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**Abstract**

The aim of this paper is to conduct research on the needs of the business by requiring Australian Graduate Attributes in Higher Education. The study seeks to answer the research questions Graduate Attributes in Higher Education in Australia play an central role in business given the contemporary global uncertainty related to the increasing technological advancement concerning social and political and social disruption.

**Introduction**

 The concept of ‘graduate attributes’ denote to a range of skills that are beyond discipline like that of soft or transferable skills, generic and life-long learning. The need for the development of graduate attributes emerged from a focus of the employability of graduates. However, for the past twenty years, the limitations between the concepts like graduate attributes, employability and learning outcomes are indistinctly used. Some observers, however, viewed these concepts detrimental to the personal and social developments of students by suggesting that the terms are visibly related to employability risks of erosion.

The classification of employability and citizenship as a binary opposition is neither helpful nor necessary (Oliver and Jorre de St Jorre 2018). The broad categories of graduate attributes that have been identified as vital to industry bodies and employers are overlapping to each other if not crossover. There are even several parallels between pedagogies which focus on citizenship and employability for the promotion of graduates’ development. Such as, the pedagogies use work and service integrated learning for engaging the students and contextualize the attributes.

 Several national projects in Australia have pursued to classify the graduate attributes that are vital to higher education providers by fostering and adopting strategies to assure their strategies (Barrie Simon, Hughes Clair, and Crisp Geoff n.d.). By looking at contemporary policy changes at government level and requirements of quality concerning higher education, and wider socio-economic changes at international level, it is high time to analyze how these projects have been contributing to the providers of higher education in Australia. Currently, there have been cardinal changes and that are beyond higher education as there is an increase in demand-driven funding. At the same time, the diversity and number of providers have significantly increased, particularly, the non-university providers. Apart from this, the requirements have been tightened in the revised Higher Education Standards Framework. The providers have to provide evidence that they have achieved the learning outcome along with skills that are vital to life-long learning and employment (Commonwealth of Australia, 2015 n.d.). Further than the higher education, technological and geopolitical developments have risen the interruption of countries, labour supply and demand, and voting patterns.

**Literature Review**

**Examining Graduate Attribute Agenda**

The review of literature about graduate attributes exhibits four broad understanding of their purpose: life-long learning, employability, acting for the social good and formulating for an ambiguous future. While performing for the social good and an uncertain future are closely associated with social inclusion with more stress on the curriculum and the future, and transformation of the students. Within these understandings, students are characterized as entering into an uncertain and unknown future.

Peta S. Cook has reviewed a few continuous graduate problems in the higher education sector of Australia twenty years after their introduction and workability, readiness, and mapping and resourcing (Cook 2018). The investigation focusses the continuous pitfalls of graduates attributes in accordance with the purpose, contextualization and implementation. However, there exist significant institutional and student outcomes by the graduate attributes, role and purpose of the universities and the problems of diversity and resources. (Cook 2018).

**Graduate Attributes for 2020 and Beyond**

Beverley Oliver and Trina Jorre de St Jorre have scrutinized three areas of practice in both the university and non-university providers that were omitted this kind of analysis in Australia (Oliver and Jorre de St Jorre 2018). First, they investigated the graduate attributes mostly published by discipline groups and institution along with their emphasis change over time. Second, how these graduate attributes are assured, compared, employers view of these attributes, including the practices of higher education providers. Lastly, in the first two areas they have connected their findings by making recommendations for equipping more than 2020 graduates for employability and recommendation.

The findings based on these areas recommended that all the university and non-university providers and the discipline groups need to have more clear graduate attributes to students and public; in the assessed curricula they need to continue embedding, but there is an evident assessment while the attributes are explained and communicated frequently throughout the course; keep on measuring stockholders perception; have emphasis attributes that are linked to teamwork, international citizenship and communication; have stress to independence, fundamental foundational skills, problem-solving, critical thinking, and independence (Oliver and Jorre de St Jorre 2018). Most significantly, revise the attributes regularly so that they could ensure fitness for purpose in the continuously varying environment by which the graduates function.

Currently, there has been the propagation of commentary on disruption and change: implications of artificial intelligence and robotics, upsetting effects of digital advancement, the continuous threats of climate change, cybersecurity and terrorism, and the global financial crisis. What graduates have been facing is known as the post-truth era in which objectivity is less significant. It has increasingly being difficult to predict futuristic phenomenon.

**Pattern, Problems and Prospects**

Gabriel Donleavy investigated the clusters or patterns of the graduate attributes in Australia who are policed by TEQSA and the universities have announced them on the official websites (Donleavy 2013). The findings, however, were that there is the availability of each university’s graduate attributes after investigation of the top five graduate attributes, each cluster of university discloses substantial cross-cluster variation (Donleavy 2013). The research limitation includes the content analysis of each university's official website at the discourse level.

However, there are rationales that these universities have not entirely overlooked their part in the society and competitive environment. Moreover, for the maintenance of their accreditation, Australian providers of higher education need to comply with the TEQSA standards. The TEQSA evaluate the risk factors while auditing the universities. However, in previous surveys, Australian universities have series policy implications (Donleavy 2013). The graduate attributes are usually assessed for students is a serious concern of contemporary practices. If student is not engaged as a partner or are not made aware of these aspirations, the assessment plans would critically fail. Therefore, the universities need to analyze the nature of different graduate attributes and their association to the individual discipline. However, there has been an increasing ineffectiveness and confusion of the graduate attributes between the public and private sector, and above capital nature of education in contemporary universities. While many universities have understood the eternal appropriate values with employability.

