university experience. This agenda, driven by government policy, is well-established in countries such as the United Kingdom (UK), North America and Australia, but it is also a topic of significant interest in many other parts of the world including Asia, Africa, and parts of Europe (Mok & Wu, 2016; Sin & Neave, 2016; Walker & Fongwa, 2017).

Policy makers make the logical assumption that the economic and societal value of higher education is amplified as more educated graduates transition into the workforce. Thus, policies have focussed on expanding higher education from an elite system that prepares a relatively small group of individuals to drive economic growth, towards a

massified system that promotes access to a larger number of individuals. These political and economic changes have had a considerable impact on how higher education institutions (described here as universities) define themselves and how they operate. On the one hand, universities are sources of intellectual enquiry, deep and critical thinking and production of new knowledge. On the other hand, they are under pressure to work in an increasingly marketised educational system in which they must compete for prospective students and prepare graduates with more economically relevant skills.

Against this backdrop, discussions of graduate employability have been dominated by a focus on human capital development, with both employers and governments emphasising the acquisition of skills that will enhance graduate-level employment and meet current and future challenges of industry (see Cole & Hallett, 2019). Universities have tended to respond by incorporating career development learning experiences designed to better prepare graduates for the workplace and so enhance graduate employment outcomes. These experiences take the form of both curricular and co-curricular opportunities, with a particular emphasis on work-integrated learning experiences (Clarke, 2018). However, the efficacy and impact of university initiatives on graduate outcomes are notoriously difficult to measure.

Measurement of graduate employment outcomes data is now common in many countries and it is variously linked with base funding. In the UK, for example, the Graduate Outcomes Survey records graduate employment 15 months after graduation (Higher Education Statistics Agency [HESA], 2017). Similar measures of employment outcomes are used in other countries, including in Australia, which employs a Graduate Outcomes Survey four months after graduation (Social Research Centre, 2018).

Although *employment* outcomes data can be relatively easily measured and can be easily communicated to external stakeholders (Spence, 2018), these data are unable to provide a sophisticated understanding of *employability* in terms of the “on-going processes of performance and activity and future processes of development and sustainability” (Tomlinson, 2017, p. 14). For this reason, they have been heavily criticised in the literature (see Bennett et al., 2015; Christie, 2017; Jackson & Bridgstock, 2018). We contend that a realistic measurement of employability should take into account individual characteristics, labour market demand and the ability of the graduate to navigate the labour market in the longer term. This broader conceptualisation of employability is supported by Holmes (2013, p. 259), who argues that graduates must

possess a set of skills and also “act in ways that lead others to ascribe to them the identity of a person worthy of being employed”.

Holmes (2013) emphasises the process by which graduate identity develops through industry interactions and through work that influences students’ sense of self and their ability to position themselves in the labour market; Holmes uses the term ‘processual’ to describe this iterative, process-oriented approach. The processual approach is in contrast with what Holmes describes as a ‘possessional’ approach to employability development, which focusses on the possession of skills, abilities or characteristics required for work. This fits with human capital theory that views higher education as imparting a set of marketable skills that increases graduates’ productivity and subsequently, their earnings in the employment market (Maringe, 2015). Holmes’ third orientation is a ‘positional’ approach, which highlights the role of social and cultural capital and how these advantage graduates transitioning into the labour market (Norton & Carroll, 2015). Universities which promote a positional approach to employability development tend to emphasise institutional reputation and the generation of employability capital through access to social and work-based networks (see hidden et al., 2017). The three approaches of Holmes are summarised below.

- Possessional: an emphasis on the acquisition of employability skills, attributes and capabilities;
- Positional: a focus on cultural and social capital as a means by which employment outcomes are enhanced; and
- Processual: employability development is described as a long-term process, with an emphasis on graduate identity that builds up through repeated exposure and interactions with learning and work-related activities.

However employability is defined and developed, future employment prospects are a key consideration when students decide where and what to study. United States-based research has identified the most important variables affecting higher education student choice as academic reputation, location, programme of study and employment opportunities or career enhancements (Kinzie et al., 2004; Moogan & Baron, 2003). Factors influencing student choice are similar in the UK (Diamond et al., 2012). As such, it is unsurprising that institutional marketing pays particular attention to graduate employment and the processes through which successful graduate outcomes are achieved.

Marketing, employability and student choice

When making enrolment decisions, university prospectuses and websites are widely consulted by prospective applicants. Oakleigh Consulting and Staffordshire University's (2010) survey of 1,942 UK university students, for example, found that 88.4 per cent of that university's students had used university prospectuses and websites when deciding what and where to study. Despite the importance of websites in conveying information to prospective applicants, however, little is known about the extent to which employability development is foregrounded in the marketing materials of institutions. Absent from the discourse is a comparison of internal constructions of employability, how these are enacted and realised by students, and how employability is represented to external audiences.

The research reported here extended two earlier studies. The first of these was conducted by Smith, Bell, Bennett and McAlpine (2018), who interviewed university staff engaged in employability development and highlighted the importance of using consistent employability language when communicating with stakeholders. In the second study, hidden et al. (2017) conducted a content analysis on the websites of 107 research-intensive universities and identified a prevalence of positional and possessional approaches.

The study combined and further interrogated the interview data and collected additional website data to ascertain the alignment of how employability is communicated to external audiences with how it is understood and enacted internally. Early quantitative exploration of the combined dataset (hidden et al., in press) revealed a dissonance between the internal and external constructions of employability. Using new insights from the qualitative data, for this article we explored how and why these inconsistencies might arise and we sought to highlight the consequences of misalignment in terms of curricular development and pedagogical approaches to employability. We end the article with recommendations to align internal and external employability narratives.

Methodological Approach

The study reported here combined earlier interview data with an expanded dataset of institutional website data to explore the alignment of internal and external employability narratives. To assure the participants' identity, institutions are referred to by country and

differentiated by a numbered code: for example, the three Australian institutions are identified as Australia 1, 2 or 3.

Analysis of interview data

Interview data were gathered by Smith, Bell, Bennett and McAlpine (2018), who conducted interviews with 16 academic and career development professionals from nine institutions in Australia, Canada and the UK. Smith et al. (2018) employed purposeful convenience sampling to identify potential participants, with invitations based on the participants' ability to provide a representative institutional view of employability in addition to broader social and theoretical issues relating to employability in the context of higher education.

To reduce bias inherent within convenience sampling methods, in most cases the participants in Smith et al.'s study were interviewed by, and interviews were conducted with, one or more participants from a different university located in another country. Interviews included senior learning and teaching academics and careers services leaders from each institution. All interview participants held leadership roles relating to institution-wide employability development and delivery (see Table 1). Permissions were obtained to re-mine the interview data for the study reported here.

Table 1 *Institutions and interview participants*

Institution	Academic leader (title)	Career Service leader (title)
Australia 1	Professor	Associate Director
Australia 2	N/A (no academic leader)	Head
Australia 3	Professor	Deputy Vice Chancellor
Canada 1	Vice President (Academic)	Head
Canada 2	Vice Provost (Teaching & Learning)	Director
Canada 3	Faculty Dean	Director
UK 1	N/A (no academic leader)	Director
UK 2	N/A (no academic leader)	Head
UK 3	Professor	Practitioner

For the current study, we probed the interview data resulting from three questions:

1. What is your institution's working definition of employability?
2. How does your institution promote an 'employability culture'?
3. What employability message do you give on the institution's website?

We first coded the interview data using Holmes' (2013) framework of approaches to employability development: possessional, positional and processual and researchers agreed on a coding frame which supported the differentiation of these approaches. The data were then coded independently by two members of the research team and the results compared. Where there were differences, consensus was reached through discussion.

Analysis of institutional websites

In order to understand how employability is messaged externally, we researched the website employability narratives at each interviewee's institution. We triangulated the interview responses by conducting a content analysis of the interviewees' institutional websites. For this, we utilised hidden et al.'s (2017) protocol for website analysis relating to employability and career development, adapted from Hite and Railsback (2010).

The following pages were searched for employability-related content.

- a. Home page;
- b. 'About' page on which the university was described;
- c. Pages for future students: for example, admissions, new/potential students, courses;
- d. Pages describing careers services/career development/student employment/workshops relating to employability;
- e. Pages describing the university mission and its vision statement; and
- f. Pages for current students: for example, student life, activities and/or organisations (hidden et al., 2017, p. 55).

As per Hite and Railsback (2010), pages two clicks away from the main page were also reviewed. The pages specified above were systematically viewed using the protocol and entered into a spreadsheet. The findings were then coded according to Holmes' (2013) framework of possessional, positional and processual approaches to employability using the same coding frame and protocol as for the interview data.

Finally, the two datasets were brought together and the alignment of Holmes' approaches was noted.

Results

Institutional narratives of employability: internal constructions

Here, we describe how the employability discourse is constructed in the three locations: Australia, Canada and the UK.

