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**Abstract:**

With growing competition, employers are increasingly differentiating applicants not only by their formal qualifications, but by their extra-curricular credentials and activities. Access to the activities valued by employers varies widely though, reflecting and reinforcing inequalities across different groups of students. This paper presents the outcomes from the first national survey of Australian universities’ careers service staff on the theme of equity in extra-curricular activities. Careers staff consistently highlighted the under-representation of equity group students in volunteering activities, work experience, and outbound mobility placements. In addition to time and money, many equity group students were perceived to be under-represented in extra-curricular activities because of their (misplaced) perception that such activities are marginal to employability. We draw on Bourdieu’s conception of the ‘cultural arbitrary’ and Yosso’s conception of community cultural wealth to highlight the need for more inclusive university practices which recognise alternative extra-curricular activities within employability strategies.

**Paper:**

**Introduction**

Extra-curricular activities (ECAs) can be broadly described as ‘activities and events that students engaged in, which are not part of their formal degree classification’ (Thompson, Clark, Walker, &
Commonly recognised extra-curricular activities include volunteering, overseas experience, and participation in student clubs and societies (Kinash et al., 2015; Perna, 2013; Yorke & Knight, 2006). Participation in ECAs has been linked with improved graduate outcomes (Richardson, Bennett & Roberts, 2016), including through social connections made that can help graduates find jobs and progress in their careers (Stuart et al., 2011). Employers may use ECAs to gauge skills and cultural fit (Rivera 2012), and to differentiate between candidates with equivalent qualifications and academic results (Stuart et al., 2011).

Theoretical Framework

The tendency of ECAs to exacerbate inequity by reflecting broader socio-economic stratification highlights a ‘cultural arbitrary’ (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977), whereby values attributed to different forms of cultural capital are arbitrary in the sense that they are determined by their relations to power structures rather than by intrinsic worth. In a “crowded” labour market (Tomlinson, 2012, p.408) those qualities and experiences which are deemed to make graduates employable are largely determined by socio-economic positioning (Allen, Quinn et al. 2013), reproducing inequalities by reinforcing an ideal that reflects middle class characteristics (Morley, 2007).

The kinds of capital emphasised within traditional ECAs, meeting the cultural arbitrary, are typically held by students from middle class backgrounds. However, Yosso (2005) highlights that marginalised groups often hold different types of capital that lie unrecognised and unrewarded by employers (and universities). This critique challenges the way marginalised cultural expressions are degraded, rather than analysed for the ways they provide people of colour, in particular, transferable and valuable capabilities. Examples of such alternative capitals include resistant, familial, and linguistic capital, or the ‘intellectual and social skills attained through communication experiences in more than one language and/or style’ (Yosso, 2005, p.78).

In Australia, for example, Indigenous students and students from non-English speaking backgrounds (NESB) do not necessarily identify with the concept of volunteering in the same way as their peers. Many of these students spend time assisting their families and communities in ways that are neither measured nor rewarded by universities, including caring and kinship responsibilities (Walsh & Black, 2015). These same family and community commitments for economically marginalised people can be a source of development of persistence, resourcefulness, motivation toward achievement in the form of viewing themselves as fulfilling family potential unrealised due financial constraints (Mallman
New migrants also have numerous home and community involvements that, though not recognised as ECAs, provide a source of support, identification, and inspiration (Harvey and Mallman 2019; Harvey et al. 2018). What could be viewed by employers as the source of rich development of skills and personal attributes are not viewed as having legitimate exchange value.

