
GiLE Journal of Skills Development

Can Embedding Authentic Assessment Into the Curriculum Enhance the Employability of Business School students?

Graham Manville

Zayed University & University of East Anglia

William E. Donald

Ronin Institute & University of Southampton

Anita Eves

University of Surrey

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to explore whether embedding authentic assessment into the university curriculum can enhance the employability of business school students. Three research questions are addressed: (1) What is the rationale for authentic assessment in the curriculum?, (2) What are the opportunities for authentic assessment to enhance the employability of students?, and (3) What are the challenges of embedding authentic assessment into the university curriculum? The findings indicate that authentic assessment has the potential to increase the employability of students graduating from university business schools. The opportunity to develop human capital, collaborate with fellow students and solve real-world problems can help students to develop and signal their employability to prospective employers. However, lecturers and administrative staff require additional time to plan and deliver modules using this form of assessment. Students also need to be convinced of the benefits of the extra time investment if the module is not a compulsory component of their degree course. Our paper proposes that authentic assessment should be utilised to a greater extent by university business schools. The benefits of such an approach can transcend students, graduates, universities, organisations, and broader society. Directions for future research are also discussed to maximise the benefits of authentic assessment and seek to reduce the barriers to embedding authentic assessment in the curriculum.

Keywords: Authentic Assessment, Employability, Higher Education, Human Capital.

1. Introduction

The neoliberalisation of higher education positions the student as the consumer and education as a commodity, whereby market transactions shape the relationship between students and universities (Mintz, 2021). The COVID-19 pandemic as a global chance event has exacerbated competition for graduate employment as graduates from different cohorts contest against each other for employment opportunities (Donald et al., 2021). Moreover, employers often criticise the quality of graduates entering the labour market, claiming that graduates cannot plan or think strategically, cope with uncertainty, or work under pressure (Deng, 2021; James & Casidy, 2018). This evidences a gap between the teaching and assessment that occurs in educational settings with the needs of organisations for graduates to operate in the workplace (Gulikers et al., 2006). Additionally, whilst the perceived benefits of participation in higher education continue to outweigh the perceived costs, the gap is narrowing due to increasing tuition fees and a reduction in graduate employment opportunities in some sectors (Donald et al., 2018).

Higher education is witnessing a paradigm shift from objective standardised tests of knowledge requiring low-level cognitive skills (Koh et al., 2012) toward a more complex assessment of knowledge and higher-order skills via authentic assessment (Villarroel et al., 2018). The term authentic assessment is defined by James and Casidy (2018, p. 1) as “*tasks that measure and test the skills and practice that they will need in their future careers – tasks that mirror professional practice and test more than just rote memorisation*”. Outstanding teachers use assessment as a learning opportunity, not just to rate their students’ efforts but to evaluate the ability of an individual to put knowledge into practice (Thurab-Nkhosi et al., 2018). Contemporary notions of student learning in higher education reflect a synthesis of ideas from constructivist, socio-cognitive, and situated perspectives, whereby the learning occurs via the synthesis of knowledge which is constructed in the process of interaction with a social environment (Hawe & Dixon, 2017). Authentic assessment practice is well-established in some fields, for instance, nursing or apprenticeship tracks as examples of vocational education (Gulikers et al., 2006). However, whilst authentic assessment has begun to emerge in the curriculum of business schools, it remains in an embryonic state. Maxwell and Broadbridge (2017) call on universities to do more to promote styles of learning and assessment that can bridge the gap between the expectations of students and graduate employers. Yet, new assessment methods have proved challenging to implement in educational settings (Robson et al., 2022; Villarroel et al., 2018).

In response, this paper aims to explore whether embedding authentic assessment into the university curriculum can enhance the employability of business school students. Three Research Questions (RQs) are addressed: (RQ1) What is the rationale for authentic assessment in the curriculum?, (RQ2) What are the opportunities for authentic assessment to enhance the employability of students?, and (RQ3) What are the challenges of embedding authentic assessment into the university curriculum? The theoretical contribution comes from advancing understanding of authentic assessment beyond vocational education settings to optimise the curriculum of business-related degree subjects. The practical contribution comes from offering opportunities to enhance the employability of business school students for the benefit of students, graduates, universities, organisations, and broader society.

The paper is structured as follows. A brief discussion of the employability agenda, human capital, and signalling of employability set the context. Next, the rationale for authentic assessment in the curriculum is presented. Subsequently, the opportunities for authentic assessment to enhance student employability and the challenges of embedding authentic assessment into the curriculum are explored. The paper concludes with a discussion, implications, and presentation of a future research agenda.

2. The Employability Agenda

The Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework (TEF) enables participating universities to achieve a gold, silver, bronze, or provisional award by assessing “*excellence in teaching... and how each higher education provider ensures excellent outcomes from their students in terms of graduate-level employment or further study*”. (Office for Students, 2021, Online). The TEF positions employability as a constituent part of good teaching rather than a peripheral activity provided by university career services. The TEF sees universities compete with each other to attract prospective students by evidencing opportunities for career success and value for money regarding their investment in degree studies. This is crucial since the perceived gap between the benefits and costs is narrowing due to tuition fees of up to £27,000 for a 3-year undergraduate degree plus additional living expenses (Donald et al., 2018). The challenge to universities is compounded by government legislation promoting apprenticeships and degree apprenticeships as alternative routes for school leavers to gain work experience alongside their studies (Degree Apprenticeships, 2015).