Australia

In our interview data, two institutions described their approach to employability in a manner that aligned with Holmes' (2013) processual approach:

... [a] strong focus on a student being aware of self and their professional and personal identity. (Australia 1 participant)

... pitched around preparation for lifelong and life-wide context. (Australia 3 participant)\

However, the websites of these institutions revealed that neither institution communicated a processual construction of employability. Instead, their focus was on institutional prestige, referring in particular to positional characteristics such as employer perceptions, graduate outcomes and university rankings: for example, 'top 1%' claims from the Australia 1 website and a 'top 100 in Law' headline from the Australia 3 website. Interviewees from the third Australian institution described an institutional approach to employability that aligned with Holmes' processual approach, emphasising skills development amongst students. This view was supported by information located on the institution's website:

... equip[ping] our students and graduates with the skills they'll need in an increasingly disrupted and challenged world. (Australia 2 website)

In addition to skills development, employment outcome statistics featured heavily on the Australia 2's website. From the interview comments, it appeared that there was a strategic

clarity in terms of the internal construction of employability and how they are presented externally:

...our University brand is for the real world, so there's quite a clear mandate in our marketing. (Australia 2 participant)

Interview participants across all three Australian institutions consistently highlighted the importance of differentiating between employability and graduate employment outcomes:

...I've been pushing hard that we need to stop mixing up the two terms. It's two different things: employment is an outcome and employability is a set of abilities, capabilities, skills that help an individual become both employed now: i.e., post-university, and ongoing, not just at one time. (Australia 3 participant)

The interviewees were aware that institutional website messaging tended to focus on graduate outcomes as opposed to employability development. One interview participant noted that even when a university mission was presented as 'preparing students for the real world', this often linked back to employment outcomes rather than employability development (Australia 1 participant). The interviewee from that institution bemoaned the inconsistency of internal and external employability messaging across the sector:

...I would say across Australia, maybe 20 per cent of the universities do that well: how we manage engagement and how we message that. (Australia 1 participant)

Australian participants emphasised that to manage engagement and present a coherent message about employability, a cross-institutional approach was required (Australia 3 participant) and that all stakeholders should be involved including students, staff involved in delivering and supporting employability, institutional leadership and marketing staff.

Canada

The interview data and website analysis from two of the Canadian institutions suggests that the employability agenda may be enacted differently in Canada than in Australia or the UK. Interview participants specifically highlighted that employability was 'a new concept' (Canada 1 participant) for higher education institutions, with one interviewee

noting that:

... employability is not a word that resonates I'd say, probably in most, if not possibly all, Canadian universities. (Canada 2 participant)

This finding was supported by our analysis of the websites in that there was no use of the term 'employability' on the pages searched using our methodology. Instead, the prominent discourse on all three Canadian websites related to students' career readiness. In two of the three institutions, there were indications on the websites of a sophisticated engagement with career development theory. For example, the Canada 1 website emphasised the importance of networking in graduate transitions and the Canada 3 website explicitly discussed the 'chaos theory of careers' (Pryor & Bright, 2003) on a webpage of the institution's career service. Although external messaging on websites related to career readiness, interviewees from Canada 1 and 2 described a possessional approach to employability development, focusing mainly on skills acquisition and career education. Institutional reputation and how reputation might support their graduates' transition into work was also highlighted on both websites, aligning with a positional approach (Holmes 2013). In contrast, a Canada 3 interview participant described a processual approach to employability development:

... for example, really emphasising this notion of using your time in university to explore, engage, participate. (Canada 3 participant)

This approach was supported through our analysis of Canada 3's website. Despite the consistency in internal and external constructions of employability for this institution, the interview participants viewed the marketing of any idea of employability to prospective students as a separate concern to that of the work of the institution in supporting its students to develop their employability.

UK

Interview participants from the UK universities were aware that graduate outcomes were presented on their institutional websites and that employability was an important part of marketing the university and its courses to prospective students:

...a lot of the marketing to our prospective students is framed around that employability agenda. (UK 1 participant)

The participants emphasised that it is a mandatory requirement in the UK to present Key Information Sets on university websites and that graduate outcomes data must be included in these Sets. Although all three UK institutions discussed graduate employment in a way that emphasised employability as a progressive concept, they employed marketing strategies which leveraged graduate employment as a key selling point. This can be seen in the following example.

...we want to support you in preparing for the world of work and make sure that you have the greatest possible chance of getting a job you want after graduating. (UK 3 participant)

Two divergent accounts about institutional understandings of employability were identified from the UK participants. UK 1 interviewees expressed fatigue with the idea of employability and focussed instead on immediate graduate outcomes and the associated (positional) importance of institutional reputation. The UK 1 website did not align with that view, presenting in contrast a possessional approach to employability with an emphasis on skills development:

...we encourage our students to be enterprising and innovative — key skills for all types of graduate employment. (UK 1 participant)

We noted a tension between the UK 1 interviewees' comments and those of their institution's website, reflected through comments such as:

... it's great for marketing but ... I have a different approach to employability because, you know, going to university is not just about getting you a job. (UK 1 participant)

In contrast, the website of the UK 2 institution presented Holmes' (2013) processual approach to employability, with skills being referenced in terms of cognition and the development of identity. UK 2's internal account was consistent with this and emphasised that the institution viewed employability as a collective responsibility:

... everybody plays their part in it ... from the VC (Vice Chancellor) and the Executive Board to the individual student. I think we view it as a continuous process. (UK 2 participant)

UK 2 staff went on to say that they perceived employability to be a continuous process and that this view was shared by the marketing department:

...it isn't a series of random interventions that needs to be part of the total student experience, and that's the test to really old model. (UK 2 participant)

In sum, the data from the UK interviews and website analysis indicate that the concept of employability has evolved and changed in response to different institutional contexts and their local needs.

Discussion

In this study, we first explored how employability is understood and enacted within institutions. We did this through interviews involving sixteen participants, all of them tasked with developing student employability. We compared these views with constructions of employability as they were presented to external stakeholders, including prospective students, through institutional websites.

Three key themes emerged from our analysis. First, there appear to be rich and diverse understandings and practises in relation to employability. These are evident within and across institutions and between geographical locations. Second, how employability is understood and enacted internally appears to vary considerably from its representation to external audiences. Although a developmental approach to employability is commonly practiced internally, external representations are often dominated by metrics relating to graduate outcomes and by rankings which highlight institutional prestige.

Our third point of note stems from participants' emphasis that consistent messaging is a crucial part of supporting employability. The most commonly cited reason for misalignment between external and internal representations was lack of communication between different operations of the university. We next discuss each of these points in turn, exploring the consequences of misalignment in terms of curriculum development and pedagogy for employability.

Internal narratives of employability development

Half the institutions involved in our study focussed on the acquisition of human capital (a possessional approach) when describing employability. However, broader definitions of employability also emerged. Three institutions emphasised the ability of graduates to transition successfully into the workforce together with the need for lifelong learning and the ability to sustain employability over the longer term (a processual approach).

The processual approach is more aligned with recent employability concepts expressed in the scholarly literature: for example, Bennett's (2019, p. 1) emphasis on a metacognitive, strengths-based view of employability: students' "cognitive and social development as capable and informed individuals, professionals and social citizens". Tomlinson (2017a) agrees, describing the process of developing five forms of crucial capital—human, social, cultural, identity and psychological capitals—and their impact on graduates' ability to transition into and through the labour market. The capitals view is certainly more in line with the traditional mission of higher education. However, the more pragmatic, *skills-based* view of employability is also gaining ground (see Clarke, 2018) and we return to the reasons for this later in the discussion.

We note the differences in how the employability agenda is expressed in Canadian institutions compared with UK and Australian institutions. Career development theory, for example, was an active discourse on the websites of the three Canadian institutions but it was absent from all UK and Australian institutional websites. This may be a consequence of how government policy interacts with higher education, including in its funding and reporting models. It might also be a matter of longevity: employability discourse in the UK and Australia has been ongoing since the early 1960s (see Robbins in the UK and Pullman in Australia, both 1963). The term 'employability' was also absent from the websites of Canadian institutions, with one participant highlighting that employability is 'not a word that resonates' (Canada 2 participant) in that context.

Although some interviewees described an institutional culture of employability development involving partnerships between academic and professional staff, students and senior management teams, this was rare. More commonly, institutional representatives described a fragmented relationship. Smith et al.'s study (2018) highlights the value of an institution-wide approach to employability in which all stakeholders work together. The ability of an institution-wide approach to promote meaningful engagement in employability development, however, is realised only when all university operations emphasise a 'learning view' of employability rather than a 'productivity and skills view'.

Whilst the learning view was prominent among interviewees' conceptualisations of employability, in no case was a learning view seen across an institution. Given the desire for such an approach, its absence serves to emphasise the challenges of working across operations to ensure that careers practitioners and academic staff work together, influencing not only how employability development is defined and practised—as “part of the student experience agenda” (AGCAS, 2018, p. 31)—but how it is communicated to internal and external audiences.

Do different internal and external constructions of employability matter?

We assert that the misalignment of internal and external constructions of employability matters considerably. There exist two competing constructions of employability within higher education: a university-student transaction view; and a learning view. In terms of providing students with realistic expectations of study and an understanding of their role and responsibility within this, the two views carry conflicting messages which at best misinform and at worst mislead potential and current students.

In the vast majority of cases, our study data revealed that employability constructions were inconsistent between the institutional practice reported by senior university staff and the skills-based employability narratives presented on institutional websites. Some participants attributed these differences to lack of communication between different operations of the university: for example, between marketing, learning and teaching and the careers service.

