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Literature Review

INTRODUCTION

We are in a new work reality; how we work and progress through our careers has changed dramatically and will continue to do so (Education Council, 2019; FYA, 2018; Torii, 2018). At the same time, young people have diverse, flexible work and study choices open to them and are competing in an increasingly competitive labour market (Archer, DeWitt, & Wong, 2014; Galliott, 2015; Joyce, 2019). Engagement with school and post-school education is becoming more essential to participate in the world of work and gain full access to economic, political, and social opportunities as well as increased wellbeing (Education Council, 2019; O’Connell, Milligan, & Bently, 2019). Navigating the complex pathways through school into work requires sound career development learning (CDL) – opportunities to learn ‘about the content and process of career development or life/career management’ (McMahon, Patton, & Tatham, 2003, p.6). There are suggestions that current approaches to CDL in schools are inadequate in meeting the needs of students from diverse backgrounds (Andrews & Hooley, 2017; Atalier Learning Solutions, 2012; Galliott & Graham, 2015; Moote & Archer, 2018). Providing best practice CDL might enable equitable outcomes from education and work for all students.

The COVID-19 pandemic has also had an impact on the career prospects of young people, and particularly those from diverse backgrounds. Borland (2020) writes that the effects of the pandemic are similar to those of the impacts of the global financial crisis in 2008 where the proportion of young people in employment declined and took a long time to reverse. In the European labour market, estimates show that due to the COVID-19 pandemic, up to 59 million jobs are at risk (Chinn, Klier, Stern, & Tesfu, 2020) and ‘short term job risk is highly correlated with level of education, potentially exacerbating existing social inequalities’ (Chinn et al., 2020, n.p.).

This document examines the journey of young people through education into the world of work and the influences on their planning and decision making, including aspirations, sources of information and formal, school-based career education. Based on a systematic review of the literature in this area, this document considers the CDL needs of students from LSES backgrounds as well as the best practices of provision which might help these, and every student, reach their full potential.
METHODOLOGY

This document is the result of a systematic literature review conducted to determine the factors which influence CDL of students from low SES backgrounds. The literature review was conducted using a scoping methodology (Arksey, 2005; Gore et al., 2017), which allowed for a wider understanding of the topic. Specifically, scoping reviews provide a broad overview of the literature (Kaihlanen, Haavisto, Strandell-Laine, & Salminen, 2018), disseminate research findings (Virtanen, Haavisto, Liikanen, & Kääriäinen, 2018), and facilitate analytical reinterpretation of the literature reviewed (Thier et al., 2019).

Literature were included or excluded from the review according to the following criteria.

Inclusion criteria:

- Academic articles and book chapters
- Reports and policies
- Statistics from empirical reports and reviews
- Focus on people from LSES backgrounds
- Specific to primary, secondary and tertiary students
- Global best practice

Exclusion criteria:

- In languages other than English
- Publication prior to 2009
- Non-empirical publications

The scoping literature review was conducted in stages, with the first stage was calling for literature references from known experts in the field of career education. This yielded key references and websites, which were built upon and expanded through the use of key words and author searches. The second stage of the literature search involved database searches through the University of Wollongong’s library search engine and global databases. The third stage involved searching through the CERIC website, a Canadian non-profit organisation that supports education and research into career development. CERIC had pre-existing lists of literature specific to search words and topics that had been compiled by CERIC staff to support research.

The three-stage search uncovered 310 references. Each of the abstracts were read to determine the relevance and to determine if they fit the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Those that did
not fit the criteria were discarded (n=120) and the remaining references were read in their entirety (n=190).

The literature reviewed was recorded in the Endnote referencing system and PDF copies of the articles were uploaded into Nvivo 12 Plus, a qualitative analysis software that allows for coding and analysis of the themes from the literature.

After this initial search, the research team continued to add literature to the collection that came to their attention via email newsletters and recommendations from colleagues, and via seeking out further references mentioned in the literature.

An early version of this literature review was presented to equity practitioners and researchers at the EPHEA Enabling Excellence through Equity Conference (November 2019), and attendees contributed ideas, experiences and further references which were incorporated into the literature review.

A more developed draft of the literature review was sent to the wider project team (n=6) and the Expert Panel for the project (n=11) for their input and insights. These were also incorporated into this final document.
1. THE TRANSITION FROM FULL-TIME EDUCATION TO FULL-TIME WORK

This section will discuss the context within which career development occurs in three sub-sections:

- The new work reality
- Youth employment
- Complex education and training pathways

1.1 The new work reality

The world of work is changing rapidly as a result of globalisation, artificial intelligence and technology (Education Council, 2019; FYA, 2018; OECD, 2016; Torii, 2018). Automation, global influences and more flexible roles have dramatically changed the way we work and how we progress through our careers (FYA, 2018). When we consider the term career, it is assumed that this is a sequence of work roles, both paid and unpaid, that continues over a lifetime (Fuller, McCrum, & Macfadyen, 2014; Irving, 2013). However, careers are no longer linear and in one field of work; today’s careers are flexible and multiple (FYA, 2018; LSAY, 2019; MCEECDYA, 2010; OECD, 2016). Indeed, the average 15 year old is predicted to have 17 jobs over 5 different careers in their lifetime (FYA, 2018). However, the career management competencies of our youth need to be developed in order to manage these changes in the labour market (Foundation for Young Australians, 2018b; MCEECDYA, 2010; Skillsroad, 2018).

The skills and knowledges required by employees today are different from the past and will continue to change over time. Employers today are looking (and paying a premium) for employees with transferable enterprise skills such as digital literacy, problem solving and creativity (FYA, 2018). There are also considerably more jobs in nursing and personal care work as a result of the aging population (LSAY, 2019). In the future, automation is projected to radically affect 70% of entry level jobs for young people (FYA, 2018) and it is predicted that workers in the future will have less need for skills in management and organisational coordination (FYA, 2018). On the other hand, technological advances such as the ability to create new apps, and the growth of the ‘gig economy’ are regarded as providing opportunities for young people to start businesses or become ‘entrepreneurs’ (Education Council, 2019, p. 7).

Given these, and other, profound changes in work, it is perhaps unsurprising that youth feel unprepared and lacking in the requisite skill and knowledge to participate in a complex and
highly competitive job market. It is shown that young people feel that the biggest barriers to transitioning into today’s employment market are insufficient work experience, training and qualifications (Foundation for Young Australians, 2018b; LSAY, 2019). However, young people who have developed and can explicitly demonstrate skills such as communication and problem-solving and who have significant workplace experience, make the transition to work more quickly than others (O’Connell et al., 2019). Therefore, in order to progress smoothly from school into this new work reality, having appropriate skills, knowledge and experience is vital.

The following section more closely examines the outcomes of the transition to work for young people today.

1.2 Youth employment

Upon leaving full-time education, many young people are not able to access full-time work. According to the Foundation for Young Australians, 31% of young people are un/underemployed (FYA, 2018). In 2017, eleven per cent of those who completed Year 12 in 2016 were not enrolled in study or employed the year after leaving school (Education Council, 2019). Young people who are not employed or in further study could be ‘taking a gap year, looking for work, attempting to start their own business, taking on caring responsibilities or be otherwise disengaged’ (Education Council, 2019, p. 19). The high numbers of young people disengaged from work and study is concerning, as those individuals who do work report higher levels of wellbeing, optimism, self-esteem, vitality, emotional stability, resilience and self-acceptance (Skillsroad, 2018).

A further issue related to this unemployment is the level of casualisation amongst young people (LSAY, 2019). An increasing number in this population are more likely to have more than one job compared with ten years ago, and be working in multiple jobs to reach full-time working hours (Education Council, 2019). Almost three quarters of youth cite a lack of jobs as a barrier to finding employment (LSAY, 2019). This is a pattern repeated across generations with university graduates also forced to ‘make do’ with jobs which are not consistent with their level of skill and qualification (O’Shea, 2019; QILT, 2019).

For those that do achieve full-time work, the process can be lengthy. It now takes young people on average of 2.6 years to transition from full-time education to full-time work (FYA, 2018). For some, the transition to work can take up to five years (O’Connell et al., 2019). Even with
a university degree, the transition to desirable employment in a preferred field of study can take up to four years (O’Shea, 2019). Long transitions can delay young people developing confidence and optimism about their future, making it more difficult for them to establish career, family and community life (O’Connell et al., 2019).

The effect of COVID-19 on employment in occupations such as retail and hospitality has been dire (Borland, 2020; Chinn et al., 2020), whereas individuals with higher levels of education, such as a bachelor’s degree, have been comparatively unaffected (Borland, 2020). As the economy recovers from the COVID-19 pandemic ‘there is a pressing case for programs targeted at the young to improve their prospects of employment when the economy recovers’ (Borland, 2020, n.p.) and now, more than ever, career education and training pathways are critical to the long term success of students from disadvantaged backgrounds.

Underemployment and lengthy transitions to full-time employment are part of the problematic pathways that many youth experience in their journey from school to work. The following section examines how education and training pathways are part of this complex transition process.

1.3 Education and training pathways

Australia has moved from universal primary education to near universal secondary education and a time of universal tertiary education is also emerging (O’Connell et al., 2019). Most of the jobs created in the next five years will require post-school qualifications (O’Connell et al., 2019), predominantly, a bachelor degree or higher in professional occupations such as registered nursing, and software and applications programming. To be competitive in the job markets of the future, students will need to not only complete Year 12 but also obtain additional qualifications through post-school education or training (Education Council, 2019). It is also likely that young people will have to engage and reengage with post-school education throughout their lives (Bolton, 2019; O’Connell et al., 2019). Those who do not complete the final year of schooling are less likely to gain full access to Australia’s economic, political, and social opportunities, and this can impact their ability to achieve financial independence (Education Council, 2019).