Unfortunately, the terminology of employability and employment is often used interchangeably despite having different meanings (Holmes, 2013; Jackson, 2015). Employability refers to “the potential a graduate has for obtaining and succeeding in graduate-level positions” (Knight & Yorke, 2004, p. 4). Employment is a snapshot-in-time measure of whether an individual currently holds a job, but this fails to account for structural factors whereby a graduate is employable without being employed (Vanhercke et al., 2014). Universities are thus tasked with producing employable graduates whilst partnering with graduate employers to secure employment opportunities for their graduates. Furthermore, league table rankings tend to lead to a degree of homogeneity or isomorphism whereby normalising operations is considered necessary for survival and sustainability (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Yet, the COVID-19 pandemic has increased the appetite for collaboration and innovation as pre-existing norms are challenged (Donald et al., 2021).

In this paper, the focus is on the use by academics operating within higher education institutions of authentic assessment within the course curriculum as a vehicle to enhance the employability of their students. Our focus now moves to the theoretical framework of human capital theory and signalling theory before discussing the rationale for authentic assessment within the curriculum.

3. Human Capital and Signalling Employability

Human capital theory emerged in the 1960s (Becker, 1964; Schultz, 1961) and was then applied to the field of higher education consisting of social capital, cultural capital, and scholastic capital (Useem & Karabel, 1986). The notion of the need for achievement (Cook et al., 1981) and inner-value capital (Baruch et al., 2005) were subsequently collated under the term psychological capital (Luthans et al., 2004; Luthans et al., 2015). Additionally, the concept of market capital (Baruch et al., 2005) and skills was added to human capital to recognise their alignment with employability (Barrie, 2007; Cranmer, 2006; Knight & Yorke, 2004). Therefore, in the context of undergraduate students, human capital consists of social capital, cultural capital, psychological capital, scholastic capital, market-value capital, and skills (Donald et al., 2019). Universities are tasked with increasing their students’ human capital levels and fostering a commitment to lifewide and lifelong learning to produce graduates capable of improved job performance and productivity (Baruch et al., 2005; Cole & Donald,

2022; Suleman, 2018). Subsequently, organisations strategically acquire human capital via the employment of graduates as a means of organisational sustainability via competitive advantage, productivity, and profitability (Donald et al., 2020).

However, graduates need to be able to convey their human capital to potential employers, particularly as suggestions of grade inflation reduce the value of the degree classification as a differentiator of talent (Bachan, 2017; Chen et al., 2017). Consequently, the graduate premium can be attributed to a combination of human capital and signalling (Rospigliosi et al., 2014). Signalling theory addresses information asymmetry between two parties termed the signaller and the receiver (Spence, 1973). In the context of graduate recruitment, graduates signal their employability to prospective employers via the application and selection process (Kalfa & Taksa, 2015). A prospective employer decodes the signals provided by each candidate to identify talent and inform hiring decisions (Anderson & Tomlinson, 2021).

We believe that authentic assessment offers universities a way to increase their students' human capital and help graduates signal their employability to secure graduate employment. The curriculum also provides an opportunity to help students to develop their employability proactively through their university studies rather than as a reactive necessity in the final semester of study or following graduation (Jackson & Tomlinson, 2020). This paper now sets out the rationale for authentic assessment before exploring the opportunities and challenges of embedding authentic assessment within the university curriculum.

4. The Rationale for Authentic Assessment in the Curriculum

RQ1: What is the rationale for authentic assessment in the curriculum?

Current approaches to assessment within the business school curriculum usually involve a mix of formative and summative assessments. Formative assessment involves either informal or practice assessments that take place throughout the course and do not contribute to the final module mark (Yorke, 2003). In contrast, summative assessment occurs when a formal assessment does contribute to the final module mark to measure and certify learning outcomes (Earl, 2003). However, there are concerns that these assessment approaches lack opportunities for students to apply theoretical constructs (Mooney & Harkison, 2018) and engage in transformative learning (James & Casidy, 2018). In particular, employers continue to raise concerns over the quality of graduates, and this problem is likely to be exacerbated by suggested grade inflation and COVID-19-related impacts on assessment (Donald et al., 2021; Hinchliffe & Jolly, 2011).

One approach to address such concerns is authentic assessment, which is used extensively in vocational-based degree programmes (Gulikers et al., 2006). However, its application in the context of the curriculum of business schools is not yet sufficiently developed (Maxwell & Broadbridge, 2017). As previously mentioned, James and Casidy (2018, p. 1) define authentic assessment as “*tasks that measure and test the skills and practice that they will need in their future careers – tasks that mirror professional practice and test more than just rote memorisation*”. This definition acknowledges the performance of authentic tasks (Mueller, 2005) and emphasises the practical application of tasks within a real-world setting (Fook & Sidhu, 2010). Moreover, authentic assessment can enhance instructional practices and fill gaps in the curriculum resulting in increased student performance (Dunn & Mulvenon, 2009).