Interviewees pointed out the importance of aligning internal and external constructions of employability. They also emphasised that if employability is to be understood and effectively operationalised, its definition and the communication of that definition must involve all institutional stakeholders:

... marketing need[s] to be at [the] table, future students need to be at the table, so our message gets out to the community—future students, current students and employers. (Australia 1 participant)

Our previous analysis of institutional websites (hidden et al., in press) found that 50% of institutions utilised a positional approach to employability on their websites, emphasising both employment outcomes and institutional prestige through university rankings and

achievements. Given that potential students are influenced by the strength of an institution's employment and career enhancement opportunities (see Diamond et al., 2012), it is not surprising that these feature heavily on institutional websites. Our interview participants agreed that institutional websites are a crucial point of information for potential students, with one interviewee describing potential students as the 'number one audience' (Australia 3 participant) for which the website had been designed. Indeed, a visit to the homepage of a university or faculty is for many students their first 'campus visit' (Opoku et al., 2006).

The inclusion on institutional websites of employment and related data, however, also reflects the marketisation of higher education (Tomlinson, 2018). As marketisation continues, the "teaching and research activities of academics are increasingly measured and scrutinised, the contemporary academy appears to be suffused with anxiety" (Loveday, 2016, p. 154), and the fate of teaching-focussed academics within a research-based funding model is increasingly uncertain (Bennett, Roberts, Ananthram, & Broughton, 2018). Declines in public funding and increased competition for fee-paying students have placed institutions under increasing pressure to demonstrate their value to students. As such, websites increasingly market to potential students both the likely (or the ideal) outcomes of their studies and the quality of the education they can expect to receive.

Metrics which claim to demonstrate teaching quality are perhaps best evidenced in the UK example, where the Teaching Excellence Framework (DBIS, 2016) was designed in part to inform student choice. The UK is among many countries to employ multiple graduate data instruments as proxy indicators of quality. Authors such as Jackson and Bridgstock (2018), Muller (2018) and Spence (2018) have argued strongly against the excessive use of metrics in making judgments about the quality of higher education, maintaining that such metrics can lead to narrower student experiences rather than the higher standards, quality and choice that such data is intended to foster. In the context of employability, institutions conscious of metrics may, for example, funnel students towards employment and direct them away from potentially life-enhancing activities such as a post-graduate gap year.

In line with arguments such as these, our interviewees were consistent in their view that institutions must not conflate employability with employment outcomes data. A persistent challenge in this regard is that students' understanding of employability tends to be limited to a narrow view which emphasises short-term graduate employability goals

together with credentials such as degree and grade point average (see Gedye & Beaumont, 2017). Students are also displaying increasingly consumer-orientated attitudes to higher education in that they are more concerned about getting financial value from their higher education studies (Tomlinson, 2017b).

Ironically, a positional approach to employability, characterised by rankings, achievements and graduate outcomes, may speak to the expectations and behaviours of prospective applicants and so be effective in enhancing student recruitment. However, these approaches are at odds with the equity agenda of higher education. As Holmes (2013) asserts, people from privileged backgrounds are advantaged in the labour market because they can use their social and cultural capital to secure work (see also Norton & Carroll, 2015). The most advantaged groups continue to dominate attendance at the most prestigious institutions and this selective advantage can be further reinforced by employers who recruit from prestigious universities, often due to alumni connections (Holmes, 2013; Tomlinson, 2012). These factors suggest that the positional approach exacerbates inequality in the graduate labour market, as evidenced by Pitman et al. (2019) and Tholen (2015).

Our contention that it is important to have consistency between internal and external narratives is substantiated through the interview data. Interviewees, who were all senior university staff involved in the design and delivery of employability, emphasised the need for consistent employability narratives and the need for all stakeholders, including marketing, to engage in constructive and critical dialogue about how employability might be constructed and developed.

We end our discussion with an example from Thornton and Shannon's (2014, p. 158) study of employability narratives in the discipline of law. Thornton and Shannon highlight that a student who undertakes a law degree is promised employability, prestige and wealth. Consequently, the serious and difficult aspects of studying law are overlooked. As Nixon et al. (2011) assert, good marketing should work hard to eliminate content that induces 'dissonance and angst'. If the higher education sector is to avoid dissatisfied students whilst developing "more complex and sophisticated expectations of university and of their [students'] own roles and responsibilities" (James, 2002, p. 81), the alignment of marketing narratives and institutional practice should lie at the core of the sector's activities.

Conclusion

We begin by acknowledging the limitations of the study. First, although the interview study involved participants who were selected for their ability to give a representative view of employability within both their institutions and their geographic regions, the study was limited to a small sample of institutions and geographical locations. Differences across regional and institutional statuses might emerge with a larger and more geographically diverse sample. Second, we analysed external institutional positioning using only the institutional website. A more comprehensive analysis that includes other modes of communication might yield a more nuanced picture of institutional employability narratives. Finally, we note the absence of the student voice in this study. Research that incorporates the student voice in discussions about employment metrics, consumer-led marketing and employability development is lacking and should be explored.

In this article, we investigated how institutional employability discourse and practice compares with the employability discourse communicated to prospective students via institutional websites. Internal constructions of employability included conceptualisation at a sophisticated level in terms of developing social, personal and academic capitals, and at a functional level in terms of the skills and capabilities required to navigate the graduate labour market. External representations of employability were dominated by a focus on graduate employment metrics and data as opposed to descriptions of employability practice experienced and realised by students internally.

The misalignment between internal and external representations could be attributed to two competing characterisations of higher education. As government interventions increasingly direct the higher education sector along market lines, universities recruit students in an environment of intense competition. To do this, they take a transactional view to “sell their courses” (Askehave, 2007, p. 725) by marketing to students economic gains in terms of high employment prospects following completion of their studies. In contrast, internal constructions of employability are based on a learning view in which each student is more a “young person ‘in formation’, or the ‘citizen-specialist’ in training, than the burgeoning *homo economicus*” (Lyndsay, 2014, p. 147).

We assert that this tension can be productive if it provides an impetus for active and critical dialogue involving all stakeholders (for example, policy-makers, institutions, industry, students, and alumni) about the economic and social purposes of higher education learning, and the means of achieving these. In the current environment,

however, students are caught up in discourses of skill, employability, employment, attributes and performance, directed by market mechanisms used by governments to reshape higher education and to encourage and inform student choice.

Since institutional strategies are influenced by such interventions, a constructive dialogue is required at the level of policy-making to ensure that the inherent social values of higher education are protected and that the excesses of marketisation are resisted. This could, in turn, reduce the incongruence between external and internal representations of employability and lead to more coherent, institution-wide employability strategies that include accurate and realistic marketing of courses to prospective applicants.

Institution-wide strategic development is of critical importance in the development of practices which support individual employability development because discursive positioning helps to resource individuals with context-specific modes of self-identification and behaviour (Tomlinson, 2017b). As noted by one UK interview participant, employability development “isn’t a series of random interventions... [it] needs to be part of the total student experience” (UK 2). By providing accurate representations of student experience, and what they will get from attending university, the expectations and responsibilities of each partner will be better understood. Not only would this lead to prospective applicants becoming better informed in their selection of a university, it would enhance student engagement and satisfaction.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge Graduate Careers Australia, whose support made possible the Smith et al. (2018) study titled *Employability in a global context: Evolving policy and practice in employability, work integrated learning, and career development learning*. We would also like to thank the senior leaders who gave generously of their time and expertise. Finally, we would like to thank Joy Higgs, Will Letts and Geoff Crisp for permission to reproduce early findings from our work, which will appear in their 2019 edited volume titled *Education for employability (vol II): Learning for future possibilities*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Brill-Sense Publishers.

References

- Askehave, I. (2007). The impact of marketization on higher education genres: The international student prospectus as a case in point. *Discourse Studies*, 9(6), 723–742. doi: 10.1177/1461445607082576.
- Association of Graduate Careers Advisory Services (AGCAS). (2018). *AGCAS HE careers services survey 2018*. Sheffield: AGCAS.
- Bennett, D. (2019). Meeting society's expectations of graduates: Education for the public good. In J. Higgs, G. Crisp, & W. Letts (Eds.), *Education for employability 1: Learning for future possibilities* (forthcoming). Rotterdam: Brill | Sense.
- Bennett, D., Coates, H., MacKinnon, P., Poronnik, P., Richardson, S., Schmidt, L., & Mahat, M. (2015, July). [Navigating uncertainty and complexity: Higher education and the dilemma of employability](#). In *Research and development in higher education: Learning for life and work in a complex world* (pp. 1-10). 38th Higher Education Research and Development Conference, Melbourne.
- Bennett, D., Knight, E., Divan, A., & Bell, K. (In press). (2019). Marketing graduate employability: The language of employability In higher education. In J. Higgs, G. Crisp, & W. Letts (Eds.), *Education for employability 1: Learning for future possibilities* (forthcoming). Rotterdam: Brill | Sense.
- Bennett, D., Knight, E., Divan, A., Kuchel, L., Horn, J., van Reyk, D., & da Silva, K. B. (2017). How do research-intensive universities portray employability strategies? A review of their websites. *Australian Journal of Career Development*, 26(2), 52–61. doi: 10.1177/1038416217714475.
- Bennett, D., Roberts, L., Ananthram, S., & Broughton, M. (2018). [What is required to develop career pathways for teaching academics?](#) *Higher Education*, 75(2), 271–286.
- Christie, F. (2017). The reporting of university league table employability rankings: A critical review. *Journal of Education and Work*, 30(4), 403–418. doi: 10.1080/13639080.2016.1224821.
- Clarke, M. (2018). Rethinking graduate employability: The role of capital, individual attributes and context. *Studies in Higher Education*, 43(11), 1923–1937. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2017.1294152.
- Cole, D., & Hallet, R. (2019). Language of employability. In J. Higgs, G. Crisp, & W. Letts (Eds.), *Education for employability 1: Learning for future possibilities* (forthcoming). Rotterdam: Brill | Sense.