**Social Inclusion and Higher Education Curriculum**

Over the last fifteen year of drawing data from thirty-nine universities, Theresa Winchester-Seeto Agnes Bosanquet, and Anna Rowe, scrutinized the influencing factors for graduate attributes with two keys aspects: global perspective and diversity. In addition, social inclusion in higher education by evaluating the statements of universities. Graduate attributes form a vision of an institute and they try to develop values, knowledge and dispositions they want to communicate (Bosanquet, Winchester-Seeto, and Rowe 2012). Such justification and statements represent a feature of the planned curriculum, but may not reflect the experience or enacted curriculum. Bradley’s review of Australian higher education, social discussion have absorbed on access to opportunities and socio-economic scopes of participation.

Till to date, pedagogical and curriculum concerns have faced less critical attention. Australian graduate statements and policies have often pronounced social inclusion with the view of respect and appreciation of diversity with an international perspective by participating in the community. These outcomes reflect significant themes established in the most descriptions of social inclusion. However, in higher education, the role of an educational curriculum is equivocal, without no consequences what form it should take and what it should be. It is, however, become important to acquire an understanding of an institutional conceptualization of social inclusion.

**Realizing Graduate Attributes in the Research Degree**

In realizing graduate attribute in the research degree, Elke Stracke and Vijay Kumar have debated the role of peer support groups (PSGs)and have specified that top-down entrenching of graduate attributes has limited success. With a bottom-up approach, they have shown the PSGs in Malaysia Austalia, and New Zealand, the findings of an exploratory opinion survey (Elke Stracke and Vijay Kumar n.d.). The survey required the present and past PSG members to share their learning experiences regarding graduate attributes’ development. The participants, however, preferred five attributes: teamwork, research organization, self-motivation, critical thinking, and communication.

By looking at the growth of graduate attributes with the prism of the students adds for their conceptualization of how PSGs help in developing graduate attributes. The peer support groups (PSGz) have the ability to play a vital role in comprehending graduate attributes in the research degree. With a focus on three specific PSG, would bring a learner-centred view around graduate attributes (Elke Stracke and Vijay Kumar n.d.). However, there is agreement that the attributes in a disciplinary context are more engaging. Contextualization helps inconsiderate the interrelationships between integrating and transfer, concepts and organize.

**Research and Development in Higher Education**

 To reflect on the first year of the project, the Aboriginal academic staff has drawn on the Critical Race Theory along with the work of Ladson-Billings (Research and Development in Higher Education: The Shape of Higher Education Vol. 39 | herdsa.org.au n.d.). To produce graduates who are ready to engage with a professional workforce has pressurized to universities to bring graduates. Moreover, the graduates are expected to be highly skilled and meet the continuous demand in this rapidly changing technological advancement. The graduate attributes, currently, need to focus on generic skills like critical think, communication, working collaboratively. While globalization has been forcing universities to produce graduates with international skills and intercultural.

Graduate attributes are an instrument for both fostering graduate abilities and development of employment skills for bringing social change. There is an increasing recognition that university graduate needs to contribute to increasing outcomes for Torres and Aboriginal islanders by looking at the transformative possibilities of a substantial number of graduates have empowered to work effectively.

**Building Employability Skills**

Building employability skills for students of higher education has been a vital focus in Australia. By presenting an example, Robert Joseph Gill examined the higher education communication disciplines from across Australia that permits students to have direct engagements with industry leaders (Gill 2018). Moreover, Gill has explored student forums, media and communication and public relations. This would produce multi-institutional groups of students, academics, leaders, and industry practitioners with regard to aid the student’s development like effective work habits, time management, job application and networking. Teaching and learning tool has a unique value in the development that includes industry, students, feedback between educators, and collaboration.

 Through various disciplines groups, the notion of threshold outcome would be adopted, and such reports are found important for assessment practices and improving networks. The discipline with defined threshold learning outcomes has been continuously increasing. While the formulation of networks usually supports additionally for designing of the course, assessment and quality improvement. However, employability development should not be at the cost of global citizenship. The employer, however, should be positive about the foundation of graduates, employability, technical skills and collaborative skills. In fact, the attributes are not enough, the universities ought to strengthen students’ ability to self-assessment, identification, and articulation. This view must be applied to assessment and learning associations with graduate attributes.

**Conclusion**

 There is a need to admit the surprising achievement of higher education providers for producing graduates with apparatuses for careers and success in life. A great amount of hard work, particularly discipline leaders and degree has driven to substantial influence on acquiring attributes that are beyond the disciplinary understanding at all levels. In this regard, the higher education sector requires providers who demonstrate the achievements that attributes have acquired. Nonetheless, a volatile international provider needs to evaluate regularly and carefully and revise their understanding of attributes.

 The providers need to publish the focused attributes by bringing into line the emphasis with their students’ requirements and the purposes of their institutions. In addition, they need to make sure that all the attributes are communicated and contextualized at a course level, along with marketing materials, course handbooks and curriculum. Moreover, they ought to be explicit with the students and share their intended outcomes and importance all over the course. Have emphasis towards the attributes that have an association with the communication, teamwork, and global citizenship, problem-solving and critical thinking. To test their achievements, they need to draw objective measures for testing the students’ achievements. Keep on using perception measures along with stakeholder groups, review and refresh the attributes.
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