Five criteria to assess the authentic intellectual quality of assessment tasks include depth of knowledge, knowledge criticism, knowledge manipulation, sustained writing, and connections to the real world (Koh et al., 2012). Depth of knowledge refers to using subject-specific skills, tools, and methods to understand how subject matter is organised and structured to identify interconnections with other areas of knowledge. Knowledge criticism requires students to judge the value, credibility, and soundness of sources of information to foster critical literacy. Knowledge manipulation is the organisation, interpretation, analysis, synthesis, or evaluation of information to facilitate higher order thinking and reasoning skills. Sustained writing elaborates on understanding, explanations, arguments, and conclusions and the ability to articulate these in prose form. Finally, connections to the real-world focus on cultivating valuable skills in the classroom that are transferable to a workplace setting and broader society.

When addressing these criteria, there is an opportunity to counteract the marketisation of higher education via a focus on the quality of assessment. This view is supported by Villarroel et al. (2018) through the identification of three dimensions of authentic learning – realism, cognitive challenge, and evaluative judgement. Realism is related to, for instance, being contextualised to everyday life, relevance beyond the classroom, and performing similar tasks to real-world settings. Realism can be evident in case studies or exams where these act as a proxy for real life. Other forms of authentic assessment can include inquiry-based reports, oral presentations, role-playing, and situational judgement tests (James & Casidy, 2018). Cognitive challenge relates to higher order thinking as demonstrated in Bloom’s taxonomy which was extended further from the early 2000s (Krathwohl, 2002; Krathwohl & Anderson, 2010) and incorporates aspects of problem-solving, linking concepts, drawing sound conclusions, and the creation of new knowledge. Moreover, constructing knowledge through engaging in higher-order retrieval practice is more beneficial than via fact-based retrieval practice (Agarwal, 2019). Finally, evaluative judgement acknowledges that authentic assessment is a subjective and relative concept only authentic within a particular situation, place, or profession.

A key rationale for embedding authentic assessment into the curriculum of business schools is that it comprises assessment tasks that mirror professional practice rather than testing rote memorisation (Scott & Unsworth, 2018). This exposure helps students to develop professionally relevant skills to navigate uncertainty and adapt to an evolving workplace (Thurab-Nkhosi et al., 2018). This supports the view of Gulikers et al. (2006) that increasing authenticity in assessment practices can enhance student learning and prepare students better for entry into the labour market. The learning via authentic assessment is thus contextualised and focuses on the use of skills and demonstration of competencies, knowledge, and attitudes that are applied in professional life when handling problem situations (Eddy & Lawrence, 2013; Villarroel et al., 2018).

Authentic assessment also provides the opportunity for students to acquire human capital, enhance employability, and have the confidence to signal this employability to potential employers (Anderson & Tomlinson, 2021; Donald et al., 2019). This is because it focuses on deep learning and knowledge transformation rather than surface-level learning (Deng, 2021; Gulikers et al., 2008). The inquiry-based approach stimulates self-directed learning and encourages a lifelong learning mentality (Hume & Coll, 2010; Koh et al., 2012) as a means for career sustainability (Donald et al., 2020). The opportunity for students to challenge pre-existing assumptions via authentic assessment empowers them to establish themselves in the world and to be reflexive about their own way of doing and being (Vu & Dall’Alba, 2014).

Furthermore, authentic assessment has been shown to enhance reflection, communication, and collaboration (Scott & Unsworth, 2018). It is also favoured by career-oriented students (James & Casidy, 2018), suggesting that authentic assessment may offer an opportunity to address calls in the vocational behaviour literature for innovative ways to engage students with career support via the curriculum (Quinlan & Renninger, 2022).

The focus of this paper now shifts to examining the opportunities for using authentic assessment in business schools to enhance student employability.

5. Opportunities for Authentic Assessment to Enhance Student Employability

RQ2: What are the opportunities for authentic assessment to enhance the employability of students?

Authentic assessment develops students' higher order thinking and deep learning skills (Guliker et al., 2008), aiding knowledge construction, complex thinking, elaborated communication, collaboration, and problem-solving in authentic contexts (Koh et al., 2012). The increased depth of learning also provides opportunities for autonomy, commitment, motivation, self-regulation, metacognition, and self-reflection (Villarroel et al., 2018). Authentic assessment enables students to develop these skills and attributes within a safe environment (Sutherland & Markauskaite, 2012) and captures the true ability of students regarding what they know and what they can do (Koh et al., 2012). Moreover, the diversity of students within business schools provides an excellent socio-cultural opportunity to learn from peers who may have different and creative approaches to problem-solving (Bohemia & Davison, 2012). This can increase confidence in students in dealing with less predictable assignments and subsequently prepare them for navigating complexity in the world of work (Mooney & Harkinson, 2018). Additionally, authentic assessment can enhance the employability of students by developing human capital through the construction of networks, exposure to different cultures, psychological development, and the acquisition of skills and attributes (Donald et al., 2019).