- Diamond, A., Vorley, T., Roberts, J., & Jones, S. (2012). *Behavioural approaches to understanding student choice*. York: Higher Education Academy. Retrieved from https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/resources/student_choice.pdf.
- Gedye, S., & Beaumont, E. (2018). “The ability to get a job”: Student understandings and definitions of employability. *Education + Training*, 60(5), 406–420. doi: 10.1108/ET-10-2017-0159.
- Graduate Careers Australia. (2019). *Graduate Outcomes Survey*. Retrieved from <https://www.srcentre.com.au/our-research/graduate-outcomes-survey>
- Higher Education Statistics Agency. (2017). *NewDLHE: the future of graduate outcomes data. A synthesis*. Cheltenham: Higher Education Statistics Agency.
- Hite, N. G., & Railsback, B. (2010). Analysis of the content and characteristics of university websites with implications for web designers and educators. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 51(1), 107–113. doi: 10.1080/08874417.2010.11645455.
- Holmes, L. (2013). Competing perspectives on graduate employability: Possession, position or process? *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(4), 538–554. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2011.587140.
- Jackson, D & Bridgstock, R. (2018). Evidencing student success and graduate employability in the contemporary world-of-work: renewing our thinking. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 37(5), 984-998.
- James, R. (2002). Students’ changing expectations of higher education and the consequences of mismatches with reality. In P. Coaldrake & L. Stedman (Eds.), *Responding to student expectations* (pp. 71–83). Paris: OECD.
- Kinzie, J., Palmer, M., Hayek, J., Hossler, D., Jacob, S. A., & Cummings, H. (2004). *Fifty years of college choice: Social, political and institutional influences on the decision-making process*. Indianapolis: Lumina Foundation. Retrieved from <https://www.luminafoundation.org/files/publications/Hossler.pdf>.
- Loveday, V. (2018). *The neurotic academic: Anxiety, casualisation, and governance in the neoliberalising university*. *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 11(2), 154–166. doi:10.1080/17530350.2018.1426032
- Maringe, F. (2015) Higher Education Market. In J.D. Wright (ed.). *International Encyclopaedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences*. (pp. 850–861). Elsevier.

- Mok, K. H., & Wu, A. M. (2016). Higher Education, changing labour market and social mobility in the era of massification in China. *Journal of Education and Work*, 29(1), 77–97.
- Moogan, Y. J., & Baron, S. (2003). An analysis of student characteristics within the student decision making process. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 27(3), 271–287. doi: 10.1080/0309877032000098699.
- Muller, N. Z. (2018). *The tyranny of metrics*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Nixon, E., Scullin, R., & Molesworth, M. (2011). How choice in higher education can create conservative learners. In M. Molesworth, R. Scullion, & E. Nixon (Eds.), *The marketisation of higher education and the student as consumer* (pp. 196–208). New York: Routledge.
- Norton, A., & Carroll, D. (2015, August 26). How does your choice of university affect your future? *The Conversation*. Retrieved from <http://theconversation.com/how-does-your-choice-of-university-affect-yourfuture-45699>.
- Oakleigh Consulting and Staffordshire University. (2010). *Understanding the information needs of users of public information about higher education*. United Kingdom: Higher Education Funding Council for England. Retrieved from https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/1994/1/rd12_10b.pdf.
- Opoku, R., Abratt, R., & Pitt, L. (2006). Communicating brand personality: are the websites doing the talking for the top South African business schools? *Brand Management*, 14, 20–39. doi: 10.1057/palgrave.bm.2550052.
- Pitman, T., Roberts, L., Bennett, D., & Richardson. (2019). An Australian study of graduate outcomes for disadvantaged students. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 43(1), 45–57. doi: 10.1080/0309877X.2017.1349895.
- Pryor, R. G. L., & Bright, J. (2003). The Chaos Theory of Careers. *Australian Journal of Career Development*, 12(3), 12–20. doi: 10.1177/103841620301200304.
- Pullman, W. A. (1963). Instrumentation in mechanical engineering laboratories. *Education + Training*, 5(8), 371–371. doi: 10.1108/eb015325.
- Robbins, L. (1963). The Robbins report. London. Her Majesty's Stationary Office.
- Sin, C., & Neave, G. (2016). Employability deconstructed: perceptions of stakeholders. *Studies in Higher Education*, 41(8), 1447–1462.
- Smith, M., Bell, K., Bennett, D., & McAlpine, A. (2018). *Employability in a global context: Evolving policy and practice in employability, work integrated learning, and*

- career development learning*. Wollongong, Australia: Graduate Careers Australia. doi: 10.6084/m9.figshare.6372506.
- Spence, C. (2018). 'Judgement' versus metrics in higher education management. *Higher Education*, doi: [10.1007/s10734-018-0300-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-018-0300-z).
- Tholen, G. (2015). What can research into graduate employability tell us about agency and structure? *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 36(5), 766–784. doi: 10.1080/01425692.2013.847782.
- Thornton, M., & Shannon, L. (2014). 'Selling the dream': Law school branding and the illusion of choice. In M. Thornton (Ed.), *Through a glass darkly: The social sciences look at the neoliberal university* (pp. 157–177). Canberra, Australia: Australian National University Press.
- Tomlinson, M. (2018). Conceptions of the value of higher education in a measured market. *Higher Education*, 75(4), 711–727. doi: 10.1007/s10734-017-0165-6.
- Tomlinson, M. (2017). Introduction: graduate employability in context: Charting a complex, contested and multi-faceted policy and research field. In Tomlinson, M., & Holmes, L. (Eds). *Graduate employability in context: Theory, research and debate* (pp. 1–40). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tomlinson, M. (2017a). Forms of graduate capital and their relationship to graduate employability. *Education + Training*, 59(4), 338–352. doi: 10.1108/ET-05-2016-0090.
- Tomlinson, M. (2017b). Student perceptions of themselves as 'consumers' of higher education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 38(4), 450–467. doi: 10.1080/01425692.2015.1113856.
- Tomlinson, M. (2012). Graduate employability: A review of conceptual and empirical themes. *Higher Education Policy*, 25(4), 407–431. doi: 10.1057/hep.2011.26.
- Walker, M., & Fongwa, S. (2017). *Universities, employability and human development*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Marketing graduate employability: Understanding the tensions between institutional practice and external messaging

Do the narratives of employability constructed by higher education institutions for marketing purposes differ from the conceptualisation and/or the realisation of employability within those institutions? The study reported here drew on interviews with 16 senior academic and student support staff who were tasked with developing student employability at one of nine institutions in Australia, Canada and the UK. We then compared the interview data with content analysis of the employability narratives on those institutions' websites. We employed Holmes' conceptions of employability as possessional, positional or processual to analyse how the interviewees conceptualised employability and the presentation of employability on the institutional websites. We found that most institutions' employability marketing narratives were inconsistent with the institutional practice reported by staff. We explain this tension in the context of two competing characterisations of higher education: a university-student transaction view; and a learning view. We emphasise the need for internal and external narratives to align and advocate the need for engagement in a constructive and critical dialogue involving all stakeholders.

Keywords: graduate outcomes, graduate employment, marketing, higher education, student experience

Background and context

Across the world, higher education systems are evolving in a way that aligns the economic prosperity of a country to the skills and knowledge its graduates attain from their university experience. This agenda, driven by government policy, is well-established in countries such as the United Kingdom (UK), North America and Australia, but it is also a topic of significant interest in many other parts of the world including Asia, Africa, and parts of Europe (Mok & Wu, 2016; Sin & Neave, 2016; Walker & Fongwa, 2017).