School-to-work pathways have changed dramatically and traditional routes to work have been described as irrelevant (FYA, 2018; International Centre for Career Development and Public Policy, 2017; Raciti, 2019; Ranasinghe, Chew, Knight, & Siekmann, 2019). The idea of a step
by step progression from school through higher levels of learning into work is not necessarily a ‘myth’ (O’Connell et al., 2019, p. 5), but a straightforward path which is experienced by few and mainly those who live in metropolitan areas and often from high socioeconomic status backgrounds (Ranasinghe et al., 2019). Instead, most Australian young people experience diverse and individualised school-to-work pathways which include frequent switching between higher education (HE) and vocational education and training (VET) activities, episodes of part-time work and repeatedly moving in and out of the labour market (Ranasinghe et al., 2019).

HE is often viewed as a more prestigious educational pathway (OECD, ILO, UNESCO, & The European Commission, 2019) and is increasingly becoming a prerequisite to enter the labour market (Education Council, 2019). However, HE is not necessary for all jobs and many people find vocational education more appropriate. VET is essential for providing pathways to skilled employment in many industries, however, VET students are faced with complex and confusing funding models including large up-front fees not faced by university students who may access low-interest loans (Education Council, 2019). Also, VET providers are reported to be slow at developing qualifications to match workplace demands (Joyce, 2019); and there continues to be quality issues with some VET providers (Joyce, 2019). Despite these differences, the distinction between HE and vocational education is becoming less clear (Bolton, 2019) and options such as micro-credentialing offer flexible opportunities for timely skill and knowledge development (Education Council, 2019).

There is a need for better support for flexible educational pathways. The ‘current frenzy of education-system reviews’ (Kift, 2019, n.p.) such as reviews of HE (Bradley, Noonan, Nugent, & Scales, 2008); regional remote and rural education (Halsey, 2017); vocational education and training (Joyce, 2019); career development (Atalier Learning Solutions, 2012); pathways into work further education and training (Education Council, 2019); and the Australian Qualifications Framework (Noonan, 2019), provide growing evidence that the current education and training system needs to be redesigned to better meet the needs of contemporary youth.

It is recommended that Australia invests in redesigning learning pathways from education to work ‘to ensure young Australians are equipped and empowered with the skills, mindset and confidence they urgently need’ (FYA, 2018, p. 12). Suggested improvements include: a commitment to work-integrated models of learning through school-industry partnerships (Education Council, 2019; FYA, 2018; OECD, 2016; Torii, 2018); less focus on ATAR (which
meets the narrow needs of a single pathway); and more focus on providing every student with the broad transferrable knowledge, skills and attributes they need for learning, life and work (Bolton, 2019; Education Council, 2019). Other innovative suggestions include the development of individual learner profiles (O’Connell et al., 2019) or educational passports (Bolton, 2019) designed to provide a trusted, common way of representing the full range of attainments of young people during their transition years (within school and beyond) across a broad range of domains.

As can be seen, there is significant change occurring in the education and training arena to reflect the changing world of work. The next section introduces a group of young people who often experience inequitable access and outcomes from education, training and employment and stand to continue to participate inequitably in the future world of work unless equity measures are achieved (Australian Government, 2013a).
2. CONSIDERING STUDENTS FROM LSES BACKGROUNDS

This section discusses the situation for young people from LSES backgrounds and what is known about their educational and employment outcomes.

2.1 Defining equity students and those from LSES backgrounds

In Australia, there are six groups of students that are recognised as having inequitable academic and employment outcomes in comparison to the broader population (Department of Education, 2018). These are:

- Students with a disability;
- Students from regional, rural and remote areas;
- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students;
- Students from low socioeconomic status (LSES) backgrounds;
- Students from non-English speaking backgrounds (NESB); and
- Women in non-traditional areas (WINTA).

The identification of students from LSES backgrounds is ‘messy business’ (Zacharias, 2017, p. 52). Officially, the socioeconomic status (SES) of Australian students is categorised as high, medium or low, as defined by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) Socio Economic Indexes of Areas (SEIFA), Index of Education and Occupation (ABS, 2018). This index reflects the educational and occupational level of communities. Within the population, the top 25% of the population aged 15–64 are classified as high SES based on where they live; the middle 50% of the population are classified as medium SES; and the bottom 25% of the population as low SES (QILT, 2019). Students are classified as being from a LSES background based on the statistical area (SA1) of their permanent home residence (Department of Education, 2018). However, in practice, literal interpretation of LSES based on SA1 is unworkable as it would require the singling out of individual students for targeted support (Zacharias, 2017).

Furthermore, the effects of multiple forms of disadvantage overlap (intersectionality) and potentially compound barriers to educational and employment outcomes, having a profound impact on equity (Education Council, 2019). Research on students who are the first in the family to attend university are also useful in understanding the experiences of equity groups as this cohort is intersected by multiple equity markers (O’Shea, 2016-2019). As a result, as Zacharias (2017, p. 53) found, in university practice, there is a focus on students from ‘low
SES backgrounds’ but this term is the ‘shorthand way for addressing education disadvantage’ experienced by other equity groups as well.

The following section examines the education and work outcomes for students from LSES backgrounds.

### 2.2 Employment and educational outcomes for students from LSES backgrounds

This section examines the outcomes for young people from LSES backgrounds in their journey from high school, through further education and into work. While the focus of this section is the reported outcomes of students from LSES backgrounds, the intersectionality of this cohort means that many students in this ‘category’ might also be from regional, rural or remote areas; have a disability; identify as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander; or have travelled to Australia as a result of conflict within their home country. These factors have a ‘compounding effect’ on disadvantage (McLachlan, Gilfilan, & Gordon, 2013, p. 93). Furthermore, the outcomes of students with backgrounds from ‘multiple categories of disadvantage’ are nuanced and largely hidden in aggregated statistical data (Richardson, Bennett, & Roberts, 2016). Therefore, the educational and employment outcomes discussed in this section might actually be poorer for students who fit within multiple equity groups.

Whilst there is evidence that students from LSES backgrounds experience disadvantage in comparison to students from HSES backgrounds, evidence indicates that many students from LSES backgrounds thrive due to the supports from widening participation (WP) programs (Zacharias, 2017), support from teachers, career advisors and mentors (Bridge Group, 2017; Cuervo, Chesters, & Aberdeen, 2019; Harwood, McMahon, O’Shea, Bodkin-Andrews, & Priestley, 2015), and through the growth of social capital (Cuervo et al., 2019). O’Shea and Delahunty (2019) write that by moving away from the deficit view of outcomes for students from LSES backgrounds the strengths, skills and knowledge of this cohort can be more effectively utilised, leading to a better chance of career success.

Young people from LSES backgrounds do not perform as well at school, on average, as their higher SES peers (McLachlan et al., 2013). Students from LSES backgrounds have a higher probability of leaving school early (McLachlan et al., 2013). Specifically, only 73% of students from LSES backgrounds complete Year 12 compared to 83% of students from high SES backgrounds (Education Council, 2019). Furthermore, the subjects studied by senior high school students in NSW are related to their socioeconomic characteristics and locality meaning
that the senior school curriculum is operating as a system to reinforce social status rather than equalise it (Roberts, Dean, & Lommatsch, 2019).

The educational participation rates of students from LSES backgrounds in further education is lower than that of students from other SES background groups as Figure 1 illustrates (Brett, 2018; Cunninghame, 2017; Li & Carroll, 2017; Ranasinghe et al., 2019). In compulsory school education, equity groups make up a substantial proportion of students, but their proportion declines significantly in non-compulsory, post-school education. Specifically, students from LSES backgrounds comprise 25% of school students, but they only make up 18% and 17% of VET and HE students respectively. This occurs for students with a language background other than English, a disability, from regional and remote areas; and students who identify as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander. Individuals from LSES backgrounds are 20% less likely to follow the pathway into HE and then work than those from the high SES backgrounds (Ranasinghe et al., 2019). At the same time, they are 12% more likely to follow a pathway where they enter full-time work early through apprenticeships or traineeships (Ranasinghe et al., 2019).

In 2015, only 58.9 per cent of young people from the lowest SES decile of the population were engaged in full-time study or work; this percentage rises with each SES decile, reaching 83.1 per cent for those in the highest decile (Lamb, Jackson, Walstab, & Huo, 2015). Indeed, rates of participation in the workforce, overall employment, and full-time employment for people from economically disadvantaged backgrounds are significantly lower than the rest of the population (Cunningham, Orsmond, & Price, 2014). Accordingly, unemployment rates are also higher (Cunningham et al., 2014). As a result, economically disadvantaged Australians
experience financial difficulties and seek help from community groups at significantly higher rates than others (Cunningham et al., 2014).

In HE, widening participation strategies have attracted students (‘additional students’) who would historically not have attended university (Productivity Commission, 2019, p. 2). These additional students were largely those from LSES backgrounds (Productivity Commission, 2019). Recent research discovered that students from LSES backgrounds perform less well academically on average (Li & Carroll, 2017), possibly because they enter university with weaker literacy and numeracy skills to begin with (Productivity Commission, 2019), and are more likely to drop out and not complete their studies (Andrewartha & Harvey, 2017; Productivity Commission, 2019) due to competing priorities such as work and family.

Students from LSES backgrounds also experience unequal employment outcomes from their university experience (QILT, 2019). Specifically, graduates from LSES backgrounds experience lower employment rates than those from high socioeconomic (HSES) backgrounds (69.8% vs 74.9%) and lower rates of full-time employment as well (84.7% vs 88.1%) (QILT, 2019). Graduates from LSES backgrounds are also less likely to be in managerial/professional work, have job-security satisfaction, and financial prosperity than HSES background graduates (Tomaszewski, Perales, Xiang, & Kubler, 2019). However, these initial inequalities do disappear over time, with the gap closing at around four years post-graduation (O’Shea, 2019; Tomaszewski et al., 2019).

So far, this review has explored the current and future work and education context for young people, particularly those from LSES backgrounds. The review now examines the concept and practice of career development learning, arguably one of the keys to the successful transition from education to employment.
3. CAREER DEVELOPMENT LEARNING

This section firstly explores the various terms used in this area, defining them and providing a context for their use. Following on from that is a discussion of the importance of career development learning and an exploration of various theoretical approaches to it.