Authentic assessment also has the potential to enrich the classroom experience for students and lecturers. Under authentic assessment conditions, learners are engaged and more in control of their own learning. This can energise the learning process and enhance motivation in recognition of the value of assessment to their future professional practice (Gulikers et al., 2008). The benefits to lecturers of developing networks with industry contacts and teaching in an environment with more engaged students can enrich the lives of lecturers, and these benefits transcend to their students (Koh et al., 2012). For example, industry contacts may make lecturers aware of job opportunities for their students. Lecturers may make their industry contacts aware of students they feel would be assets to the organisation. Employer involvement in degree course design and assessment can positively affect graduates' outcomes (Cranmer, 2006). Authentic assessment thus offers the opportunity for lifelong learning and employability, which are antecedents of a sustainable career (Donald et al., 2020). Furthermore, the improved confidence in students can subsequently drive student satisfaction scores reflecting positively on the lecturer and the university (Thurab-Nkhosi et al., 2018). Authentic assessment also develops human capital in students, which is associated with increased levels of perceived employability – whereby the student believes themselves to be more employable – leading to enhanced levels of self-belief and self-efficacy (Donald et al., 2019).

The opportunity to work on real-world problems also provides students with examples on which to draw during their application and assessment for graduate employment. The graduate, as the signaller, can draw on an array of evidence to signal to the organisation as the receiver of the signal that they are capable of performing the specific role (Anderson & Tomlinson, 2021). This can enable graduates to overcome employer concerns surrounding a lack of industry experience since their degree studies have replicated such environments (Jackson, 2015). The need to signal employability is likely to increase as the perception of grade inflation within higher education reduces the effectiveness of degree classifications as a differentiator of ability among graduates (Bachan, 2017). The COVID-19 pandemic has added to this challenge since A-level grades to determine entry into universities had to be determined based on teacher assessment rather than exam conditions leading to record numbers of students achieving top grades (Kippin & Cairney, 2022).

Moreover, employers are experiencing an increased number of applications per job due to the rescinding of contracts of employment in the last graduate recruitment cycle (Donald et al., 2021). The concern is that diversity outcomes are negatively impacted as social and cultural capital plays a more significant role in differentiating candidates (Holt-White & Montacute, 2020). This highlights the opportunities for authentic assessment since it provides a way for students to acquire these types of human capital and to have the confidence to signal these to potential employers (Anderson & Tomlinson, 2021). These outcomes will also be crucial for the survival of universities when competing with apprenticeship degrees, whereby students can earn while they learn (Degree Apprenticeships, 2015).

6. Challenges of Embedding Authentic Assessment into the Curriculum

RQ3: What are the challenges of embedding authentic assessment into the university curriculum?

Unfortunately, academics face several challenges when seeking to embed authentic assessment into the business school curriculum. Aziz et al. (2020) state that one such challenge is the lack of training and lack of support from school administration groups. The concern is that authentic assessment does not always assess what an academic seeks to assess (Hathcoat et al., 2016). For example, if the assessment focuses heavily on a written report, then this can end up measuring writing skills rather than the application of knowledge. Hathcoat et al. (2016) found that 25% of the difference in critical thinking scores within authentic assessment was related to differences in writing style. Villarroel et al. (2018) offer a four-step process to guide authentic assessment focusing on workplace context, assessment design, judgement, and feedback. Their model captures the realism, contextualisation, and problematisation in assessing curricular content, linking knowledge with life and work. However, authentic assessment requires moving away from a teaching paradigm involving covering material and end-of-course static assessments to a learning paradigm focusing on learner-centric experiences and active learning approaches (Eddy & Lawrence, 2013). This requires academics to be supported in moving away from traditional norms and seeking innovative ways to embed authentic assessment into the curriculum. Poorly designed authentic assessment can do more harm than good since it can be counterproductive to learning (Gulikers et al., 2006). In particular, there should be constructive alignment between the curriculum and assessment methods with skills and broader human capital development for application in a real-world work environment (James & Casidy, 2018). Yet, authentic assessment without some degree of standardisation across business schools and

institutions could result in a second dystopian condition within education where wrong conclusions could be drawn from aggregate scores from an institution owing to a lack of interchangeability in tasks, occasions, and students (Hathcoat et al., 2016). One opportunity is to integrate traditional and authentic assessment forms into the curriculum (Villarroel et al., 2018).

Another challenge is the overwhelming level of documentation and the burden of teaching hours that can often be associated with authentic assessment (Aziz et al., 2020; Bould & Molley, 2013). Changing assessment forms requires time, energy, and intellectual resources (Mooney & Harkinson, 2018; Villarroel et al., 2018). Nevertheless, MacLean (2016) suggests that the challenges from an increased workload can be offset by the increased personal reward from students' high-quality work. However, academics can resist, particularly if they feel that increased teaching hours limit their opportunities to conduct academic research. This highlights the need for buy-in from management, academics, and business school administrators for the sustainable implementation of authentic assessment (Eddy & Lawrence, 2013).