Policy makers make the logical assumption that the economic and societal value of higher education is amplified as more educated graduates transition into the workforce. Thus, policies have focussed on expanding higher education from an elite system that prepares a relatively small group of individuals to drive economic growth, towards a

1 massified system that promotes access to a larger number of individuals. These political
2 and economic changes have had a considerable impact on how higher education
3 institutions (described here as universities) define themselves and how they operate. On
4 the one hand, universities are sources of intellectual enquiry, deep and critical thinking
5 and production of new knowledge. On the other hand, they are under pressure to work in
6 an increasingly marketised educational system in which they must compete for
7 prospective students and prepare graduates with more economically relevant skills.
8
9

10
11
12 Against this backdrop, discussions of graduate employability have been
13 dominated by a focus on human capital development, with both employers and
14 governments emphasising the acquisition of skills that will enhance graduate-level
15 employment and meet current and future challenges of industry (see Cole & Hallett,
16 2019). Universities have tended to respond by incorporating career development learning
17 experiences designed to better prepare graduates for the workplace and so enhance
18 graduate employment outcomes. These experiences take the form of both curricular and
19 co-curricular opportunities, with a particular emphasis on work-integrated learning
20 experiences (Clarke, 2018). However, the efficacy and impact of university initiatives on
21 graduate outcomes are notoriously difficult to measure.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Measurement of graduate employment outcomes data is now common in many
32 countries and it is variously linked with base funding. In the UK, for example, the
33 Graduate Outcomes Survey records graduate employment 15 months after graduation
34 (Higher Education Statistics Agency [HESA], 2017). Similar measures of employment
35 outcomes are used in other countries, including in Australia, which employs a Graduate
36 Outcomes Survey four months after graduation (Social Research Centre, 2018).
37
38
39
40
41

42 Although *employment* outcomes data can be relatively easily measured and can
43 be easily communicated to external stakeholders (Spence, 2018), these data are unable to
44 provide a sophisticated understanding of *employability* in terms of the “on-going
45 processes of performance and activity and future processes of development and
46 sustainability” (Tomlinson, 2017, p. 14). For this reason, they have been heavily criticised
47 in the literature (see Bennett et al., 2015; Christie, 2017; Jackson & Bridgstock, 2018).
48 We contend that a realistic measurement of employability should take into account
49 individual characteristics, labour market demand and the ability of the graduate to
50 navigate the labour market in the longer term. This broader conceptualisation of
51 employability is supported by Holmes (2013, p. 259), who argues that graduates must
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 possess a set of skills and also “act in ways that lead others to ascribe to them the identity
2 of a person worthy of being employed”.

3
4 Holmes (2013) emphasises the process by which graduate identity develops
5 through industry interactions and through work that influences students’ sense of self and
6 their ability to position themselves in the labour market; Holmes uses the term
7 ‘processual’ to describe this iterative, process-oriented approach. The processual
8 approach is in contrast with what Holmes describes as a ‘possessional’ approach to
9 employability development, which focusses on the possession of skills, abilities or
10 characteristics required for work. This fits with human capital theory that views higher
11 education as imparting a set of marketable skills that increases graduates’ productivity
12 and subsequently, their earnings in the employment market (Maringe, 2015). Holmes’
13 third orientation is a ‘positional’ approach, which highlights the role of social and cultural
14 capital and how these advantage graduates transitioning into the labour market (Norton
15 & Carroll, 2015). Universities which promote a positional approach to employability
16 development tend to emphasise institutional reputation and the generation of
17 employability capital through access to social and work-based networks (see Bennett et
18 al., 2017). The three approaches of Holmes are summarised below.

- 19 • Possessional: an emphasis on the acquisition of employability skills, attributes
20 and capabilities;
- 21 • Positional: a focus on cultural and social capital as a means by which employment
22 outcomes are enhanced; and
- 23 • Processual: employability development is described as a long-term process, with
24 an emphasis on graduate identity that builds up through repeated exposure and
25 interactions with learning and work-related activities.

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

However employability is defined and developed, future employment prospects are a key consideration when students decide where and what to study. United States-based research has identified the most important variables affecting higher education student choice as academic reputation, location, programme of study and employment opportunities or career enhancements (Kinzie et al., 2004; Moogan & Baron, 2003). Factors influencing student choice are similar in the UK (Diamond et al., 2012). As such, it is unsurprising that institutional marketing pays particular attention to graduate employment and the processes through which successful graduate outcomes are achieved.

Marketing, employability and student choice

1
2 When making enrolment decisions, university prospectuses and websites are widely
3 consulted by prospective applicants. Oakleigh Consulting and Staffordshire University's
4 (2010) survey of 1,942 UK university students, for example, found that 88.4 per cent of
5 that university's students had used university prospectuses and websites when deciding
6 what and where to study. Despite the importance of websites in conveying information to
7 prospective applicants, however, little is known about the extent to which employability
8 development is foregrounded in the marketing materials of institutions. Absent from the
9 discourse is a comparison of internal constructions of employability, how these are
10 enacted and realised by students, and how employability is represented to external
11 audiences.

12
13 The research reported here extended two earlier studies. The first of these was
14 conducted by Smith, Bell, Bennett and McAlpine (2018), who interviewed university
15 staff engaged in employability development and highlighted the importance of using
16 consistent employability language when communicating with stakeholders. In the second
17 study, Bennett et al. (2017) conducted a content analysis on the websites of 107 research-
18 intensive universities and identified a prevalence of positional and possessional
19 approaches.

20
21 The study combined and further interrogated the interview data and collected
22 additional website data to ascertain the alignment of how employability is communicated
23 to external audiences with how it is understood and enacted internally. Early quantitative
24 exploration of the combined dataset (Bennett, Knight, Divan, & Bell, in press) revealed
25 a dissonance between the internal and external constructions of employability. Using new
26 insights from the qualitative data, for this article we explored how and why these
27 inconsistencies might arise and we sought to highlight the consequences of misalignment
28 in terms of curricular development and pedagogical approaches to employability. We end
29 the article with recommendations to align internal and external employability narratives.

Methodological Approach

30
31 The study reported here combined earlier interview data with an expanded dataset of
32 institutional website data to explore the alignment of internal and external employability
33 narratives. To assure the participants' identity, institutions are referred to by country and

1 differentiated by a numbered code: for example, the three Australian institutions are
2 identified as Australia 1, 2 or 3.
3
4

5 *Analysis of interview data* 6

7 Interview data were gathered by Smith, Bell, Bennett and McAlpine (2018), who
8 conducted interviews with 16 academic and career development professionals from nine
9 institutions in Australia, Canada and the UK. Smith et al. (2018) employed purposeful
10 convenience sampling to identify potential participants, with invitations based on the
11 participants' ability to provide a representative institutional view of employability in
12 addition to broader social and theoretical issues relating to employability in the context
13 of higher education.
14
15
16
17
18

19 To reduce bias inherent within convenience sampling methods, in most cases the
20 participants in Smith et al.'s study were interviewed by, and interviews were conducted
21 with, one or more participants from a different university located in another country.
22 Interviews included senior learning and teaching academics and careers services leaders
23 from each institution. All interview participants held leadership roles relating to
24 institution-wide employability development and delivery (see Table 1). Permissions were
25 obtained to re-mine the interview data for the study reported here.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Table 1 *Institutions and interview participants*
35

Institution	Academic leader (title)	Career Service leader (title)
Australia 1	Professor	Associate Director
Australia 2	N/A (no academic leader)	Head
Australia 3	Professor	Deputy Vice Chancellor
Canada 1	Vice President (Academic)	Head
Canada 2	Vice Provost (Teaching & Learning)	Director
Canada 3	Faculty Dean	Director
UK 1	N/A (no academic leader)	Director
UK 2	N/A (no academic leader)	Head
UK 3	Professor	Practitioner

56
57
58 For the current study, we probed the interview data resulting from three questions:
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1. What is your institution's working definition of employability?
2. How does your institution promote an 'employability culture'?
3. What employability message do you give on the institution's website?

We first coded the interview data using Holmes' (2013) framework of approaches to employability development: possessional, positional and processual and researchers agreed on a coding frame which supported the differentiation of these approaches. The data were then coded independently by two members of the research team and the results compared. Where there were differences, consensus was reached through discussion.

Analysis of institutional websites

In order to understand how employability is messaged externally, we researched the website employability narratives at each interviewee's institution. We triangulated the interview responses by conducting a content analysis of the interviewees' institutional websites. For this, we utilised Bennett et al.'s (2017) protocol for website analysis relating to employability and career development, adapted from Hite and Railsback (2010).

The following pages were searched for employability-related content.

- a. Home page;
- b. 'About' page on which the university was described;
- c. Pages for future students: for example, admissions, new/potential students, courses;
- d. Pages describing careers services/career development/student employment/workshops relating to employability;
- e. Pages describing the university mission and its vision statement; and
- f. Pages for current students: for example, student life, activities and/or organisations (Bennett et al., 2017, p. 55).

As per Hite and Railsback (2010), pages two clicks away from the main page were also reviewed. The pages specified above were systematically viewed using the protocol and entered into a spreadsheet. The findings were then coded according to Holmes' (2013) framework of possessional, positional and processual approaches to employability using the same coding frame and protocol as for the interview data.

