

2013

## Enhancing Graduate Attributes: a Preliminary Research Study.

Eric Bates

*Technological University Dublin, eric.bates@tudublin.ie*

Peter Hinch

*Technological University Dublin, peter.hinch@tudublin.ie*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://arrow.tudublin.ie/bescharcrep>



Part of the [Educational Methods Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Bates, E. and Hinch, P. Enhancing Graduate Attributes: a preliminary research study. DIT Teaching Fellowship Reports 2012 - 2013.

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Dublin School of Architecture at ARROW@TU Dublin. It has been accepted for inclusion in Reports by an authorized administrator of ARROW@TU Dublin. For more information, please contact [arrow.admin@tudublin.ie](mailto:arrow.admin@tudublin.ie), [aisling.coyne@tudublin.ie](mailto:aisling.coyne@tudublin.ie).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-Share Alike 4.0 License](#)

## **Enhancing Graduate Attributes: a preliminary research study.**

Eric Bates & Peter Hinch

### Abstract

The objective of this teaching fellowship research project was to establish if graduate attributes should form part of student education within programmes offered by the Dublin Institute of Technology. This study was conducted during one semester and concentrated on one aspect of graduate attributes which were interview skills. Two videos were scripted, shot and edited that focused on interviews from the perspective of both the interviewer and the interviewee. These videos were showcased with lecturers whose feedback indicated that some improvements were required. Following those improvements the videos were shown to two student groups for feedback. The videos successfully provoked an awareness of the requirements in both situations and were well received. It is recommended that further research be carried out on developing materials and resources that focus on enhancing graduate attributes. These resources could be integrated into a dedicated module and embedded within programmes.

*Keywords: Graduate attributes, interview skills*

## Introduction

The National Strategy for Higher Education to 2030, commonly referred to as the Hunt Report, asks the question ‘*what are the right skills for the graduates of 2015 and of 2030 and what mix of skills should we pursue as learning outcomes of higher education?*’ (Higher Education Strategy Group 2011: 35). The answer that is proposed calls for increased attention to be paid to core skills such as communications and team working skills (ibid). International research also highlights the importance of communication skills for graduates, and indeed ranked first in a list of graduate attributes in a survey of 350 graduate employers in a recent Australian survey (Graduate Careers Australia, 2013). Communications skills were also ranked third in research that sought to determine what were the most important skills new employers look for in new hires (Hart, 2006). Thus, communications skills are a key part of the skills set of graduates.

Further, it has been pointed out that if graduates ‘*understand what employers are looking for and work to develop the skills and attributes they value, graduates will have an edge on the competition*’ (CBI, 2009: 6). Being aware that employers desire such skills should provide students with the impetus to develop these attributes.

The purpose of this research was to produce reusable resources that could be embedded within a communications module and used institute wide. This could potentially lead to the development of a generic module that would be aimed at enhancing graduate attributes. After much discussion it was agreed that interview skills would be the focus of this research.

Interview skills are one of the key factors to gaining employment. It is common practice for an interviewee to be advised on the importance of non-verbal presentation as well as verbal presentation (Bolles, 2008). Such non-verbal cues include the dress code and the sitting position. Indeed, in a meta-analysis on research carried out regarding interview assessments Barrick, Shaffer & DeGrassi (2009) found positive correlations between non-verbal behaviours and interviewer evaluations. This would appear to be common sense. Yet, some research would appear to be contradictory. Tsai, Huang, & Yu (2012) found that non-verbal behaviour had no effect on interviewer evaluations. However, the authors themselves indicate that the different research designs may have contributed to the difference between their research and that of Barrick et al (2009) and further suggest that Barrick et al (2009) may not have been able to control for other applicant behaviour and as a result the findings may be closer than on first inspection.

Given the proliferation of social media and networks this research set out to produce a series of videos focussing on interview skills. It was expected that the videos produced could utilise social media in a positive way to disseminate their research to the target student cohort and thus maximise its impact and benefits.

## **Research Outline**

The project plan had specific dates and deadlines that were put in place in order to produce a finished product by the end of the academic year. As such there were distinct phases throughout.

### **Phase 1 Production:**

This phase involved the development and writing of a series of videos related to interviewing skills. The authors scripted two distinct videos. One video would demonstrate a well prepared candidate and an ill prepared interviewer (Video 1). The second video would demonstrate an ill prepared candidate and a well prepared interviewer (Video 2). The authors used personal digital video recorders and shot the footage in the home of one of the authors. This footage was then edited through free movie editing software to produce the two separate videos.

It is important to note that the research was not trying to put together videos that could be held up as perfect examples of how to do an interview. Given the different requirements of employers it was felt that this would be too restrictive. Rather, the research set out to produce videos that would provoke debate and discussion among participants and students. Such discussions, it was hoped, would lead to a more enriching and participative experience for the students and staff alike. To help achieve this it was decided to incorporate a certain comedic element. This took the form of exaggeration that would perhaps not be typical of an interviewer or an interviewee.