- The language of career work
- Definition of CDL
- Importance of CDL
- Approaches underpinning CDL

3.1 The language of career work

There are a many different terms and combinations of terms used in this field to describe career related activities. Career advice; career counselling; career guidance; career information, advice and guidance (CIAG); vocational counselling or vocational guidance; career development; and career education or learning are some of the terms which can be found in practice, policy and theory. Similarly, the professionals who engage in this work can be employed under many titles such as career adviser, transitions adviser or pathways adviser. In practice, many terms overlap and are used synonymously (CICA, 2019). Historically, ‘career advice’, ‘career counselling’ or ‘career guidance’ referred to one-on-one interactions between an individual and a career professional (Hooley, Watts, & Andrews, 2015) and this was the extent of career work. However, today it is felt that these terms are outdated, with many practitioners preferring other terms which better reflect the nature of career activities which is much more than simply advice (Economic Education Jobs and Skills Committee, 2018).

Internationally, the term ‘career guidance’ is popular and commonly used across Europe. ‘Career guidance’ describes ‘the activities which support individuals to learn about education and employment and plan for their future lives, learning and work’ (Hooley, Matheson, & Watts, 2014, p.4). Most recently, OECD, ILO, UNESCO, and The European Commission (2019) issued a combined statement with regard to ‘career guidance.’ In Ireland too, the National Centre for Guidance in Education (NCGE, 2017) also uses the term ‘career guidance’. In the UK, the Department of Education’s Careers Strategy (2017) draws on the Gatsby Foundation’s ‘good career guidance benchmarks’ and uses the combined term ‘career advice and guidance’. Careers England, an association for career providers, uses the term
The term ‘career development’ is also widely used, particularly in the US. The National Career Development Association (NCDA, 2011), a practitioner body with a long history in the US, favours ‘career development.’ ‘Career development’ was adopted by Australian practitioners in 2006 as the overarching term in the Australian career industry (CICA, 2019). In 2013, the Australian government used the term ‘career development’ in their ‘National Career Development Strategy’ (Australian Government, 2013). Interestingly, ‘career development’ is defined similarly to ‘career guidance’ as ‘the ongoing process of a person managing their life, learning and work over their lifespan. It involves developing the skills and knowledge that enable individuals to plan and make informed decisions about education, training and career choices’ (Australian Government, 2013, p.3).

In Australia, and in other contexts, career terminology is changing to reflect the process of learning which is involved in career development work. In 2019, the Australian government shifted to use of the term ‘career education’ in their national strategy (Australian Government, 2019). Similarly, the New Zealand Government (Education Review Office, 2015) and the Ontario Government (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2013) both refer to ‘career education and guidance’ in their policies. The addition of ‘education’ in reference to career work aims to account for planned programs of learning experiences in education and training sessions (Australian Government, 2019).

In the Australian education sector, further variations of terminology can be found, highlighting the inconsistency, conflict and overlap in career policy and practice. The education departments of various states in Australia work independently in defining their career programs. For example, Victoria also uses the term ‘career education’ but NSW has used ‘career-related learning’ (NSW Government, 2014), and now ‘career learning’ (NSW Government, 2019a) in their naming of their career curriculum. But again, these terms are defined similarly to career guidance and career development. According to the NSW government, ‘career learning’ describes ‘the ongoing lifelong process of managing learning, work and life; a process that requires the skills and knowledge to plan and make informed decisions about education, training and career choices’ (NSW Government, 2019a).
Some researchers have attempted to flesh out definitions of career-related activity. Hooley, Watts and Andrews (2015) put forward the concept of ‘career and employability learning’ which includes career guidance (which can refer to one-on-one interactions between an individual and a professional or a range of activities); career education (‘a progressive curriculum of learning activities which are addressed to the issue of career’); and work-related learning (‘a range of activities that support an individual to learn about work’ including work experience) (Hooley et al., 2015, p.5). In a similar vein, Hutchinson (2013, 2018) and Moote and Archer (2018) refer to ‘career-related learning’ which comprises three parts which are, in essence the same as the elements of Hooley et al.’s (2015) ‘career and employability learning’. According to Hutchinson, ‘career-related learning’ includes careers education (including self-development, exploration and management); work-related learning (about types of work, developing skills for and through work); and careers information, advice and guidance (CIAG). Kashefpakdel and others have applied this term, ‘career-related learning’ (CRL), in primary school settings to refer to ‘early childhood activities… designed to give children from an early age a wide range of experiences of and exposure to education, transitions and the world of work’ (Kashefpakdel, Rehill, & Hughes, 2018, p i).

Figure 2. Career-related learning (Hutchinson, 2013, p. 3)

The following section identifies, defines and outlines the terminology adopted for this project: career development learning (CDL).
3.2 Definition of CDL

The term ‘Career Development Learning’ (CDL) was coined in 1999 in the work of Tony Watts as well as Wendy Patton and Mary McMahon, and has been widely adopted as the preferred term for career related learning in the HE sector (Watts, 2006). It is defined as:

learning about the content and process of career development or life/career management. The content of career development learning in essence represents learning about self and learning about the world of work. Process learning represents the development of the skills necessary to navigate a successful and satisfying life/career (McMahon et al., 2003, p. 6).

Essentially, this definition highlights the need for students to learn both knowledge and skills in career/ life management and acknowledges that this may occur with or without intervention (McMahon et al., 2003). Crucially however, CDL may be assisted and fostered through appropriate and intentional career services and programs, and is an important goal of schooling (McMahon et al., 2003).

3.3 Importance of CDL

Quality CDL is a human right (CDAA, 2012); it shapes the society we live in and the well-being of individuals within it; and helps all individuals reach their full potential (Yates & Bruce, 2017). According to OECD (2019, n.p.)

Effective career information and guidance systems are a key to making lifelong learning a reality for all. They can help to make the best use of human resources in the labour market as well as in education by allowing better matches between skills and interests and opportunities for work and learning. They are important elements in active labour market policies and active welfare to work policies.

The Australian Government highlights how important CDL is for workforce participation and national productivity (Australian Government, 2013a). It is also important for equity. Traditionally, shifts in skills demands have disproportionately affected workers with lower levels of skills and education, and the rewards of the work reality that is approaching, are unlikely to be bestowed evenly among the workforce (Torii, 2018). The ICCDPP explains how this occurs:
Individuals, families, and communities differ in their capacities to visualise and plan their futures in work and learning, to source information about themselves and the world of work, to interpret it in relation to themselves and their circumstances, and to apply it in work and learning decision-making. Such differences in capacity lead to different work and life outcomes for individuals, families, and communities, just as differences in literacy and numeracy abilities. In this context, career education/learning is a social compensatory measure to enable people to participate effectively in society and the economy just as maths and language learning (ICDPP, 2019).

Thus, quality CDL has the potential to lessen the gap in educational and employment outcomes between students from LSES backgrounds and those of HSES backgrounds (Australian Government, 2013a; Bajada & Trayler, 2014). This may be even more important for those young people living in areas with scarce post-school educational and employment opportunities (Cuervo et al., 2019). The Bridge Group (2017) claims that without tailored career programs, equity measures for students from LSES backgrounds will not be met.

CDL is particularly important for young people as career programs within secondary school curriculum ‘can impact on a young person’s sense of direction and meaning in life’ (Broadbent, Cacciattolo, & Papadopoulos, 2012, p. 126). The critical primary role of CDL in school is to help young people build their career management skills and make an effective transition to employment (Andrews & Hooley, 2017). It also has secondary benefits for students: it engages them in learning, retains them in school and helps them to attain good academic qualifications (Andrews & Hooley, 2017; Broadbent et al., 2012; OECD et al., 2019). This is particularly so for those who are at risk of disengaging from school (Australian Government, 2013b).

3.4 Career development theory

Career theory and practice are inextricably related (McMahon & Arthur, 2018). This section provides an overview of the theory underpinning CDL which informs and defines best practice.

The field of CDL is underpinned by an extensive body of theory reflecting the time, culture, and discipline in which it was developed (McMahon & Arthur, 2018). As alluded to in the preceding sections, career development theory has seen a move away from concentration on individualistic, psychological approaches to ones which are more sociological in nature and reflect a more complex, diverse and challenging world (McMahon & Arthur, 2018). Traditional career development theory tended to focus on specific discrete concepts relevant to individual
career behaviour as career development work was seen as the act of counselling an individual to match their knowledge about self and knowledge about the world of work to make a sound career choice (Patton & McMahon, 2006). This approach ignored intrapersonal aspects and the individual’s social system as well as broader environmental/ societal system (Patton & McMahon, 2006). Recent approaches are more holistic and seek to keep pace with contemporary society – particularly globalisation and the goal for social justice (Patton & McMahon, 2006).

Career development theory has been criticised for being Eurocentric, white, middle class and male (Arthur & McMahon, 2018; Bimrose, 2018; Laffernis, 2018). McMahon and Arthur claim that, ‘most theories provide little guidance to practitioners in the application of the theory in diverse settings and with diverse clients’ (McMahon & Arthur, 2018, p.14). However, sociological theories of career development learning, with society and culture at their heart, are valid as they account for cultural diversity and social contexts (Bimrose, 2018). Additionally, Indigenous ways of knowing (Laffernis, 2018) and learning from other countries, including Eastern perspectives, should be incorporated into CDL approaches (Arthur & McMahon, 2018).

CDL perspectives which might be applicable for use with diverse students include constructivist approaches, strengths-based work, and appreciative inquiry.

**Constructivist approaches** foreground the active role of the individual in career development learning activities. Constructivism emphasises self-organising and proactive knowing and highlights the importance of individuals becoming more self-directed in making meaning of the place of work in their lives and in managing their careers (Patton & McMahon, 2006). Constructivist inspired career development work encourages individuals to reflect on, revise and reorient their life-career relationship (Patton & McMahon, 2006).