1
2 Finally, the two datasets were brought together and the alignment of Holmes'
3 approaches was noted.
4
5

6 7 **Results**

8 9 10 *Institutional narratives of employability: internal constructions*

11
12 Here, we describe how the employability discourse is constructed in the three locations:
13 Australia, Canada and the UK.
14
15

16 17 *Australia*

18
19 In our interview data, two institutions described their approach to employability in a
20 manner that aligned with Holmes' (2013) processual approach:
21
22

23
24 ... [a] strong focus on a student being aware of self and their professional and
25 personal identity. (Australia 1 participant)
26
27

28
29 ... pitched around preparation for lifelong and life-wide context. (Australia 3
30 participant)\
31
32

33
34 However, the websites of these institutions revealed that neither institution communicated
35 a processual construction of employability. Instead, their focus was on institutional
36 prestige, referring in particular to positional characteristics such as employer perceptions,
37 graduate outcomes and university rankings: for example, 'top 1%' claims from the
38 Australia 1 website and a 'top 100 in Law' headline from the Australia 3 website.
39 Interviewees from the third Australian institution described an institutional approach to
40 employability that aligned with Holmes' processual approach, emphasising skills
41 development amongst students. This view was supported by information located on the
42 institution's website:
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 ... equip[ping] our students and graduates with the skills they'll need in an
53 increasingly disrupted and challenged world. (Australia 2 website)
54
55

56
57 In addition to skills development, employment outcome statistics featured heavily on the
58 Australia 2's website. From the interview comments, it appeared that there was a strategic
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 clarity in terms of the internal construction of employability and how they are presented
2 externally:

3
4
5 ...our University brand is for the real world, so there's quite a clear mandate in our
6 marketing. (Australia 2 participant)
7
8
9

10 Interview participants across all three Australian institutions consistently highlighted the
11 importance of differentiating between employability and graduate employment
12 outcomes:
13
14

15
16 ...I've been pushing hard that we need to stop mixing up the two terms. It's two
17 different things: employment is an outcome and employability is a set of abilities,
18 capabilities, skills that help an individual become both employed now: i.e., post-
19 university, and ongoing, not just at one time. (Australia 3 participant)
20
21
22
23
24

25 The interviewees were aware that institutional website messaging tended to focus on
26 graduate outcomes as opposed to employability development. One interview participant
27 noted that even when a university mission was presented as 'preparing students for the
28 real world', this often linked back to employment outcomes rather than employability
29 development (Australia 1 participant). The interviewee from that institution bemoaned
30 the inconsistency of internal and external employability messaging across the sector:
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 ...I would say across Australia, maybe 20 per cent of the universities do that well:
38 how we manage engagement and how we message that. (Australia 1 participant)
39
40
41

42 Australian participants emphasised that to manage engagement and present a coherent
43 message about employability, a cross-institutional approach was required (Australia 3
44 participant) and that all stakeholders should be involved including students, staff involved
45 in delivering and supporting employability, institutional leadership and marketing staff.
46
47
48
49

50 *Canada*

51 The interview data and website analysis from two of the Canadian institutions suggests
52 that the employability agenda may be enacted differently in Canada than in Australia or
53 the UK. Interview participants specifically highlighted that employability was 'a new
54 concept' (Canada 1 participant) for higher education institutions, with one interviewee
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

noting that:

... employability is not a word that resonates I'd say, probably in most, if not possibly all, Canadian universities. (Canada 2 participant)

This finding was supported by our analysis of the websites in that there was no use of the term 'employability' on the pages searched using our methodology. Instead, the prominent discourse on all three Canadian websites related to students' career readiness. In two of the three institutions, there were indications on the websites of a sophisticated engagement with career development theory. For example, the Canada 1 website emphasised the importance of networking in graduate transitions and the Canada 3 website explicitly discussed the 'chaos theory of careers' (Pryor & Bright, 2003) on a webpage of the institution's career service. Although external messaging on websites related to career readiness, interviewees from Canada 1 and 2 described a possessional approach to employability development, focusing mainly on skills acquisition and career education. Institutional reputation and how reputation might support their graduates' transition into work was also highlighted on both websites, aligning with a positional approach (Holmes 2013). In contrast, a Canada 3 interview participant described a processual approach to employability development:

... for example, really emphasising this notion of using your time in university to explore, engage, participate. (Canada 3 participant)

This approach was supported through our analysis of Canada 3's website. Despite the consistency in internal and external constructions of employability for this institution, the interview participants viewed the marketing of any idea of employability to prospective students as a separate concern to that of the work of the institution in supporting its students to develop their employability.

UK

Interview participants from the UK universities were aware that graduate outcomes were presented on their institutional websites and that employability was an important part of marketing the university and its courses to prospective students:

1 ...a lot of the marketing to our prospective students is framed around that
2 employability agenda. (UK 1 participant)
3
4

5 The participants emphasised that it is a mandatory requirement in the UK to present Key
6 Information Sets on university websites and that graduate outcomes data must be included
7 in these Sets. Although all three UK institutions discussed graduate employment in a way
8 that emphasised employability as a progressive concept, they employed marketing
9 strategies which leveraged graduate employment as a key selling point. This can be seen
10 in the following example.
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 ...we want to support you in preparing for the world of work and make sure that
18 you have the greatest possible chance of getting a job you want after graduating.
19
20 (UK 3 participant)
21
22
23
24

25 Two divergent accounts about institutional understandings of employability were
26 identified from the UK participants. UK 1 interviewees expressed fatigue with the idea
27 of employability and focussed instead on immediate graduate outcomes and the
28 associated (positional) importance of institutional reputation. The UK 1 website did not
29 align with that view, presenting in contrast a possessional approach to employability with
30 an emphasis on skills development:
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 ...we encourage our students to be enterprising and innovative — key skills for
39 all types of graduate employment. (UK 1 participant)
40
41
42

43 We noted a tension between the UK 1 interviewees' comments and those of their
44 institution's website, reflected through comments such as:
45
46
47
48

49 ... it's great for marketing but ... I have a different approach to employability because,
50 you know, going to university is not just about getting you a job. (UK 1 participant)
51
52
53

54 In contrast, the website of the UK 2 institution presented Holmes' (2013) processual
55 approach to employability, with skills being referenced in terms of cognition and the
56 development of identity. UK 2's internal account was consistent with this and emphasised
57 that the institution viewed employability as a collective responsibility:
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 ... everybody plays their part in it ... from the VC (Vice Chancellor) and the
2 Executive Board to the individual student. I think we view it as a continuous process.
3 (UK 2 participant)
4
5

6 UK 2 staff went on to say that they perceived employability to be a continuous
7 process and that this view was shared by the marketing department:
8
9

10 ...it isn't a series of random interventions that needs to be part of the total student
11 experience, and that's the test to really old model. (UK 2 participant)
12
13
14
15

16 In sum, the data from the UK interviews and website analysis indicate that the concept of
17 employability has evolved and changed in response to different institutional contexts and
18 their local needs.
19
20
21
22

23 **Discussion**

24 In this study, we first explored how employability is understood and enacted within
25 institutions. We did this through interviews involving sixteen participants, all of them
26 tasked with developing student employability. We compared these views with
27 constructions of employability as they were presented to external stakeholders, including
28 prospective students, through institutional websites.
29
30
31
32
33

34 Three key themes emerged from our analysis. First, there appear to be rich and
35 diverse understandings and practises in relation to employability. These are evident
36 within and across institutions and between geographical locations. Second, how
37 employability is understood and enacted internally appears to vary considerably from its
38 representation to external audiences. Although a developmental approach to
39 employability is commonly practiced internally, external representations are often
40 dominated by metrics relating to graduate outcomes and by rankings which highlight
41 institutional prestige.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Our third point of note stems from participants' emphasis that consistent
50 messaging is a crucial part of supporting employability. The most commonly cited reason
51 for misalignment between external and internal representations was lack of
52 communication between different operations of the university. We next discuss each of
53 these points in turn, exploring the consequences of misalignment in terms of curriculum
54 development and pedagogy for employability.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Internal narratives of employability development

1
2 Half the institutions involved in our study focussed on the acquisition of human capital
3 (a possessional approach) when describing employability. However, broader definitions
4 of employability also emerged. Three institutions emphasised the ability of graduates to
5 transition successfully into the workforce together with the need for lifelong learning and
6 the ability to sustain employability over the longer term (a processual approach).
7
8
9

10 The processual approach is more aligned with recent employability concepts
11 expressed in the scholarly literature: for example, Bennett's (2019, p. 1) emphasis on a
12 metacognitive, strengths-based view of employability: students' "cognitive and social
13 development as capable and informed individuals, professionals and social citizens".
14 Tomlinson (2017a) agrees, describing the process of developing five forms of crucial
15 capital—human, social, cultural, identity and psychological capitals—and their impact
16 on graduates' ability to transition into and through the labour market. The capitals view
17 is certainly more in line with the traditional mission of higher education. However, the
18 more pragmatic, *skills-based* view of employability is also gaining ground (see Clarke,
19 2018) and we return to the reasons for this later in the discussion.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 We note the differences in how the employability agenda is expressed in Canadian
30 institutions compared with UK and Australian institutions. Career development theory,
31 for example, was an active discourse on the websites of the three Canadian institutions
32 but it was absent from all UK and Australian institutional websites. This may be a
33 consequence of how government policy interacts with higher education, including in its
34 funding and reporting models. It might also be a matter of longevity: employability
35 discourse in the UK and Australia has been ongoing since the early 1960s (see Robbins
36 in the UK and Pullman in Australia, both 1963). The term 'employability' was also absent
37 from the websites of Canadian institutions, with one participant highlighting that
38 employability is 'not a word that resonates' (Canada 2 participant) in that context.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Although some interviewees described an institutional culture of employability
49 development involving partnerships between academic and professional staff, students
50 and senior management teams, this was rare. More commonly, institutional
51 representatives described a fragmented relationship. Smith et al.'s study (2018) highlights
52 the value of an institution-wide approach to employability in which all stakeholders work
53 together. The ability of an institution-wide approach to promote meaningful engagement
54 in employability development, however, is realised only when all university operations
55 emphasise a 'learning view' of employability rather than a 'productivity and skills view'.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Whilst the learning view was prominent among interviewees' conceptualisations of employability, in no case was a learning view seen across an institution. Given the desire for such an approach, its absence serves to emphasise the challenges of working across operations to ensure that careers practitioners and academic staff work together, influencing not only how employability development is defined and practised—as “part of the student experience agenda” (AGCAS, 2018, p. 31)—but how it is communicated to internal and external audiences.