**Methodology**

Our research involved a desktop review, survey of student union managers, and a separate survey of university careers service managers (or equivalent) from each of the 37 Australian public universities. Career managers responded to a survey administered via Qualtrics. A total of 29 out of the 37 invited managers responded to the survey, representing a 78 per cent response rate. Survey responses were obtained from universities with campuses across all states and territories of Australia, and covered a range of university types (see Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University group</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-aligned universities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of Eight (Go8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Research Universities (IRU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Universities Network (RUN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Technology Network (ATN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked their perspectives on the extent to which equity group students were participating in traditional careers services, such as CV assistance, interview preparation, and employer forums; and in traditional extra-curricular activities, such as formal volunteering, work-integrated learning, and outbound mobility. We concentrated on the six identified equity groups in Australia higher education, namely students from low socio-economic (SES), non-English speaking, and regional backgrounds, Indigenous students, those with a disability, and women in non-traditional areas such as Engineering and IT.
The survey found that only 48 per cent of the careers services monitored the service uptake of any of the equity groups. About one quarter of the managers reported that an inability to identify students from equity groups restricted their capacity to promote services to these groups and monitor their service uptake. In particular, managers of careers services reported that it was difficult to identify low SES students in order to monitor their service uptake and tailor careers services to them. While SES information (i.e. place of residence) is recorded in student information systems, the managers of careers services did not appear to have access to this information.

The careers services provided some tailored support to the equity groups. Slightly more than one half of the services tailored careers support to students from non-English speaking backgrounds, often targeting language and cultural issues. Women in non-traditional subject areas were the equity group that received the least amount of tailored careers support.

Findings

Our survey revealed broad concern about under-representation in ECAs across all equity groups, but respondents were also frustrated by the paucity of equity data that was either collected and/or made accessible to them. The perceptions of managers around representation were broadly consistent with student union responses and also resonated with previous research by the authors, which noted substantial under-representation of equity groups in ECAs such as study abroad and work integrated learning experiences. Relatedly, national data also confirm that graduates with a disability or from non-English speaking backgrounds typically record lower than average employment outcomes (Harvey & Mallman 2019). Managers were typically aware of these data, but constrained by the paucity of equity data, which itself reflected the marginalisation of careers services within the university and the need for greater analytic capacity.

We explore perceived reasons for under-representation, which included constraints of time and money, but also attitudinal and cultural issues. Some students were believed to be over-privileging academic achievement above participation in ECAs, potentially to their detriment. Others, particularly those from non-English speaking backgrounds, were perceived to be concerned about their level of English proficiency and the extent to which they would be welcomed in ECAs. Students with a disability were seen to be concerned about physical access and psychological support for work integrated learning and other activities, while regional students were typically seen to be under-represented because of constraints of distance. While only perceptions, these views were found to be
consistent with student union responses and with the broader data and research.

Careers managers were asked about their knowledge of university strategies to address under-representation within traditional ECAs, and many pointed to the existence of bursaries and scholarships to support low SES and other equity groups. However, strategies appeared to be limited in scope and scale.

Discussion

In our explanation of ECAs and structural inequity, we further explore how under-represented students are often excluded from participation in the activities of highest perceived value. Compounding this lack of access to traditional ECAs is an under-acknowledgement of the alternative extra-curricular activities undertaken by many equity group students, such as paid work roles, caring for family, and involvement with community. Together, these processes serve to reify a system of structural inequity and to value some forms of cultural capital above others.

There are therefore immediate challenges to educate all students about the importance of ECAs, and to remove financial, temporal and cultural barriers to the participation of students in such activities. More broadly though, there exists a challenge to institutions to review the kinds of capital that are recognised, and the kinds of ECAs that are supported and valued. Part of this review could consider how universities might recognise students who work (beyond formal WIL and placements in cognate degree fields) and who contribute to their families and communities in ways not currently acknowledged.

Conclusion

Universities need to focus on mainstreaming employability education within the curriculum where possible in order to minimise inequity, and on developing targeted strategies for particular groups with discrete needs. Providing access and support for marginalised students to undertake traditional ECAs is also critical, but we posit the equal need for universities to value and formally recognise alternative extra-curricular activities. Many equity group students are active in caring, family and community roles, and these roles could be recognised formally within university extra-curricular frameworks. A recalibration of ECA recognition would redress the ‘cultural arbitrary’ that currently exacerbates student inequity, and would value the forms of capital that diverse students bring to the university.
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