**Strengths-based approaches** to student career development have the advantage of improving student competence, and increasing their intrinsic motivation and effort for career development learning (Hiemstra & Yperen, 2015). Strengths-based approaches might broadly include measuring students’ strengths; providing individualized educational experiences for students based on those strengths; developing networking opportunities for students to develop their strengths with others; and drawing out students’ strengths through deliberate application of strengths inside and outside of classrooms (Borden, 2018).
**Appreciative inquiry** is a positive, solution-focused approach to problem solving developed in the field of human resource management (Brooks, 2013). In the approach used in CDL, a career adviser asks strategically designed questions to students through which they can develop a vision for the best possible future (Brooks, 2013). The approach has many advantages for career development work with students. Namely, it teaches students a mindset and strategies for overcoming obstacles and achieving what they want (Brooks, 2013).

Importantly, what the theories and approaches outlined here do, is focus on the strengths of the individual and empower them to reflect, learn and grow. The following section turns to examine how CDL is provided in the education system.
4. CDL IN THE EDUCATION SYSTEM

CDL practitioners can be found in schools, further education colleges, universities, adult education services and public employment services (OECD, 2004a). Having life-long access to career development programs and support is ideal, particularly for those from LSES backgrounds, in order to enable everyone to continue to participate in the ever-changing world of work. The *Student Focused National Career Education Strategy* was released in 2019 with a focus on lifelong career development for all Australians (Australian Government, 2019). CDL should begin at a young age, continue through primary school into high school and beyond. This section discusses CDL in the school system, with a specific focus on high school provision as this is the stage at which provision intensifies as education and career decisions need to be made. This section covers:

- CDL in schools
- Assessment of current provision in schools
- Specific weaknesses of CDL in schools

4.1 CDL in schools

The traditional approach to providing career education in schools is through the employment of a career advisor or career counsellor. In NSW public schools, for example, *careers advisers* ‘help students explore their education and career options [and] deliver education programs and activities for groups of students or individuals’ (NSW Government, 2019b, n.p.). School career advisers help students understand their interests and skills and provide information about what careers are available to them and pathways to those careers in whole-class, small group, and individual settings (L. Morgan, 2016). Career advisers also develop career programs, organise work experience placements, and host events such as open days and career expos (Aspden et al., 2015; J. Brown, Healy, McCredie, & McIlveen, 2019; Calzaferri, 2011; Galvan & Negrete, 2017; Gore, Holmes, Smith, Lyell, et al., 2015). Importantly, school career advisers provide access for their students to employers and businesses who are able to offer valuable career advice and experience through work placements (McGrath & Murphy, 2016; Moynihan, 2015); school visits (Kashefpakdel et al., 2018); and mentoring (McGrath & Murphy, 2016). These advisers also help students, parents and carers understand how the curriculum, subject selection, HSC, further education and training and work experience impact career decisions (NSW Government, 2019b). Research has shown that career advisers make a significant impact on the school subject and career choices that students make (Aspden et al., 2015).
In addition, a transitions adviser might work closely with a careers adviser and is a teacher trained to work with disengaged students. They personalise career experiences and resources to help students make a positive transition through and from school (NSW Government, 2019b).

However, in addition to a career advisor, there are many more opportunities for CDL within the education system, particularly across primary and secondary education levels (OECD, 2004b). In the schooling system there are four distinct stages that allow for CDL. The diagram below illustrates how the four stages fit within the pre-school, primary school, secondary school and tertiary stages of education (see Figure 2).

![Stages of CDL](image)

**Figure 3: Stages of CDL.** Source: NSW Government (2014, p. 2).

Internationally, three broad structures for the integration of career programs into schools are evident: stand-alone programs which run as a separate course; programs that are ‘subsumed’, that is, a strand of another course e.g. personal development, health and physical education; and programs that are ‘infused’ within most or all subject across the curriculum (OECD, 2004a, p. 12).

The next section explores the effectiveness of current approaches to the provision of CDL in schools.
4.2 Assessment of current provision

Current approaches to CDL in some countries, including Australia, NZ, the UK and the US, have been criticised as being inadequate (S. Brown, 2015; Economic Education Jobs and Skills Committee, 2018; Moote & Archer, 2018; Yates & Bruce, 2017). For example the provision of career education in some UK schools does not meet statutory requirements to provide impartial career support for all students (Moote & Archer, 2018). Moote and Archer (2018) found that less than two thirds of Year 11 students in the UK reported that they were receiving career education.

In Australia also, many students do not get enough help with their post-school decisions (Cherastidtham & Norton, 2018). A 2017 review of career education in Victorian government schools found that the provision of CDL varied significantly between schools (Economic Education Jobs and Skills Committee, 2018). The median school spends two hours per student per year (Dandolo partners, 2017) but 10% of schools spend 45 minutes or less on career education per student per year and 10% of schools spend 12 hours of more per students per year (Economic Education Jobs and Skills Committee, 2018), a difference likely to have profound significance for students’ career outcomes.

In addition to limited access to CDL, concerns have also been raised about the quality of it. In an Australian study, only 52% of surveyed youth (15-24yo) felt that they had received good quality career information during their schooling (Skillsroad, 2018). Similarly, large proportions of participants in that study wished that they had received more information about all of the options available to them (22%), or felt that they had been pushed/encouraged to pursue university (20%) (see Figure 4 below) (Skillsroad, 2018).

Figure 4: Student satisfaction levels. Source – Skillsroad (2018). Youth Census Report.
In the review of Victorian schools, it was found that career development provision was not perceived as being useful by stakeholders or students, with these groups feeling that it was outdated and not adequately preparing students for life after school (Economic Education Jobs and Skills Committee, 2018). In NZ, Yates and Bruce (2017, p.64) agree, stating that the ‘career education framework for many schools is not fit for purpose in today’s world and is based on assumptions about the world of work that no longer exist, such as a stable labour market.’

The following section examines more closely the specific problems with CDL in schools identified in the literature.

4.3 Specific weaknesses in CDL in schools

Specific weaknesses in CDL in the Australian education system, and in some other countries, include:

- Regulation and consistency
- Equity
- Attitudes to CDL
- Teacher qualification and knowledge
- Resourcing

**Regulation and consistency**

There are claims that the system of CDL in schools is not systematic and comprehensive, but fragmented (Australian Government, 2013a, 2019; Economic Education Jobs and Skills Committee, 2018). In Australia, there are national frameworks and guidelines that make up the policy context for CDL. The Australian Blueprint for Career Development (MCEECDYA, 2010) provides a national framework of career competencies to assist in program design and evaluation, and a set of professional standards and benchmarking resource (CICA, 2014) for school CDL programs is available from the Career Industry Council of Australia (CICA), the national peak body for the career industry in Australia. However, none of these frameworks are compulsory, resulting in inconsistent service delivery across Australian schools.

An absence of national, regulated career development policy and practice is also a highlighted issue for the UK (Andrews & Hooley, 2017). Without ‘universal benchmarks’ (Christie, 2016, p. 73), career services may not be implementing best practice principles in their work. Andrews and Hooley (2017) suggest that a lack of regulation of the quality of career work in UK schools and a nationally agreed standards for career leadership, may result in an inequality of outcomes for young people (Andrews & Hooley, 2017).
The Australian Government recognises their role in leading a cross-sectoral approach to career development at a national level, facilitating links between policies, and providing accessible high quality information (Australian Government, 2013a). At the same time, the Australian government recognises that administrative requirements and policies can act as a barrier to some CDL provision, such as industry partnerships (Torii, 2018). Specifically, child safety and occupational health and safety requirements and delivery of curriculum and assessment can impact the nature and extent of partnerships for CDL (Torii, 2018).

**Equity**

Equitable access to CDL is identified in the literature as being an area that requires attention. There is evidence that in Australia and the UK, CDL is shaped according to socioeconomic class, with those from low socioeconomic status having less access to support and resources (Andrews & Hooley, 2017; Atalier Learning Solutions, 2012). UK research suggests that poor career provision may promote inequalities based on social class, ethnicity and gender (Moote & Archer, 2018). It is suggested that in many Australian contexts, it is almost certainly a case where the students most in need of career support are the ones with the least access (Galliott & Graham, 2015).

Further issues relate to 1) location and 2) social capital. In terms of the first, Australian research has identified that students from rural backgrounds have more limited access to career education and guidance than students from urban backgrounds (McIlveen, Morgan, & Bimrose, 2012; NCSEHE, 2017). With regard to the second, while partnerships with industry are considered a highly effective way to connect youth to the world of work, they rely on the social and professional connections that exist in the school community and thus are not available equitably to all youth (Torii, 2018). These are important inequities to understand in more depth.

**Attitudes to CDL**

There is evidence that CDL in schools is poorly understood and under-appreciated by teachers, schools and the wider school community in Australia and New Zealand. Variation in the quantity and quality of CDL given to students in Victorian schools depends on whether the schools see it as a priority (Economic Education Jobs and Skills Committee, 2018). Yates and Bruce (2017) found evidence that in NZ, some subject teachers did not recognise the importance or providing career education and as a result resisted involvement in it. Furthermore, some NZ teachers also hold negative views about career work in schools including considering career activities as mandatory administrative tasks to be completed and
impositions on their teaching duties (Furbish & Reid, 2013; Yates & Bruce, 2017). Vaughan (2012) suggests that the low status given to CDL may be because of its association with vocational rather than academic pathways.

Teacher qualifications and knowledge

An identified weakness to the provision of CDL is the absence of universal formal career-specific qualifications and specific, clear job descriptions for career advisers. This situation is repeated in both New Zealand (NZ) and the UK (Career Development Institute, 2015; Furbish & Reid, 2013). Specifically, Furbish and Reid (2013) found that in NZ, while those advisers without qualifications could put together a best practice program, the absence of a formal qualifications potentially limited the refinement of their practice based on theory and research that they had not been exposed to. Clarity about their role and professional identity was also an issue for NZ career advisers (Yates & Bruce, 2017). Andrews and Hooley highlight the potential implications of this situation: ‘Where distinctions between these different roles are poorly understood there is the potential for confusion, duplication and missed opportunities, for rivalries between different roles and ultimately, for misdirection of young people’ (Andrews & Hooley, 2017, p. 155).