Do different internal and external constructions of employability matter?

We assert that the misalignment of internal and external constructions of employability matters considerably. There exist two competing constructions of employability within higher education: a university-student transaction view; and a learning view. In terms of providing students with realistic expectations of study and an understanding of their role and responsibility within this, the two views carry conflicting messages which at best misinform and at worst mislead potential and current students.

In the vast majority of cases, our study data revealed that employability constructions were inconsistent between the institutional practice reported by senior university staff and the skills-based employability narratives presented on institutional websites. Some participants attributed these differences to lack of communication between different operations of the university: for example, between marketing, learning and teaching and the careers service.

Interviewees pointed out the importance of aligning internal and external constructions of employability. They also emphasised that if employability is to be understood and effectively operationalised, its definition and the communication of that definition must involve all institutional stakeholders:

... marketing need[s] to be at [the] table, future students need to be at the table, so our message gets out to the community—future students, current students and employers. (Australia 1 participant)

Our previous analysis of institutional websites (Bennett et al., in press) found that 50% of institutions utilised a positional approach to employability on their websites, emphasising both employment outcomes and institutional prestige through university

1 rankings and achievements. Given that potential students are influenced by the strength
2 of an institution's employment and career enhancement opportunities (see Diamond et
3 al., 2012), it is not surprising that these feature heavily on institutional websites. Our
4 interview participants agreed that institutional websites are a crucial point of information
5 for potential students, with one interviewee describing potential students as the 'number
6 one audience' (Australia 3 participant) for which the website had been designed. Indeed,
7 a visit to the homepage of a university or faculty is for many students their first 'campus
8 visit' (Opoku et al., 2006).
9

10
11
12
13
14 The inclusion on institutional websites of employment and related data, however,
15 also reflects the marketisation of higher education (Tomlinson, 2018). As marketisation
16 continues, the "teaching and research activities of academics are increasingly measured
17 and scrutinised, the contemporary academy appears to be suffused with anxiety"
18 (Loveday, 2016, p. 154), and the fate of teaching-focussed academics within a research-
19 based funding model is increasingly uncertain (Bennett, Roberts, Ananthram, &
20 Broughton, 2018). Declines in public funding and increased competition for fee-paying
21 students have placed institutions under increasing pressure to demonstrate their value to
22 students. As such, websites increasingly market to potential students both the likely (or
23 the ideal) outcomes of their studies and the quality of the education they can expect to
24 receive.
25

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34 Metrics which claim to demonstrate teaching quality are perhaps best evidenced
35 in the UK example, where the Teaching Excellence Framework (DBIS, 2016) was
36 designed in part to inform student choice. The UK is among many countries to employ
37 multiple graduate data instruments as proxy indicators of quality. Authors such as Jackson
38 and Bridgstock (2018), Muller (2018) and Spence (2018) have argued strongly against
39 the excessive use of metrics in making judgments about the quality of higher education,
40 maintaining that such metrics can lead to narrower student experiences rather than the
41 higher standards, quality and choice that such data is intended to foster. In the context of
42 employability, institutions conscious of metrics may, for example, funnel students
43 towards employment and direct them away from potentially life-enhancing activities such
44 as a post-graduate gap year.
45

46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54 In line with arguments such as these, our interviewees were consistent in their
55 view that institutions must not conflate employability with employment outcomes data.
56 A persistent challenge in this regard is that students' understanding of employability tends
57 to be limited to a narrow view which emphasises short-term graduate employability goals
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

together with credentials such as degree and grade point average (see Gedye & Beaumont, 2017). Students are also displaying increasingly consumer-orientated attitudes to higher education in that they are more concerned about getting financial value from their higher education studies (Tomlinson, 2017b).

Ironically, a positional approach to employability, characterised by rankings, achievements and graduate outcomes, may speak to the expectations and behaviours of prospective applicants and so be effective in enhancing student recruitment. However, these approaches are at odds with the equity agenda of higher education. As Holmes (2013) asserts, people from privileged backgrounds are advantaged in the labour market because they can use their social and cultural capital to secure work (see also Norton & Carroll, 2015). The most advantaged groups continue to dominate attendance at the most prestigious institutions and this selective advantage can be further reinforced by employers who recruit from prestigious universities, often due to alumni connections (Holmes, 2013; Tomlinson, 2012). These factors suggest that the positional approach exacerbates inequality in the graduate labour market, as evidenced by Pitman et al. (2019) and Tholen (2015).

Our contention that it is important to have consistency between internal and external narratives is substantiated through the interview data. Interviewees, who were all senior university staff involved in the design and delivery of employability, emphasised the need for consistent employability narratives and the need for all stakeholders, including marketing, to engage in constructive and critical dialogue about how employability might be constructed and developed.

We end our discussion with an example from Thornton and Shannon's (2014, p. 158) study of employability narratives in the discipline of law. Thornton and Shannon highlight that a student who undertakes a law degree is promised employability, prestige and wealth. Consequently, the serious and difficult aspects of studying law are overlooked. As Nixon et al. (2011) assert, good marketing should work hard to eliminate content that induces 'dissonance and angst'. If the higher education sector is to avoid dissatisfied students whilst developing "more complex and sophisticated expectations of university and of their [students'] own roles and responsibilities" (James, 2002, p. 81), the alignment of marketing narratives and institutional practice should lie at the core of the sector's activities.

Conclusion

We begin by acknowledging the limitations of the study. First, although the interview study involved participants who were selected for their ability to give a representative view of employability within both their institutions and their geographic regions, the study was limited to a small sample of institutions and geographical locations. Differences across regional and institutional statuses might emerge with a larger and more geographically diverse sample. Second, we analysed external institutional positioning using only the institutional website. A more comprehensive analysis that includes other modes of communication might yield a more nuanced picture of institutional employability narratives. Finally, we note the absence of the student voice in this study. Research that incorporates the student voice in discussions about employment metrics, consumer-led marketing and employability development is lacking and should be explored.

In this article, we investigated how institutional employability discourse and practice compares with the employability discourse communicated to prospective students via institutional websites. Internal constructions of employability included conceptualisation at a sophisticated level in terms of developing social, personal and academic capitals, and at a functional level in terms of the skills and capabilities required to navigate the graduate labour market. External representations of employability were dominated by a focus on graduate employment metrics and data as opposed to descriptions of employability practice experienced and realised by students internally.

The misalignment between internal and external representations could be attributed to two competing characterisations of higher education. As government interventions increasingly direct the higher education sector along market lines, universities recruit students in an environment of intense competition. To do this, they take a transactional view to “sell their courses” (Askehave, 2007, p. 725) by marketing to students economic gains in terms of high employment prospects following completion of their studies. In contrast, internal constructions of employability are based on a learning view in which each student is more a “young person ‘in formation’, or the ‘citizen-specialist’ in training, than the burgeoning *homo economicus*” (Lyndsay, 2014, p. 147).

We assert that this tension can be productive if it provides an impetus for active and critical dialogue involving all stakeholders (for example, policy-makers, institutions, industry, students, and alumni) about the economic and social purposes of higher education learning, and the means of achieving these. In the current environment,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

however, students are caught up in discourses of skill, employability, employment, attributes and performance, directed by market mechanisms used by governments to reshape higher education and to encourage and inform student choice.

Since institutional strategies are influenced by such interventions, a constructive dialogue is required at the level of policy-making to ensure that the inherent social values of higher education are protected and that the excesses of marketisation are resisted. This could, in turn, reduce the incongruence between external and internal representations of employability and lead to more coherent, institution-wide employability strategies that include accurate and realistic marketing of courses to prospective applicants.

Institution-wide strategic development is of critical importance in the development of practices which support individual employability development because discursive positioning helps to resource individuals with context-specific modes of self-identification and behaviour (Tomlinson, 2017b). As noted by one UK interview participant, employability development “isn’t a series of random interventions... [it] needs to be part of the total student experience” (UK 2). By providing accurate representations of student experience, and what they will get from attending university, the expectations and responsibilities of each partner will be better understood. Not only would this lead to prospective applicants becoming better informed in their selection of a university, it would enhance student engagement and satisfaction.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge Graduate Careers Australia, whose support made possible the Smith et al. (2018) study titled *Employability in a global context: Evolving policy and practice in employability, work integrated learning, and career development learning*. We would also like to thank the senior leaders who gave generously of their time and expertise. Finally, we would like to thank Joy Higgs, Will Letts and Geoff Crisp for permission to reproduce early findings from our work, which will appear in their 2019 edited volume titled *Education for employability (vol II): Learning for future possibilities*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Brill-Sense Publishers.