One of the most significant challenges of embedding authentic assessment into the curriculum is the impact on student satisfaction survey results. The rise of student power has intensified in the Millennial Generation of students graduating after 2000 (Maxwell & Broadbridge, 2017) and Generation Z students born after 2000 (Ozkan & Solmaz, 2015). This generation has received high levels of positive affirmation, which has been linked with increased measures of self-entitlement and narcissism (Twenge & Foster, 2010). There are concerns that accommodations made by universities to achieve high student satisfaction scores have led to grade inflation since higher results often lead to higher reported satisfaction levels (Stroebe, 2016). Furthermore, authentic assessment requires buy-in from students to engage and embrace the approach making it a riskier teaching style in the context of student feedback (Thurab-Nkhosi et al., 2018; Vu & Dall'alba, 2014). Students can view authentic assessment as more time-consuming than other forms of summative assessment, and they may opt to avoid these modules, where permitted, due to anxiety concerning time pressures (Fook & Sidhu, 2010). This is compounded by students not realising the benefit of specific modules until they enter the labour market (Gibbons et al., 2015). This requires business schools to highlight the benefits of authentic assessment to engage students in the process and to enhance lifelong learning and employability as antecedents of career sustainability (Donald et al., 2020).

Additionally, authentic assessment is subjective, and academics often perceive a greater level of authenticity in their teaching and assessment than their students (Gulikers et al., 2006). A concern reported by students is that the assessments are too generic and not sufficiently aligned with personal aspirations (Gulikers et al., 2008). Students also have worries about peer assessment due to fears of being wrong, which can affect their sense of self-worth and confidence (Hawe & Dixon, 2017). This could be problematic given the negative impacts on the self-perceived well-being of students due to the COVID-19 pandemic (Donald & Jackson, 2022). However, as students progress through their university degree, their views of authentic assessment tend to improve, although more experienced students may still be critical of authentic assessment approaches if they feel they have not developed new skills or attributes (Gulikers et al., 2006). Universities must, therefore, balance the benefits of authentic assessment with the potential risks to student satisfaction survey scores, university league table rankings, and the attraction of future students and income for the university.

7. Discussion and Implications

Our paper has framed the rationale for authentic assessment in the curriculum (RQ1), highlighted the opportunities for authentic assessment to enhance the employability of students (RQ2), and raised awareness of the challenges of embedding authentic assessment into the university curriculum (RQ3). This approach brings rigour to authentic assessment as an approach within HEIs and pragmatically highlights opportunities and risks to enable educators to make informed decisions when designing their curriculums.

Practically, we believe that students, educators, career advisors, universities, and employers can all benefit from authentic assessment. Students can apply theoretical constructs (Mooney & Harkison, 2018), engage in transformative learning (Deng, 2021; James & Casidy, 2018), and develop new ways to signal their employability to potential employers via the acquisition of human capital (Anderson & Tomlinson, 2021; Donald et al., 2019). Educators can develop their networks with industry, improve engagement with their students, and feel a sense of enrichment from their work (Koh et al., 2012). Career advisors benefit since authentic assessment focuses on the development of student employability, offering ways to overcome challenges highlighted in the vocational behaviour literature regarding engaging students in career support initiatives (Buckholtz & Donald, 2022; Donald et al., 2018). These benefits transcend to the university level via increased league table rankings and TEF scores which can subsequently be used to attract prospective students and associated revenue streams. The partnerships with organisations and professional bodies as part of authentic assessment can also be used to highlight the opportunities for prospective students. Such opportunities include gaining real-world experience as part of the degree and exposure to innovative and collaborative teaching methods. These lead to enhanced employability outcomes and the ability for graduates to navigate their way in a volatile and rapidly evolving labour market. Moreover, we believe that authentic assessment can address the damage imposed by suggested grade inflation (Bachan, 2016; Stoebe, 2017), which is likely to have been exacerbated due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic (Bhopal & Myers, 2020). Employers can thus gain a tangible benefit from participation and support in the authentic assessment process by helping to shape graduates to meet the current and future needs of the industry (Hinchliffe & Jolly, 2011). Employers can also gain advanced access to students during their degree studies leading to the development of early career talent pipelines that have been shown to offer a sustainable competitive advantage for organisations (Donald et al., 2020).

Yet, a pragmatic approach needs to be taken by all stakeholders when implementing authentic assessment. For example, universities will need to allocate more time for lecturers to work on curriculum development and deliver their course content (Fook & Sidhu, 2010). Increased investment in administration activities may be necessary, although the involvement of career advisors could alleviate some of these pressures. Crucially, universities need to acknowledge that student satisfaction scores may initially drop while lecturers and students undertake a shift to authentic assessment. Universities should support their staff and reward attempts at embedding authentic assessment into the curriculum, particularly in cases where staff with a history of strong student feedback scores have slight dips in scores for one or two academic years. This captures the need for investment in training lecturers to feel confident using authentic assessment and to revise performance management criteria to align with personnel development and curriculum development objectives (Aziz et al., 2020). More generally, there needs to be an ongoing conversation around how the TEF is measured, what is measured, and how the weightings are decided for each measure. Otherwise, universities face the same issues as schools, whereby innovation can be stifled by ‘institutional isomorphism’ to the detriment of all stakeholders (Robson et al., 2022).