In Australia, career adviser skill and qualification requirements vary between states and education systems. The NSW DET do not have a definitive position description for career advisers, only an optional framework for performance which is enforced only at individual schools’ discretion (Youth Action, 2017). In Catholic and Independent schools, there are no guidelines or policies for career guidance with individual schools making decisions about whether to hire someone as a career adviser and what standards to uphold (Youth Action, 2017). It is suggested that in England, some teachers are assigned to career roles based on convenience rather than on skill, qualification and merit (Career Development Institute, 2015; Fuller et al., 2014). As a result, school career advisers may not have the requisite skills and knowledge to fully support students in their career planning and decision making. Additionally, some teachers (in the UK and US) feel unprepared to give career guidance (Fuller et al., 2014; Moote & Archer, 2018; Newton, 2017). This may result in programs and guidance that are of poor quality (Yates & Bruce, 2017). In Australia specifically, the staffing of rural, remote and isolated schools face challenges around high staff turnover; younger inexperienced staff; inexperienced leadership; and teachers working outside their area of expertise (Downes & Roberts, 2018) which may also compromise the quality of CDL staff and programs.
Regardless of qualifications, but particularly so when career advisers are underqualified, is that the guidance given to students is impacted by the adviser’s own work and education experiences and values. Where advisers lack relevant qualifications or have had little professional development, they rely on their life experience to carry out the role (Yates & Bruce, 2017). In Fuller et al.’s (2014, p. 279) English study, subject teachers knew ‘very little’ about what other providers offered and were most comfortable and confident delivering career guidance in areas that relate to their own subject and specialism. In Australia, it is perceived by employers that school career practitioners have a superficial understanding of their industries (Economic Education Jobs and Skills Committee, 2018). Also, the type of school a teacher is working in can inform the priority focus in offering direction for example, university versus work (Fuller et al., 2014). In this case, some teachers view particular routes such as holding more value than others, for example, university over trades, which impacts the guidance they give (Economic Education Jobs and Skills Committee, 2018; Fuller et al., 2014). In these cases, this can result in limitations to the information and options offered to students.

**Resourcing**

A lack of resources is frequently cited as a problem for the provision of CDL in schools in Australia as well as those in England (Andrewartha & Harvey, 2017; CDAA, 2012; CICA, 2015; Hooley & Dodd, 2015; Moote & Archer, 2018; Youth Action, 2017). 26% of Australian career advisers have less than $1000 to spend on career development work across their school annually (McCrindle Research, 2015). Also, low levels of funding impacts on how frequently career teachers are available to students. Some schools only have a career teacher available for a short amount of time each week (CICA, 2017a) and school-based career practitioners are often part-time staff members with classroom teaching responsibilities as well. According to a 2016 survey of Australian school-based career practitioners examining career development practitioners, more than half of those surveyed do their role on a part time basis (52%) and over half of those part-time career practitioners spend 64% of their time on classroom teaching and 22% on middle management (CICA, 2017a). In NZ too, career staff are often part-time and struggle to find enough time for the role (Yates & Bruce, 2017). In NSW schools, individual schools and principals manage the majority of their budget and can decide to use their funds to meet the specific needs of their school including the allocation of the teaching load of those staff employed as career advisers (Youth Action, 2017). This has the potential for large inconsistencies to occur across schools.
Career practitioners state that they need additional time to spend with students, and additional time with staff to develop an integrated curriculum (CICA, 2017a). At the same time, students were desirous of a personalised service but were often unable to access an adviser who was often part-time and who also had to undertake teaching, pastoral care and administrative tasks (Yates & Bruce, 2017). The amount of time, expertise and money required to develop school-industry partnerships is also a barrier to their implementation (Torii, 2018). Career advisers need to be given sufficient time to perform their role and students also need to be given the time to engage with CDL activities (Yates & Bruce, 2017). Insufficient funding combined with a lack of training in the role of career adviser can cause significant disadvantage for students (Joyce, 2019).

CDL in schools is not the only contributor to the career and educational decision making of young people. In the following section, this review examines the processes by which young people gather information and make decisions about their post-school education, training and employment, with a focus on the nuances of these processes for students from LSES backgrounds.
5. CAREER AND EDUCATIONAL DECISION-MAKING

For many, the learning journey is unclear and complex, with gates and barriers that require navigation. Pathways are often marked by changes in direction, doubling back and rethinking. Some of these pathways are expensive, causing young people to narrow their choices. Some options are well known and well documented, others are obscure and need to be uncovered or created. Some post-school options are heavily competitive, some are open. The opportunities are myriad, but hard to identify and access (O’Connell et al., 2019, p. 6).

O’Connell et al., (2019) portray some of the complexity experienced by young people today as they transition from full-time education to full-time work. Their analogy of the move from study to work as a journey with paths, options, gates, and barriers is an accurate one. This section examines how young people come to make decisions about their education and work under two headings:

- Aspirations
- Sources of knowledge

5.1 Aspirations

Very young children have the capacity to create their own understanding of the world of work and careers as well as their desires for the future. Children as young as four years old are able to develop their own ideas and aspirations toward certain careers based on association and exposure to career related experiences (Cinamon & Dan, 2010; Howard & Walsh, 2010). At primary school age, students continue to form and refine their career-based aspirations (Archer et al., 2014) including identifying factors that influence their career aspirations and pathways to achieving the career outcome (Gore, Holmes, Smith, Southgate, & Albright, 2015; Howard & Walsh, 2010). Indeed, the aspirations of younger students are similar in many respects to those of older students (Gore, Holmes, Smith, Southgate, et al., 2015) suggesting that knowledge about future ambitions are developed well before the final high school years.

Educational aspirations have a substantial effect on educational outcomes (Homel & Ryan, 2014). For example, individuals who plan to complete Year 12 are 20—25% more likely to achieve this goal (i.e. completion), compared with those who do not intend to complete Year 12 and individuals who intend to go onto university are 15—20% more likely to attend, compared with those who do not have post-school university plans (Homel & Ryan, 2014). As
a result of statistics such as this, current advice and policy focusses on ‘raising’ the aspirations of students in order to increase participation in education (Bradley et al., 2008; Homel & Ryan, 2014; Polesel, Leahy, & Gillis, 2018).

It has been suggested that students from LSES backgrounds ‘lack awareness’ of further education and thus have ‘no aspiration to participate’ in it (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 27). Consequently, policies towards ‘increasing desire to attend university’ have been implemented (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 40). However, many agree (Bok, 2010; Cuervo et al., 2019; Gore, Fray, Patfield, & Harris, 2019; Gore, Holmes, Smith, Southgate, et al., 2015; Harwood et al., 2015; Smith, 2011) that this is a narrow and deficit perspective which oversimplifies the complex and multiple reasons behind the aspirations of young people and the related structural barriers that can impact on the formation of aspirations.

Aspiration is often framed in terms of individual wants, choices and preferences, however this perspective ignores the influence of society and culture (Harwood et al., 2015; Smith, 2011). It is untrue that some groups of young people lack aspirations. All groups in society hold aspirations for the future, but the capacity to aspire is not equally distributed because of the social, cultural and economic resources available to different groups (Smith, 2011). A capacity to aspire involves the ability to both imagine the future in detailed ways and to transfer these imaginaries into desired outcomes (Bok, 2010; Smith, 2011). It is a navigational capacity that depends on people having the necessary knowledge, skills and resources to successfully manoeuvre through a plan of a journey into the future (Smith, 2011).

While there is a clear link between students’ aspirations for the future and their SES background, the proportions of students expecting to be in professional occupations fall consistently as the level of SES background falls (Polesel et al., 2018), the aspirations of students from LSES backgrounds are more nuanced than the statistics reveal. Cuervo et al.’s (2019) study of regional and rural youth found that many participants had high aspirations but that students’ aspirations and expectations were circumscribed by an awareness of changes to their regional and rural communities (Cuervo et al., 2019, p. 846). Smith (2011, p. 166) argues that students from LSES possess more ‘brittle horizons of aspirations’ as a result of having fewer concrete experiences, opportunities and resources to draw on when navigating pathways. What students from LSES backgrounds perceive to be both desirable and realistically achievable, may be a result of their experience as learners within education institutions and their limited access to social, cultural and economic resources (Smith, 2011). Cuervo et al.
(2019) argue that youth aspirations need to be contextualised, particularly in regional and rural areas that have experienced significant social and economic restructuring, including the depletion of economic and social services (Cuervo et al., 2019). Gore et al (2019, p. 64) argue that:

The fusion of geographic, structural, and relational elements within a community work in both overt and more subtle ways to shape aspirations and the capacity for young people to navigate the pathway towards their imagined futures.

In many ways, aspirations are a collective cultural capacity (Smith, 2011). Students’ aspirations are a result of the cultural and social capital held by the people around them - their peers, family members, teachers and schools. For example, parents use their educational cultural capital to support their children’s educational aspiration, which might include confidently accessing information they need about possible education pathways within and beyond school, and knowing where to find out about financial and other support resources available to facilitate access to HE (Fischer, Barnes, & Kilpatrick, 2019). Also, young people from LSES backgrounds in Archer et al.’s (2014) study, had parents with high aspirations for them which equated to educational resilience. In a regional Australian study, aspirations for HE were positively influenced by the wealth in the household and the peer social networks available to regional youth (Cuervo et al., 2019). The influence of social capital derived from peer groups was more influential than parent-derived social capital on the aspirations of regional youth (Cuervo et al., 2019). Teachers might also ‘mediate’ students’ unrealistic ‘high’ aspirations toward more realistic ambitions, i.e. lower students’ aspirations (Bok, 2010). These judgements about students’ career and educational potential may be made on the basis of what they perceive as students’ innate ability but also may in fact be made based the culture and the background of the student as displayed in their accent, manners and behaviours (Polesel et al., 2018). In these ways, teachers can impose a downward pressure on the aspirations of students (Polesel et al., 2018).