### **Phase 2 Staff Workshops:**

Once the videos were edited a lunchtime workshop was run with lecturing staff. This workshop took place in a lecture room and used a large screen, digital projector and speakers. Before the videos were shown a briefing note was read. Please see Appendix A for the text. After each video was shown short questionnaire sheets were given out – please see Appendix B. Discussions then took place where specific questions were put to the group – please see Appendix C.

## **Results and Discussion**

During the staff workshops both videos were showcased. After each video was screened a short two question survey was given out – see Appendix B. This was carried out immediately after the videos finished before any discussions took place. It was important to capture the participant's initial reactions. After the questionnaires were gathered a short focus group discussion took place with one of the authors leading the discussion and the second author acting as recorder. Ten participants took part in the workshops and for each questionnaire ten sheets were returned. To begin, the results from Video 1 Prepared Candidate will be discussed.

### Question 1.

| Question                      | Agree<br>5 | 4 | Don't know<br>3 | 2 | Disagree<br>1 |
|-------------------------------|------------|---|-----------------|---|---------------|
| 1. This video is a good idea. | 80%        |   | 10%             |   | 10%           |

Table 1 Question 1 results

The overall consensus was that the video was a good idea with eight out of ten agreeing while one indicated disagreement and one also indicating a 'don't know'. There was a comment box beneath each question and generally the responses were positive. Examples included 'It will keep the students interested', 'multimedia always works well in the class room.' The participant that indicated 'Don't know' wrote that 'lecturers are expected to entertain rather than teach, I am not sure we should be doing this kind of thing.' Interestingly the participant that disagreed wrote 'this is not part of our job.'

### Question 2.

| Question                                      | Agree<br>5 | 4 | Don't know<br>3 | 2 | Disagree<br>1 |
|---|------------|---|-----------------|---|---------------|
| 2. I would use such a video with my students. | 40%        |   | 10%             |   | 50%           |

Table 2 Question 2 results

Four out of the ten participants indicated they would use such a video with their students. Comments included the following 'I have thought of doing stuff like this myself but never got around to it' and 'a selection of these videos would be perfect for my module.' Despite the majority indicating in Question 1 that the video was a good idea it was surprising that so many of the participants would not actually use the video (50%). However, the comments section provided some elaboration which went some way to explaining the response rate. Comments from participants who would not use such a video included the following 'I do not have time on my module' and 'I do not use media like this' and perhaps most telling 'students would expect me to have videos for every class.' The participant who indicated indecisiveness wrote 'I am not sure of the learning this would generate, I tend to be slightly sceptical of this kind of thing anyway.'

### Focus group discussion

This discussion took place after the questionnaires had been collected. The questions were put to the group by one of the authors while the other acted as scribe and recorder taking written notes. The first question put to the group was 'what was good about the video?' An overwhelming reaction was the comedic element. The group identified the funny elements as a key point in keeping their attention.

The group was then asked 'what was not so good about the video?' Once again there was an immediate overwhelming response that the videos were too long. Each video lasted approximately six minutes and the general agreement was that this may not hold the interest of students who 'are raised on YouTube clips of 90 seconds' (participant 2). Following close behind this point was the quality of the video. Being shot on a home camera meant that the

quality suffered and the audio was distinctly poor as radio microphones were not used in the production.

Lastly the group were asked 'what would you do to improve the video?' Not surprisingly the quality of the picture and the audio was highlighted as well as the length of the video. The lead researcher prompted the group regarding the comedic element. There was a worry that too much comedy might be seen as too slapstick and devalue the aim of the video. The group disagreed with this point.

### **Phase 3 Re-shoot.**

Given the overwhelming criticism of the quality of the videos it was decided to try improving the product. To this end, Roy Moore of the Telemetric Facility in DIT was contacted and he agreed to become our technical advisor to help improve the quality of the videos. Roy has a mini studio with high grade equipment and an expert knowledge of what is involved in shooting, editing and finishing high quality video films. Over the course of several weeks the video scripts were edited and re-shot under Roy's supervision with the use of radio microphones and professional editing techniques. The end result was two streamlined high quality videos which were shorter in duration and vastly improved sound quality. The next step in the research was to run student workshops in order to obtain feedback.

### **Student Workshops.**

Ten students were recruited to take part in the student workshops. In order to ensure objectivity the students were from a course which neither author had any contact with. The ten students were split into two groups and shown either video 1 or video 2.

Video 1 group:

The students were given a pre video worksheet which asked 'You are required to carry out an interview. Please list the factors to be considered in carrying out the interview.' Five minutes was allotted for this task. The sheets were then collected and the video was shown. When the video was finished the students were given another blank worksheet and asked to fill it out once more to allow for additional comments.

Pre-video responses listed items such as dress code, eye contact, preparation in terms of the questions to be asked, to look and be professional.