8. Future Research Agenda

The limitation of this study is the lack of empirical evidence of the benefit of authentic assessment. Future research could provide a cross-sectional or longitudinal sample of graduates that have taken part in authentic assessment during their university degrees. Studies involving graduates that have been in graduate roles for a significant time (e.g., five years) will provide a compelling answer to the efficacy of embedding authentic assessment into the curriculum, which to our knowledge, has not yet been investigated. The views of other stakeholders such as line managers or human resource managers of early career talent in organisations could also be valuable in determining industry satisfaction levels with graduate performance.

Additionally, students need to have experiences within the university curriculum that prepare them to navigate global level threats such as climate change which are likely to bring significant disruption to global economies. The future of work is also evolving via technological advances and Industry 4.0, which have been accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic (Donald et al., 2021). This suggests that it has never been more critical for academia to engage with industry to ensure that the graduate workforce of tomorrow is prepared for the challenges ahead and that universities remain relevant in this fast-changing world. Particularly given that industry is often ahead of academia when it comes to pragmatic changes in the workplace.

We also believe that education can be influential in developing a deep learning culture within students during their university studies. This aligns with the views of Eddy and Lawrence (2013), who advocate for a shift from an instruction-led paradigm to a learning paradigm in the university curriculum. An immersive experience in authentic assessment may promote higher-order learning outcomes of Bloom's taxonomy (i.e., evaluating and creating) (Krathwohl, 2002), which can serve as a symbiotic relationship between the student, the employer, and the university. Future research in the area of authentic assessment in the university curriculum thus has practical implications as the solutions to the challenges the economy faces will not be readily solved by existing solutions. Increasing critical evaluative skills in students and enabling them to synthesise and create new knowledge will ultimately benefit the students themselves, industry, and broader society.

References

- Agarwal, P. K. (2019). Retrieval practice & Bloom's taxonomy: Do students need fact knowledge before higher-order learning? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *111*(2), 189–209. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000282>
- Anderson, V., & Tomlinson, M. (2021). Signaling standout graduate employability: The employer perspective. *Human Resource Management Journal*, *31*(3), 675–693. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12334>
- Aziz, M. N. A., Yusoff, N. M., & Yaakob, M. F. M. (2020). Challenges in using authentic assessment in 21st century ESL classrooms. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, *9*(3), 759–768. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v9i3.20546>
- Bachan, R. (2017). Grade Inflation in UK Higher Education. *Studies in Higher Education*, *42*(8), 1580–1600. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1019450>
- Barrie, S. C. (2007). A conceptual framework for the teaching and learning of generic graduate attributes. *Studies in Higher Education*, *32*(4), 439–458. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070701476100>

-
- Baruch, Y., Bell, M. P., & Gray, D. (2005). Generalist and Specialist Graduate Business Degrees: Tangible and Intangible Value. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67(1), 51-68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2003.06.002>
- Becker, G. S. (1964). *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis with Special Reference to Education*. University of Chicago Press.
- Bhopal, K., & Myers, M. (2020). *The impact of COVID-19 on A Level students in England. Preliminary Report Findings*. University of Birmingham and University of Nottingham.
- Bohemia, E., & Davison, G. (2012). Authentic learning: The gift project. *Digital and Technology Education*, 17(2), 49-62.
- Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2013). Rethinking models of feedback for learning: The challenge of design. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(6), 698-712. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2012.691462>
- Buckholtz, T. J., & Donald, W. E. (2022). Direct outcomes and win-win relationships between university careers advisors and graduate recruiters. *GiLE Journal of Skills Development*, 2(1), 9-25. <https://doi.org/10.52398/gjsd/2022.v2.i1.pp9-25>
- Chen, C. Y., Wang, S. Y., & Yang, Y. F. (2017). A Study of the Correlation of the Improvement of Teaching Evaluation Scores Based on Student Performance Grades. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 6(2), 162. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v6n2p162>
- Cole, D., & Donald, W. E. (2022). Shifting the narrative: Towards a more holistic approach to learning. *GiLE Journal of Skills Development*, 2(1), 3-4. <https://doi.org/10.52398/gjsd/2022.v2.i1.pp3-4>
- Cook, J. D., Hepworth, S. I., Wall, T. D., & Warr, P. T. (1981). *The Experience of Work: A Compendium and Review of 249 Measures and Their Use*. Academic Press.
- Cranmer, S. (2006). Enhancing graduate employability: best intentions and mixed outcomes. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 169-184. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572041>
- Degree Apprenticeships. (2015, March). *Government rolls-out flagship Degree Apprenticeships*. UK Government. Retrieved August 1, 2022, from <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-rolls-out-flagship-degree-apprenticeships>
- Deng, Z. (2021). Powerful knowledge, transformations and *Didaktikl* curriculum thinking. *British Educational Research Journal*, 47(6), 1652-1674. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3748>
- Department for Education. (2020, March). *Schools, colleges and early years settings to close*. UK Government. Retrieved August 1, 2022, from <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/schools-colleges-and-early-years-settings-to-close>
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-160. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101>
- Donald, W. E., Ashleigh, M. J., & Baruch, Y. (2018). Students' perceptions of education and employability: Facilitating career transition from higher education into the labor market. *Career Development International*, 23(5), 513-540. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-09-2017-0171>
- Donald, W. E., Ashleigh, M. J., & Baruch, Y. (2021). The university-to-work transition: Responses of universities and organizations to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Personnel Review*. Advanced Online Publication. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-03-2021-0170>
- Donald, W. E., Baruch, Y., & Ashleigh, M. J. (2019). The undergraduate self-perception of employability: Human capital, careers advice and career ownership. *Studies in Higher Education*, 44(4), 599-614. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2017.1387107>
-