References

- 1
2 Askehave, I. (2007). The impact of marketization on higher education genres: The
3 international student prospectus as a case in point. *Discourse Studies*, 9(6), 723–742.
4 doi: 10.1177/1461445607082576.
5
6
7 Association of Graduate Careers Advisory Services (AGCAS). (2018). *AGCAS HE*
8 *careers services survey 2018*. Sheffield: AGCAS.
9
10
11 Bennett, D. (2019). Meeting society's expectations of graduates: Education for the public
12 good. In J. Higgs, G. Crisp, & W. Letts (Eds.), *Education for employability 1:*
13 *Learning for future possibilities* (forthcoming). Rotterdam: Brill | Sense.
14
15
16 Bennett, D., Coates, H., MacKinnon, P., Poronnik, P., Richardson, S., Schmidt, L., &
17 Mahat, M. (2015, July). [Navigating uncertainty and complexity: Higher education](#)
18 [and the dilemma of employability](#). In *Research and development in higher education:*
19 *Learning for life and work in a complex world* (pp. 1-10). *38th Higher Education*
20 *Research and Development Conference*, Melbourne.
21
22
23
24
25 Bennett, D., Knight, E., Divan, A., & Bell, K. (In press). (2019). Marketing graduate
26 employability: The language of employability In higher education. In J. Higgs, G.
27 Crisp, & W. Letts (Eds.), *Education for employability 1: Learning for future*
28 *possibilities* (forthcoming). Rotterdam: Brill | Sense.
29
30
31
32
33 Bennett, D., Knight, E., Divan, A., Kuchel, L., Horn, J., van Reyk, D., & da Silva, K. B.
34 (2017). How do research-intensive universities portray employability strategies? A
35 review of their websites. *Australian Journal of Career Development*, 26(2), 52–61.
36 doi: 10.1177/1038416217714475.
37
38
39
40 Bennett, D., Roberts, L., Ananthram, S., & Broughton, M. (2018). [What is required to](#)
41 [develop career pathways for teaching academics?](#) *Higher Education*, 75(2), 271-286.
42
43
44 Christie, F. (2017). The reporting of university league table employability rankings: A
45 critical review. *Journal of Education and Work*, 30(4), 403–418. doi:
46 10.1080/13639080.2016.1224821.
47
48
49 Clarke, M. (2018). Rethinking graduate employability: The role of capital, individual
50 attributes and context. *Studies in Higher Education*, 43(11), 1923–1937. doi:
51 10.1080/03075079.2017.1294152.
52
53
54
55 Cole, D., & Hallet, R. (2019). Language of employability. In J. Higgs, G. Crisp, & W.
56 Letts (Eds.), *Education for employability 1: Learning for future possibilities*
57 (forthcoming). Rotterdam: Brill | Sense.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- Diamond, A., Vorley, T., Roberts, J., & Jones, S. (2012). *Behavioural approaches to understanding student choice*. York: Higher Education Academy. Retrieved from https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/resources/student_choice.pdf.
- Gedye, S., & Beaumont, E. (2018). “The ability to get a job”: Student understandings and definitions of employability. *Education + Training*, 60(5), 406–420. doi: 10.1108/ET-10-2017-0159.
- Graduate Careers Australia. (2019). *Graduate Outcomes Survey*. Retrieved from <https://www.srcentre.com.au/our-research/graduate-outcomes-survey>
- Higher Education Statistics Agency. (2017). *NewDLHE: the future of graduate outcomes data. A synthesis*. Cheltenham: Higher Education Statistics Agency.
- Hite, N. G., & Railsback, B. (2010). Analysis of the content and characteristics of university websites with implications for web designers and educators. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 51(1), 107–113. doi: 10.1080/08874417.2010.11645455.
- Holmes, L. (2013). Competing perspectives on graduate employability: Possession, position or process? *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(4), 538–554. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2011.587140.
- Jackson, D & Bridgstock, R. (2018). Evidencing student success and graduate employability in the contemporary world-of-work: renewing our thinking. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 37(5), 984-998.
- James, R. (2002). Students’ changing expectations of higher education and the consequences of mismatches with reality. In P. Coaldrake & L. Stedman (Eds.), *Responding to student expectations* (pp. 71–83). Paris: OECD.
- Kinzie, J., Palmer, M., Hayek, J., Hossler, D., Jacob, S. A., & Cummings, H. (2004). *Fifty years of college choice: Social, political and institutional influences on the decision-making process*. Indianapolis: Lumina Foundation. Retrieved from <https://www.luminafoundation.org/files/publications/Hossler.pdf>.
- Loveday, V. (2018). *The neurotic academic: Anxiety, casualisation, and governance in the neoliberalising university*. *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 11(2), 154–166. doi:10.1080/17530350.2018.1426032
- Maringe, F. (2015) Higher Education Market. In J.D. Wright (ed.). *International Encyclopaedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences*. (pp. 850–861). Elsevier.

- 1 Mok, K. H., & Wu, A. M. (2016). Higher Education, changing labour market and social
2 mobility in the era of massification in China. *Journal of Education and Work*, 29(1),
3 77–97.
4
- 5 Moogan, Y. J., & Baron, S. (2003). An analysis of student characteristics within the
6 student decision making process. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 27(3),
7 271–287. doi: 10.1080/0309877032000098699.
8
9
- 10 Muller, N. Z. (2018). *The tyranny of metrics*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University
11 Press.
12
13
- 14 Nixon, E., Scullin, R., & Molesworth, M. (2011). How choice in higher education can
15 create conservative learners. In M. Molesworth, R. Scullion, & E. Nixon (Eds.), *The*
16 *marketisation of higher education and the student as consumer* (pp. 196–208). New
17 York: Routledge.
18
19
- 20 Norton, A., & Carroll, D. (2015, August 26). How does your choice of university affect
21 your future? *The Conversation*. Retrieved from [http://theconversation.com/how-](http://theconversation.com/how-does-your-choice-of-university-affect-yourfuture-45699)
22 [does-your-choice-of-university-affect-yourfuture-45699](http://theconversation.com/how-does-your-choice-of-university-affect-yourfuture-45699).
23
24
25
26
- 27 Oakleigh Consulting and Staffordshire University. (2010). *Understanding the*
28 *information needs of users of public information about higher education*. United
29 Kingdom: Higher Education Funding Council for England. Retrieved from
30 https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/1994/1/rd12_10b.pdf.
31
32
33
- 34 Opoku, R., Abratt, R., & Pitt, 'L. (2006). Communicating brand personality: are the
35 websites doing the talking for the top South African business schools? *Brand*
36 *Management*, 14, 20–39. doi: 10.1057/palgrave.bm.2550052.
37
38
39
- 40 Pitman, T., Roberts, L., Bennett, D., & Richardson. (2019). An Australian study of
41 graduate outcomes for disadvantaged students. *Journal of Further and Higher*
42 *Education*, 43(1), 45–57. doi: 10.1080/0309877X.2017.1349895.
43
44
- 45 Pryor, R. G. L., & Bright, J. (2003). The Chaos Theory of Careers. *Australian Journal of*
46 *Career Development*, 12(3), 12–20. doi: 10.1177/103841620301200304.
47
48
- 49 Pullman, W. A. (1963). Instrumentation in mechanical engineering laboratories.
50 *Education + Training*, 5(8), 371–371. doi: 10.1108/eb015325.
51
52
- 53 Robbins, L. (1963). The Robbins report. London. Her Majesty's Stationary Office.
54
- 55 Sin, C., & Neave, G. (2016). Employability deconstructed: perceptions of stakeholders.
56 *Studies in Higher Education*, 41(8), 1447–1462.
57
- 58 Smith, M., Bell, K., Bennett, D., & McAlpine, A. (2018). *Employability in a global*
59 *context: Evolving policy and practice in employability, work integrated learning, and*
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

career development learning. Wollongong, Australia: Graduate Careers Australia.
doi: 10.6084/m9.figshare.6372506.

Spence, C. (2018). 'Judgement' versus metrics in higher education management. *Higher Education*, doi: [10.1007/s10734-018-0300-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-018-0300-z).

Tholen, G. (2015). What can research into graduate employability tell us about agency and structure? *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 36(5), 766–784. doi: 10.1080/01425692.2013.847782.

Thornton, M., & Shannon, L. (2014). 'Selling the dream': Law school branding and the illusion of choice. In M. Thornton (Ed.), *Through a glass darkly: The social sciences look at the neoliberal university* (pp. 157–177). Canberra, Australia: Australian National University Press.

Tomlinson, M. (2018). Conceptions of the value of higher education in a measured market. *Higher Education*, 75(4), 711–727. doi: 10.1007/s10734-017-0165-6.

Tomlinson, M. (2017). Introduction: graduate employability in context: Charting a complex, contested and multi-faceted policy and research field. In Tomlinson, M., & Holmes, L. (Eds). *Graduate employability in context: Theory, research and debate* (pp. 1–40). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tomlinson, M. (2017a). Forms of graduate capital and their relationship to graduate employability. *Education + Training*, 59(4), 338–352. doi: 10.1108/ET-05-2016-0090.

Tomlinson, M. (2017b). Student perceptions of themselves as 'consumers' of higher education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 38(4), 450–467. doi: 10.1080/01425692.2015.1113856.

Tomlinson, M. (2012). Graduate employability: A review of conceptual and empirical themes. *Higher Education Policy*, 25(4), 407–431. doi: 10.1057/hep.2011.26.

Walker, M., & Fongwa, S. (2017). *Universities, employability and human development*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.