Post video responses listed items such as the importance of a hand shake in making a good impression, being organised for the interview, being professional in terms of phone etiquette, information for interviewee in terms of signage, job specific questions, and professional conclusion to the interview.

Video 1 can be viewed here:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RA-Ja4Z0jaI>

Video 2 group:

The second group of students were also given a pre video worksheet which asked 'You have been called for an interview. Please list the factors to be considered in attending the interview.' Five minutes was allotted for this task. The sheets were then collected and the video was shown. When the video was finished the students were given another blank worksheet and asked to fill it out once more to allow for additional comments.

Pre-video responses included the following:

- The importance of dressing appropriately,
- Carry out some background research on the company,
- Bring references,
- What I have to offer the company,
- Stay positive, smile but don't grin.

Post video results included the following:

- Always switch off the phone,
- Give a good handshake,
- Correct posture during interview,
- Have prepared questions,
- Positive projection of self,
- Have a good attitude.

Video 2 can be viewed here:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FQ13zayCUe4>

## **Conclusions**

It is clear that the videos were very useful as a talking point and a means of discussion among the participants. Several items were brought to light that the students deemed to be helpful both in the preparation for being an interviewee and being an interviewer. The majority of lecturers also believed this to be a useful tool. It was clear that the videos must be of a good quality to use in the classroom.

## **Recommendations**

1. Develop further material dedicated to specific themes relevant to graduate attributes. Such themes could include presentation skills, team working, problem solving and leadership skills.

2. Develop a full module focusing on enhancing graduate attributes and offer this as an elective module worth 5 ECTS. This module could become embedded within programmes leading to a focus on such generic skills being an integral part of any graduates core competencies.

### **Acknowledgements**

We would like to express our thanks to the staff and students who took part in this research project. We would like to especially thank M Roy Moore of the Telemetric Facility in DIT Aungier Street for his support in producing the videos. Finally, we wish to thank the staff of the DIT Learning, Teaching and Technology Centre for their support and advice during this project.



## References.

- Barrick, M. R., Shaffer, J. A., & DeGrassi, S. W. (2009). What you see may not be what you get: Relationships among self-presentation tactics and ratings of interview and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 1394–1411.
- Bolles, R. N. (2008). *What color is your parachute? 2009: A practical manual for job-hunters and career-changers*. Berkeley, CA: Ten Speed Press.
- CBI (2009). Future fit: Preparing graduates for the world of work. Accessed 12<sup>th</sup> May 2013 from [http://www.agcas.org.uk/agcas\\_resources/104-Future-fit-Preparing-graduates-for-the-world-of-work-](http://www.agcas.org.uk/agcas_resources/104-Future-fit-Preparing-graduates-for-the-world-of-work-)
- Graduate Careers Australia, (2013) What employers Want, Accessed 6<sup>th</sup> May 2013 from <http://www.graduatemcareers.com.au/CareerPlanningandResources/StartingYourSearch/GraduateSkillsWhatEmployersWant/index.htm>
- Hart, P., D., (2006). How Should Colleges Prepare Students To Succeed In Today's Global Economy? The Association of American Colleges and Universities
- Higher Education Strategy Group (2011) *National Strategy for Higher Education to 2030*. Dublin: The Department of Education and Skills; available online at [http://www.heai.ie/sites/default/files/national\\_strategy\\_for\\_higher\\_education\\_2030.pdf](http://www.heai.ie/sites/default/files/national_strategy_for_higher_education_2030.pdf) (last accessed September 2013).
- Tsai, W., Huang, T., & Yu, H. (2012). Investigating the unique predictability and boundary conditions of applicant physical attractiveness and non-verbal behaviours on interviewer evaluations in job interviews. *Journal Of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 85(1), 60-79.



## **Appendix A**

### DIT Teaching Fellowship Project: Enhancing Graduate Attributes.

Good afternoon and I would like to welcome you all here today. We are very grateful that you would take the time to help us in this research.

We are both very interested in enhancing graduate attributes and are trying to produce workable videos that would help graduates as they seek employment. We are going to show two videos and we would like your feedback on the videos.

The feedback sheets are anonymous so please be as honest as you can be – we value everyone's opinion.

If at any time you want to leave and take no further part in this research please feel free to do so.

Thank you

Eric Bates and Peter Hinch

## Appendix B

### VIDEO FEEDBACK SHEET

Please rate your response to the following questions on the following scale of 5 (Agree Strongly) to 1 (Disagree Strongly)

| Question                                     | Agree<br>5     | 4 | Don't know<br>3 | 2 | Disagree<br>1 |
|--|----------------|---|-----------------|---|---------------|
| 1. These videos are a good idea.             |                |   |                 |   |               |
|  | <i>Comment</i> |   |                 |   |               |
| 2. I would use such videos with my students. |                |   |                 |   |               |
|  | <i>Comment</i> |   |                 |   |               |

## **Appendix C**

Focus group discussions questions:

Question 3: what was good about the videos?

Question 4: what was not so good about the videos?

Question 5: what would you do to improve the videos?