-
- Donald, W. E., Baruch, Y., & Ashleigh, M. J. (2020). Striving for sustainable graduate careers: Conceptualization via career ecosystems and the new psychological contract. *Career Development International*, 25(2), 90-110. <https://doi.org/10.1108/cdi-03-2019-0079>
- Donald, W. E., & Jackson, D. (2022). Subjective wellbeing among university students and recent graduates: Evidence from the United Kingdom. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(11), 6911. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19116911>
- Dunn, K. E., & Mulvenon, S. W. (2009). A critical review of research on formative assessment: The limited scientific evidence of the impact of formative assessment in education. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 14(7), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.7275/jg4h-rb87>
- Earl, L. (2003). *Assessment as learning: Using classroom assessment to maximize student learning*. Corwin Press.
- Eddy, P. L., & Lawrence, A. (2013). Wikis as Platforms for Authentic Assessment. *Innovation in Higher Education*, 38(1), 253-265. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-012-9239-7>
- Fook, C. Y., & Sidhu, G. K. (2010). Authentic Assessment and Pedagogical Strategies in Higher Education. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(2), 153-161. ISSN 1549-3652
- Gibbons, S., Neumayer, E., & Perkins, R. (2015). Student satisfaction, league tables and university applications: evidence from Britain. *Economics of Education Review*, 48(C): 148-164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2015.07.002>
- Gulikers, J., Bastiaens, T., & Kirschner, P. (2006). Authentic assessment, student and teacher perceptions: the practical value of the five-dimensional framework. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 58(3), 337-357. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13636820600955443>
- Gulikers, J., Bastiaens, T., Kirschner, P., & Kester, L. (2008). Authenticity is in the eye of the beholder: student and teacher perceptions of assessment authenticity. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 60(4), 401-412. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13636820802591830>
- Hathcoat, J. D., Penn, J. D., Barnes, L. L. B., & Comer, J. C. (2016). A Second Dystopia in Education: Validity Issues in Authentic Assessment Practices. *Research in Higher Education*, 57(1), 892-912. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-016-9407-1>
- Hawes, E., & Dixon, H. (2017). Assessment for learning: a catalyst for student self-regulation. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42(8), 1181-1192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2016.1236360>
- Hinchliffe, G. W., & Jolly, A. (2011). Graduate identity and employability. *British Educational Research Journal*, 37(4), 563-584. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2010.482200>
- Holmes, L. (2013). Competing Perspectives on Graduate Employability: Possession, Position or Process? *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(4), 538-554. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2011.587140>
- Holt-White, E. & Montacute, R. (2020, July). *COVID-19 and Social Mobility Impact Brief #5: Graduate Recruitment and Access to the Workplace*. Sutton Trust. Retrieved August 1, 2022, from <https://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Access-to-the-Workplace-Impact-Brief.pdf>
- Humes, A., & Coll, R. (2010). Authentic student inquiry: the mismatch between the intended curriculum and the student-experienced curriculum. *Research in Science and Technological Education*, 28(1), 43-62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02635140903513565>
- Jackson, D. (2015). Employability Skill Development in Work-integrated Learning: Barriers and Best Practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 40(2), 350-367. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2013.842221>