Aspirations and educational decision-making are also a product of students’ own ‘risk-tolerance’ (Raciti, 2019, p. 13). Recent research found that secondary students from LSES backgrounds respond in different ways to the dilemma of deciding whether or not to go to university (Raciti, 2019). Students from LSES backgrounds are more likely to be risk averse than other students and are generally slower and more careful in their decision-making process.
The exception to this is those students who are risk seekers in which case they leapfrog steps faster than students from other backgrounds (Raciti, 2019).

These findings reinforce the idea that ‘expanding’ or ‘raising’ the aspirations of students from LSES backgrounds might not be the key strategy for increasing equity in HE. Indeed, Bok (2010) cautioned that raising a student’s aspirations without the supports in place to achieving them was a dangerous proposition. This is particularly the case for parents from LSES backgrounds who may have less access to cultural capital to make an appropriately informed decision to enable success for the student. Instead, Gore et al. (2015) advocate for greater emphasis on supporting the educational achievement of students from these backgrounds as more critical than developing aspirations. CDL is a pathway to achieve this. High quality CDL is also vital for achieving equity in education and work. Cuervo et al. (2019) warn against devaluing the experiences and aspirations of students who do not seek HE and professional careers. They also contend that HE should not be established as the normative pathway for regional youth as it neglects the spatial and economic challenges faced by this group (Cuervo et al., 2019).

As alluded to in this section, occupational aspirations are the result of a specific confluence of family, peer, school, community, and personal factors (Gore, Holmes, Smith, Southgate, et al., 2015). This section examines more closely how key influencers are a source of knowledge for diverse youth.

5.2 Sources of knowledge

Young people are influenced in their educational and career decision making by a range of sources, both formal and informal. Ball and Vincent (1998) differentiate between ‘hot’ and ‘cold’ sources of knowledge. Informal hot knowledge is ‘word-of-mouth’ knowledge gained ‘through the grapevine’ from social sources such as family, friends, teachers and others (Ball & Vincent, 1998; Smith, 2011). On the other hand, ‘cold’ knowledge is formal knowledge produced by, for example, governments, institutions and schools, and communicated via websites, enrolment information, and statistical data (Smith, 2011).

Informal or ‘hot’ influences on the aspirations, career information and decision making of youth include family, friends, the wider community and the media. Parents and family members help identify a young person’s passions and strengths, discuss their interests, influence aspirations, and support student career decisions (Australian Government, 2019;
Chavira, Cooper, & Vasquez-Salgado, 2016; Dietrich & Kracke, 2009; Seward & Gaesser, 2018). Significant adults, peers and the broader community act as informants, supporters, and a safe haven to explore and test ideas (Broadbent et al., 2012; Cenkseven-Önder, Kirdök, & İşik, 2010). The media, including the internet, also has a role in shaping aspirations, particularly when combined with other influences (Archer et al., 2014; Aspden et al., 2015; Broadbent et al., 2012; Gore, Holmes, Smith, Lyell, et al., 2015; Kashefpakdel et al., 2018; Pavulens, 2013).

There are differences in the ways in which people from different socioeconomic backgrounds access and act upon information regarding education and career decision making (Smith, 2011). Students from LSES backgrounds draw more heavily on ‘hot’ knowledge when imagining and aspiring towards educational and vocational pathways (Archer et al., 2014; Ball & Vincent, 1998; Smith, 2011). Hot knowledge is informal, socially embedded, and involves the impressions and emotions that develop as a result of ‘affective responses or direct experiences’ (Ball & Vincent, 1998, p. 380). Locality, both geographical and socio-structural, impacts which networks or grapevines are open to different groups of people (Smith, 2011). Teachers are a strong source of ‘hot’ knowledge for students from LSES backgrounds. Gore et al. (2015, p. 64) confirmed that students from LSES backgrounds ‘rely on their teachers for advice and encouragement, including through informal classroom and outside classrooms conversations’. This quote reflects a consensus on the strong impact that teachers have in providing CDL for diverse students (Fuller et al., 2014; Higher Education Standards Panel, 2017).

There are also class related differences between the ways in which ‘hot’ knowledge is acted upon (Ball & Vincent, 1998). Ball and Vincent (1998) found that middle-class parents are often suspicious of hot knowledge and minimally affected by it, and prefer to acquire cold knowledge which they know how to access and decode. In contrast, working class parents often accept hot knowledge and dismiss cold knowledge under the perception that it is simply public relations material, and possibly due to difficulties decoding it (Ball & Vincent, 1998).

Young people from LSES backgrounds are also more likely to gather information about HE and pathways from hot rather than cold sources (Smith, 2011). Cold knowledge accessed through university websites and admission guides was less significant because, unlike their social networks, these forms of information were not directly connected to their interests and identities (Smith, 2011). However, ready acceptance of hot knowledge from grapevines
without accessing cold knowledge can result in more limited and confused information and misinformation (Smith, 2011).

Students who are First in Family (FiF) to attend university might not have the ‘hot’ knowledge that non FiF students acquire from parents and older siblings who have already attended university (NCSEHE, 2017; O’Shea, 2016a, 2016b; O’Shea, May, Stone, & Delahunty, 2017). Transgenerational family scripts or inheritance codes are a means for relaying and passing down hot knowledge about education institutions and pathways, however this knowledge is not available to those first in their family to go to university (Smith, 2011). Additionally, students from HSES backgrounds are more likely than those from LSES backgrounds to engage in discussions with their parents (Chesters & Smith, 2015).

These distinctions between how information is accessed and acted upon by youth from different backgrounds confer increased importance to the CDL offered in schools. Given that students from LSES backgrounds rely on ‘hot’ knowledge from social sources who may themselves hold misinformation and/or not have the appropriate capitals to access and interpret cold knowledge, it is important that accurate and timely knowledge about HE and pathways is given to these students in an appropriate ways. Teachers, career advisers and CDL programs in schools are in prime positions to do so.

There is also evidence that tertiary information sessions are an important way for students to gain an understanding of future career or study choices (Broadbent et al., 2012; Fernandez-Repollet, Locatis, De Jesus-Monge, Maisiak, & Liu, 2018). Such sessions motivate students to do well at school, leave them better informed and more confident about making study choice and give them a greater sense of purpose and destination regarding future study and career (Broadbent et al., 2012). The popularity of these information sessions might relate to the fact that ‘cold’ knowledge from the university in the form of brochures or static websites is transformed into ‘hot’ knowledge forms characterized by student presentations and conversations. We would argue that such transformation creates knowledge sources which students from LSES backgrounds find more trustworthy and accessible.

This section has examined how aspiration for future work and study is a ‘collective cultural capacity’ (Smith, 2011, p. 166) impacted by youth’s social networks and trusted sources of knowledge. It has positioned quality CDL as a critical intervention to provide students from LSES backgrounds with contextual aspirations and knowledge to achieve them. The final
section of this literature review explores what is evident in the literature on the best practices for CDL for young people from LSES backgrounds.
6. BEST PRACTICE IN CDL FOR STUDENTS FROM LSES BACKGROUNDS

This section identifies elements of practice which might best provide students from LSES backgrounds with quality CDL. According to the literature, best practice CDL:

... begins at a young age

Given that the formation of aspirations occurs from a young age (Howard & Walsh, 2010; Knight, 2015), it is argued that career education should begin as early as the pre-school years (Cinamon & Dan, 2010; Howard & Walsh, 2010; Knight, 2015). The world of work and potential careers can be explored by preschools through structured age appropriate play (NSW Government, 2014) and aspirations should be addressed through building social capital in young children (Galliott & Graham, 2014).

Children should continue to be exposed to career education through their primary school years to broaden career aspirations, develop their knowledge about and perceptions of different jobs, and build self-awareness (Archer et al., 2014; International Centre for Career Development and Public Policy, 2017; Kashefpakdel et al., 2018; Kellahan, 2018; Knight, 2015; Wood, Smith, & Duys, 2018). CDL at this stage should focus on expanding each child’s awareness of the work that adults do and of challenging their attitudes about gendered work roles through structured age appropriate activity and play (Kashefpakdel et al., 2018; NSW Government, 2014). Fischer, Barnes and Kilpatrick (2019) claim that there is a strong theoretical basis for the effectiveness of primary school career education. It is recommended that CDL should continue from the primary years into the early years of high school (Archer et al., 2014; Atalier Learning Solutions, 2012; Fuller et al., 2014; Plasman, 2018; Tazzyman, 2018) where it should be focused on experiencing and researching work and career perceptions through diverse learning opportunities (NSW Government, 2014).

Starting CDL early and making it a long-term priority is a principle of best practice highlighted within the literature (Dandolo partners, 2017; Holden, Rumala, Carson, & Siegel, 2014; OECD, 2004b; Seward & Gaesser, 2018). CDL for young people from LSES backgrounds particularly, should begin at a young age. There has been a call to introduce a law in Victoria to mandate career education from Year 3 in primary school to extend the range of career options for students, ‘particularly for students at risk of disengagement’ (Cook, 2018, n.p.). This was particularly relevant for students who base their career aspirations on academic results as students who had low academic attainment were at risk of limiting their career aspirations.
In New Zealand, it is mandatory for career education to begin in Year 7, particularly for students deemed ‘at risk’ (Irving, 2013). Seward and Gaesser (2018, p. 1) suggest that career education should be operating from Kindergarten through to Year 12 with a particular emphasis on CDL in Year 6 and Year 7 when students were actively curious about career choices. It is clear from the research that ‘every school student in Australia can benefit from regular opportunities to engage meaningfully with the world of work across their years of schooling’ (Torii, 2018, p. vi).