-
- Jackson, D., & Tomlinson, M. (2020). Investigating the relationship between career planning, proactivity and employability perceptions among higher education students in uncertain labour market conditions. *Higher Education*, 80, 435-455. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00490-5>
- James, L. T., & Casidy, R. (2018). Authentic assessment in business education: its effects on student satisfaction and promotion behaviour. *Studies in Higher Education*, 43(3), 401-415. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1165659>
- Kalfa, S., & Taksa, L. (2015). Cultural capital in business higher education: reconsidering the graduate attributes movement and the focus on employability. *Studies in Higher Education*, 40(4), 580-595. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2013.842210>
- Kippin, S., & Cairney, P. (2022). The COVID-19 exams fiasco across the UK: four nations and two windows of opportunity. *British Politics*, 17(1), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41293-021-00162-y>
- Knight, P., & Yorke, M. (2004). *Learning, curriculum and employability in higher education*. RoutledgeFalmer.
- Koh, K. H., Tan, C., & Ng, P. T. (2012). Creating thinking schools through authentic assessment: the case in Singapore. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 24(1), 135-149. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-011-9138-y>
- Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A revision of Bloom's taxonomy: An overview. *Theory Into Practice*, 41(4), 212-218. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4104_2
- Krathwohl, D. R., & Anderson, L. W. (2010). Merlin C. Wittrock and the revision of Bloom's Taxonomy. *Educational Psychologist* 45(1), 64-65. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1080/00461520903433562>
- Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2015). *Psychological Capital and Beyond*. Oxford University Press.
- Luthans, F., Luthans, K. W., & Luthans, B. C. (2004). Positive Psychological Capital: Beyond Human and Social Capital. *Business Horizons*, 47(1), 45-50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2003.11.007>
- MacLean, H. (2016). *What matters in assessment: Insights from the experiences of academics and students of assessment that supports learning in higher education*. RMIT University Press.
- Maxwell, G. A., & Broadbridge, A. M. (2017). Generation Y's employment expectations: UK undergraduates' opinions on enjoyment, opportunity and progression. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(12), 2267-2283. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1141403>
- Mintz, B. (2021). Neoliberalism and the Crisis in Higher Education: The Cost of Ideology. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 80(1), 79-112. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajes.12370>
- Mooney, S., & Harkison, T. (2018). Assessment for learning in university settings: fun and games. *Anatolia*, 29(4), 507-517. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2018.1443826>
- Mueller, J. (2005). The authentic assessment toolbox: enhancing student learning through online faculty development. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 1(1), 1-7.
- Office for Students. (2021, June). *About the TEF*. Office For Students. Retrieved August 1, 2022, from <https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/teaching/about-the-tef/>
- Ozkan, M., & Solmaz, B. (2015). The changing face of employees-generation Z and their perceptions of work. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 26(1), 476-483. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(15\)00876-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(15)00876-X)

-
- Quinlan, K. M., & Renninger, K. A. (2022). Rethinking employability: how students build on interest in a subject to plan a career. *Higher Education*. Advanced Online Publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-021-00804-6>
- Robson, J., Randhawa, A., & Keep, E. (2022). Employability skills in mainstream education: Innovations in schooling and institutional isomorphism. *British Educational Research Journal*. Advanced Online Publication. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3756>
- Rospigliosi, A. P., Greener, S., Bourner, T., & Sheehan, M. (2014). Human Capital or Signalling, Unpacking the Graduate Premium. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 41(5), 420-432. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSE-03-2013-0056>
- Schultz, T. W. (1961). Investment in Human Capital. *The American Economic Review*, 51(1), 1-17.
- Scott, M., & Unsworth, J. (2018). Matching final assessment to employability: developing a digital viva as an end programme assessment. *Higher Education Pedagogies*, 3(1), 373-384. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23752696.2018.1510294>
- Spence, M. (1973). Job Market Signaling. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 87(3), 355-374. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1882010>
- Stroebe, W. (2016). Why Good Teaching Evaluations May Reward Bad Teaching: On Grade Inflation and Other Unintended Consequences of Student Evaluations. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 11(6), 800-816. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616650284>
- Suleman, F. (2018). The employability skills of higher education graduates: insights into conceptual frameworks and methodological options. *Higher Education*, 76, 263-278. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-017-0207-0>
- Sutherland, L., & Markauskaite, L. (2012). Examining the role of authenticity in supporting the development of professional identity: an example of teacher education. *Higher Education*, 64(6), 747-766.
- Thurab-Nkhosi, D., Williams, G., & Mason-Roberts, M. (2018). Achieving confidence in competencies through authentic assessment. *Journal of Management Development*, 37(8), 652-662. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-12-2017-0413>
- Twenge, J. M., & Foster, J. D. (2010). Birth cohort increases in narcissistic personality traits among American college students, 1982-2009. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 1(1), 99-106. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550609355719>
- Useem, M., & Karabel, J. (1986). Pathways to top Corporate Management. *American Sociological Review*, 51(2), 184-200. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095515>
- Vanhercke, D., Cuyper, N., Peeters, E., & De Witte, H. (2014). Defining Perceived Employability: A Psychological Approach. *Personnel Review*, 43(4), 592-605. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-07-2012-0110>
- Villarroel, V., Bloxham, S., Bruna, D., Bruna, C., & Herrera-Seda, C. (2018). Authentic assessment: creating a blueprint for course design. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(5), 840-854. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1412396>
- Vu, T. T., & Dall'Alba, G. (2014). Authentic Assessment for Student Learning: An ontological conceptualisation. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 46(7), 778-791. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2013.795110>
- Yorke, M. (2003). Formative assessment in higher education: Moves towards theory and enhancement of pedagogic practice. *Higher Education*, 45(4), 477-501. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023967026413>

Declaration Statements

Conflict of Interest

The authors report no conflict of interest.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Ethics Statement

No dataset is associated with this article.

Open Access Agreement

This article is published under a CC BY 4.0 license. This license allows reusers to distribute, remix, adapt, and build upon the material in any medium or format, so long as attribution is given to the creator. The license allows for commercial use. For more information please visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>