However, CDL work with children must take an expansive view of what career work is. The Ontario Ministry of Education (2013) has adopted a broad definition of career which informs their programs for students from Kindergarten to Grade 12. Their career/life development program encourages students to:

- discover who they are, explore opportunities, pursue their passions, and design personal pathways to success. They are encouraged to express their insights in individual ways and to keep track of what they discover about themselves and their interests, passions, and opportunities over time (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2013, p. 7).

This type of approach is not about limiting and focusing children’s experiences but providing a navigation for their aspirations so that they can ‘map a journey’ into their future, whatever that might be.

... is student-centred and individualised

‘Career education is most effective when it is student-centred, and tailored to individual needs, interests and circumstances of school students’ (Australian Government, 2019, p.13). Knowing the social, emotional and academic needs of each student is a significant factor for best practice in CDL (Broadbent et al., 2012; Yates & Bruce, 2017). An understanding of a student is important for being able to personalise and direct well (Australian Government, 2019); particularly for students who are undecided and lack other sources of support as there is a risk that they will not necessarily make the most appropriate choices (Fuller et al., 2014). Indeed, providing student-centred CDL is an effective approach for students from LSES backgrounds as it allows for individual-specific encouragement and development of a personalised career strategy (Beaumont, Gedye, & Richardson, 2016). When students feel understood they are more responsive to career guidance, particularly when it is offered in a one-to-one counselling
session (Broadbent et al., 2012). Tailoring and flexibility in approaches is particularly
important to meeting the needs of Indigenous students (Laffernis, 2018).

A student-centred approach for students from LSES backgrounds should focus on ‘opening up’
rather than ‘honning-in’ on careers to address the highly contextualised aspirations experienced
by some students. A resource to this end, Aspirations: Supporting students’ futures is a free
online professional development course for teachers (primary and secondary)
(Aspirations.edu.au, 2018). The course was developed by The University of Newcastle and
funded by the Australian Department of Education and Training with the aim of supporting
‘teachers in understanding and nurturing students’ aspirations and illuminating pathways to
higher education’ (Aspirations.edu.au, 2018).

... is contextual
The provision of successful CDL requires consideration of the contextual background of
students (Ali, Yang, Button, & McCoy, 2012) and best practice programs respond to localised
school and community environments (Ashley & Ireland, 2019; Australian Government, 2019;
Furbish & Reid, 2013; Gore et al., 2019). It has been shown that ‘a diversity of approaches is
essential to ensure that career development services are available at the times and in the ways
that best meet the needs of each individual’ (Australian Government, 2013a, p. 5).

Students living in rural or remote areas often have limited access to infrastructure and education
and training opportunities and appropriate services need to be developed to reach them
(Australian Government, 2019; Cherastidtham & Norton, 2018). It is recommended that career
advisers develop programs specifically tailored to rural communities in order to expand the
career options of rural students when they finish secondary school (S. Brown, 2015; Gore et
al., 2019). This is important for rural students who may have had less exposure to career options
than their urban counterparts. Provisions tailored to the students’ environments helps to
develop career aspirations (Calzaferri, 2011; Higher Education Standards Panel, 2017) and
provides ‘peace of mind’ in career decision-making (McIlveen et al., 2012, p. 28).

... is culturally sensitive
Meeting cultural needs and providing content that is culturally relevant is a method of student-
centred CDL. The recognition of student diversity is necessary to support the career aspirations
of all students (Australian Government, 2019). Specifically for Aboriginal and Torres Strait
Islander students, it is recommended that culturally appropriate role models and mentors be
used to provide CDL as it fosters genuine relationships and builds trust, ensuring that successful outcomes are more likely (Curtis, Wikaire, Stokes, & Reid, 2012). Laffernis (2018) recommends that reciprocity and good relationships are essential for meaningful and authentic work for Indigenous students. Other recommendations included creating career programs that are framed within an Indigenous world view; identifying and addressing potential barriers to career success; and increasing engagement with Indigenous communities as part of the career program (Curtis et al., 2012). Indigenous students given career guidance by local community members are able to learn ‘on country and in their own language’ (Joyce, 2019, p. 109).

The University of Southern Queensland’s (USQ) three-day program for Year 10 and Year 11 students focuses on providing Indigenous students activities and career guidance combined with leadership and culture (Kinnane, Wilks, Wilson, Hughes, & Thomas, 2014). This program involves parents and community members who are invited to attend the end of program ceremony. Involvement in this program is reported as leading to increased engagement in school and broader aspirations in Indigenous students (NCSEHE, 2013).

... **is embedded in the curriculum and integrated as part of a whole school approach**
Best practice approaches to CDL require a move beyond conventionally held attitudes towards career education in relation to the expectation that career education can be carried out by one career adviser (Yates & Bruce, 2017). Career development practitioners in schools believe that an interview with a career development practitioner is the most effective career development activity in schools (CICA, 2017) however, there is much evidence to indicate that this should occur as part of an integrated, whole of school approach to CDL (Economic Education Jobs and Skills Committee, 2018).

The Australian Government National Career Education Strategy (2019) indicates that work exploration, work-related learning, transferrable skills and attitudes, and career management skills should be taught through the national curriculum. Moote and Archer (2018) recommend an integrated career education approach for the UK with career development embedded in the curriculum in order to reach **all** students. Specifically, there is evidence that weekly and year-long programs in school classrooms are superior in providing cohesive career education that is related to the school curriculum and student interest (Ali et al., 2012, p. 377).

An integrated whole-school approach involves the integration of career education within subject teaching and career advisers working alongside subject teachers to provide relevant
career education (Yates & Bruce, 2017). Moote and Archer (2018) claim that teachers should be at the heart of a long-term approach to improving career support. Best practice programs in New Zealand had a team approach where classroom teachers and career advisers collaborated and incorporated the school curriculum into career programs and vice versa (Furbish & Reid, 2013). These programs provided ongoing integration of career topics into subject content delivery. This approach also included co-ordination between career advisers, and other programs within the school including work experience and concurrent tertiary study (Furbish & Reid, 2013).

... is accessible
CDL should be accessible to all young people, regardless of location. It should be freely available i.e. at no cost, accessible to those with a disability, and able to be accessed if you have limited access to a computer, or issues with internet. Technology can somewhat be garnered to this purpose. The Pathways Website provides sequential activities based on career development for students aged 10 to 17 years in the ACT, Australia (ACARA, 2019). This tool helps students plan their careers and develop self-awareness skills and is designed to be shared with parents to engage in family discussion. Another website that was developed for Australian students is the Myfuture website (Australian Government, 2013a) which provides online information that helps students explore their interests and career options, courses to enable the career, and an overview of specific industries.

Recently, the NSW Government launched the LifeLauncher website which aims to give students guidance in figuring out their future post-school (NSW Government, 2019b). The platform combines information on careers, links to VET and university courses, statistical information on careers and their employment prospects (NSW Government, 2019b).

... involves key influencers
Involving family and community is a theme of best practice within the literature reviewed (Furbish & Reid, 2013; Gibbons et al., 2019; M. Morgan, 2012; NSW Government, 2014). The Australian Government National Career Education Strategy (2019) observes that career development of young people is a shared responsibility; therefore all stakeholders should be involved in programs to support them. Holden et al. (2014) promote a CDL approach that comprehensively and actively engages all stakeholders including parents, students, teachers and employers. Career practitioners must ‘respect local knowledge…collaborate with local communities and individuals, and empower local people’ (Gibbons et al., 2019, p.3). The
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CDAA emphasises the value and necessity of community engagement in supporting career development in students (CDAA, 2012) and this is shown to be particularly important to supporting Indigenous students within their communities (Curtis et al., 2012). Also, Furbish and Reid (2013) suggest that targeting parents of students from minority backgrounds helps to build their general knowledge of career and HE pathways which assists the students themselves (Fischer et al., 2019).

Role models should be employed in best practice programs. For secondary students from rural backgrounds, it is shown that mentors are key to developing aspirations in careers (Curtis et al., 2012); linking authentic career experience and role models helps to shape student career aspirations and career decisions. Gore et al. (2019) recommend that for rural areas, HE providers should identify current university students to become community role models creating opportunities as part of their degree to return home to their community and share their experiences of university.

... involves partnerships between schools, industry, HE and VET providers

The Australian Government recommends schools partner with employers, members of the community, community organisations and tertiary organisations to enrich student learning (Australian Government, 2018). This section will examine partnerships with two groups: industry or employers, and universities.

The term ‘industry’ encompasses all employers across the private, public and not-for-profit sectors. Employers and businesses are well placed to provide career support to students as they are immersed in their field and have current knowledge of the pathways to achieve that career, thus providing authentic, accurate, and timely guidance (Australian Government, 2019; Career Development Institute, 2015; Joyce, 2019; Kashefpakdel et al., 2018).

School-industry partnerships provide a range of activities that enable students to engage with the world of work as part of school learning. Generally, partnership activities aim to broaden students’ understanding of the world of work and enrich school learning through providing a variety opportunities to meet and learn from industry professionals, solve real world problems and learn to use state-of-the-art technology (Torii, 2018, p. vi).

Employer engagement and exposure to the world of work bestows benefits on students including improved school performance and higher long term wages (Torii, 2018).
Opportunities to engage with industry partners are particularly important for children and young people from LSES backgrounds who may have more limited social networks which may not support access to a broad set of employment opportunities (Torii, 2018).

Direct partnership activities including one-off events, incursions or excursions, career taster days, school group workplace visits, and job shadowing, allow for contextualisation and the meeting of the needs of specific cohorts of students (Torii, 2018). Large-scale partnerships engage multiple schools and tend to involve multiple component activities and run over multiple years as part of broader strategic plans. These include activities such as regional industry tours, career talks and expos, industry-based competitions and events, mentoring programs, and teacher professional development workshops (Torii, 2018). There are benefits of scale for these types of partnerships, but they also are more complex and require the use of intermediary organisations to facilitate.

Part of a partnership approach includes providing young people with work experience that mirrors the type of work done in the profession instead of menial and mundane work or job-shadowing (Hutchinson, 2018; McGrath & Murphy, 2016; Seward & Gaesser, 2018; Wood et al., 2018). Work experience placements help create concrete experiences to develop career aspirations and understand pathway options (Gore et al., 2019; McGrath & Murphy, 2016). Results from Broadbent et al.’s study (2012) show that work experience is an important factor in motivating students to do well at school, being informed about making future choices, and creating a greater sense of purpose regarding study and career. Australian career practitioners identified work experience as being the second most effective career development activity in their schools (McCrindle Research, 2015).

Partnerships between schools and universities have benefits for students, schools and communities as well as universities. Traditionally, universities might have engaged with schools as part of one-off university-centred events (Armstrong & Cairnduff, 2011). However, universities can learn as much from schools and their communities, as schools from universities (Dhillon, 2005); and partnership approaches, particularly those that are student-centred rather than those that favour one particular post-school outcome, can have a transformative impact on educational access (Armstrong & Cairnduff, 2011), if they are sustained over time (Blackmore, Hutchinson, & Keary, 2017).
In practice, partnerships between universities are highly differentiated and contextual but are a form of ‘social partnership’ which address local needs or challenges in communities. Key characteristics of good social partnership practice are a shared purpose and common goals; relations with partners; capacity for partnership work; partnership, governance and leadership and; trust and trustworthiness. These attributes are discussed further in the following paragraphs.

A core characteristic of successful university and school partnerships is a shared purpose (Elliot & Campbell, 2015), or a shared strategic vision that is mutually and strategically beneficial (Thomas, 2010). To sustain a partnership long term, there is need for a collaborative vision that is mutually rewarding. Partners should not see themselves as occupying separate territories, but as sharing a common ground (Butcher, Bezzina, & Moran, 2011; Eyal & Yarm, 2018). Ideally however, as argued by Dhillon (2009), partners move beyond shared vision and adopt shared values and ‘norms’ within the partnership.

Networks, networking and the relationships formed between individuals is a key practice in developing and sustaining partnerships between universities and schools. Networks that emerge from university and school partnerships can assist in the pooling of resources, as well as a wider source of knowledge to draw from in gaining guidance about the provision of widening participation activities (Dhillon, 2009). However, networks need to be more than linear individual to individual relationships, but ‘web-like’ networks (Putnam, 1993) that are more effective in enabling the achievement of shared goals between two or more partners. Indeed, successful partnership working is dependent on relationships and the ‘people-richness’ of initiatives (Gale & Sellar, 2011; Thomas, 2010).

A core characteristic of effective social partnerships is the development and maintenance of capacity for partnership. Specifically, school staff might need professional development and consideration of the division of labour in order to be able to engage with partnership work (Clarke, 2010; Martin, Snow, & Torrez, 2011). Furthermore, governance, which oversees the development and operation of partnerships, needs to be accounted for (Billett, Ovens, Clemens, & Seddon, 2007).

A key to successful collaboration is trust, mutual respect and honesty. In order to overcome differences between partners, and to create a basis of trust, adequate time and opportunities need to be established to allow relationships to be established and trust to grow (Eyal & Yarm,
2018). Time and opportunity to meet informally was considered to be crucial in the development of trust between staff in universities and schools (Butcher et al., 2011; Dhillon, 2009).

School-university partnerships which feature the characteristics discussed in this section have the potential to enrich student learning and aspirations, as well as provide quality CDL.

... is targeted
For career education to meet the individual needs of every student including those from equity groups and those facing multiple disadvantages, career programs may need to be targeted (Australian Government, 2013a, 2019).

In HE, some institutions have implemented a career program for students from low socioeconomic or minority groups. One program, developed by the University of Southern Queensland (USQ), targets students from rural backgrounds. It provides specific career education classes and support for those who deal with issues such as loneliness and being first-in-family to attend university. USQ’s program also looks long-term by providing a transition to university program in conjunction with the career development program to increase enrolments and retention in university courses (McIlveen et al., 2012). By providing tailored career programs, students from low socioeconomic or equity backgrounds have a greater chance of equality in career outcomes (Bridge Group, 2017).

Another example of tailoring HE courses to create career equity outcomes has been implemented at the University of Technology Sydney (UTS) with a Bachelor of Business (Indigenous) that specifically addressed the needs of Indigenous Australians and aimed to provide positive career outcomes in the field of business (Bajada & Trayler, 2014). Another program included matching training to job growth (Bajada & Trayler, 2014) where areas of employment and career growth were defined and pathways are provided for students from equity backgrounds.

... has the ‘right’ person employed as career adviser
Employing a person well suited to the position of career adviser is a method to maximise the effectiveness of CDL provision in schools. The role of a career adviser is ‘multi-faceted requiring the individual in that role to be many things to many people’ (Yates & Bruce, 2017, p. 65). Desirable characteristics for an exemplary career adviser include experience; a sense of ownership of career education programmes; formal career development qualifications; the
ability to network and maintain relationships both inside and outside of their school; and marketing skills to promote the merits of career education and advocate on behalf of career education itself and on the behalf of students (Yates & Bruce, 2017). Best practice career programs in New Zealand had enthusiastic and dedicated career advisers who had ownership over and pride in the career programmes and recognised the value of them (Furbish & Reid, 2013). Rural pathways advisors specifically need to have extensive local knowledge and professional relationships in their community (Fuqua, 2019). Career advisers must also have a wide range of problem-solving skills, be accessible and flexible, and have well-developed counselling skills (Yates & Bruce, 2017). Finally, they must be extremely adept networkers who develop contacts with a wide range of people and organisations to benefit their students (Yates & Bruce, 2017).

However, hiring the ‘right’ person for career advisor role is problematic in contexts such as regional and rural Australia where the provision of appropriate, quality reliable staff is the most significant barrier to education quality provision (Roberts, 2005).

... has all teachers appropriately trained and involved in professional development

CDL pedagogies should be embedded in initial teacher training to make explicit the role that they will play in directing students’ careers and to train student teachers to successfully integrate career education strategies into their curriculum planning (Fuller et al., 2014; Yates & Bruce, 2017). It is recommended that Indigenous perspectives, specifically, also be embedded in practitioner training (Laffernis, 2018)

Once practicing, professional development should be used to instruct teachers how to integrate career theories and concepts into academic materials (Furbish & Reid, 2013) and to improve teachers’ knowledge and understanding of the full spectrum of possible options available to students as they consider their transition from compulsory education (Fuller et al., 2014; Moote & Archer, 2018). This support and training of teachers to increase their awareness of various vocational landscapes should be a priority (Fuller et al., 2014).

In addition, Fuqua (2019) recommends that a strong and well-resourced professional network with active members is necessary to improve the practice of career advisers in rural locations. Career advisors themselves say that they need networking with other professionals to enhance their work (CICA, 2017a).
To achieve this whole school approach, career advisers need to be able to critically rethink traditional career education activities and their role having traditionally been the sole keepers of information and resources (Yates & Bruce, 2017).

... has strong leadership

Of central importance to successful career programs is leadership. NZ best practice programs have the support of the school principal and senior leadership of the school (Furbish & Reid, 2013). In practice, this might look different in different contexts including adding the career adviser to the school management team (Furbish & Reid, 2013); or employing a senior leader with oversight of career education and guidance across the school (Yates & Bruce, 2017). Having a strong advocate in the school is essential to drive the career programme and to maintain the relationships required to ensure its success (Yates & Bruce, 2017).

There is a need for purposeful leadership and careful management if all of the complex elements and actors involved in a career programme are to be effectively delivered. There is also a clear need for someone within the school to hold the accountability for the delivery of this activity (Andrews & Hooley, 2017, p. 160).

For the delivery of career education and guidance in schools to be both efficient and effective,

the distinctions and relationships between these different roles need to be understood by all contributors. The respective and related roles of other school staff, such as career advisers, librarians and support staff, also need to be made explicit (Andrews & Hooley, 2017, p. 156).

This delineation of roles and responsibilities also applies to internal and external partners in a partnership model in order to maximise the benefits of the partnership (Andrews & Hooley, 2017).

... is evaluative

Another component of best practice was that career programs self-reviewed and evaluated their outcomes and success to ensure that students are being prepared for further education and employment (Andrewartha & Harvey, 2017; Joyce, 2019; Moote & Archer, 2018; Yates & Bruce, 2017). Joyce (2019) found that the best performing international career programs had
an evaluation component that informed the ongoing delivery of the program and Brown et. al (2019) recommend that evaluations be undertaken on career services at HE institutions within Australia. Moote and Archer (2018) advocate for monitoring and equity audits. Standards and quality assurance processes for both services and practitioners support effective career development services and enhance career development outcomes (Australian Government, 2013a).

The Queensland Government (2019) has made career development a core outcome of all their schools (government, Catholic and independent) and have implemented the Next Step post-school destination survey to identify the employment, study or other point-in-time destinations of school leavers. An objective of the survey is to help schools review and plan services for students (Queensland Government, 2019), and is therefore a tool Queensland schools may use to evaluate the quality of their CDL provision.
CONCLUSION

Quality CDL has never been more important. In order to effectively transition from school into the new work reality, appropriate skills, knowledge and work experience is vital. Young people must navigate diverse and flexible study pathways to acquire these things but also, and importantly, be assisted to realise their aspirations. CDL can provide support as young people traverse this process of educational and career decision making and reach their full potential. However, the current provision of CDL in schools has been criticised as being inequitable, with those from LSES backgrounds having less support and resources than those from HSES backgrounds (Andrews & Hooley, 2017; Atalier Learning Solutions, 2012). This is particularly problematic given that young people from LSES backgrounds might not have access to the same level or types of resources available to youth from HSES backgrounds. This limited access may result in ‘brittle horizons of aspirations’ (Appadurai, 2004, p. 69) and more restricted sources of knowledge about education and career options.

Best practices in CDL are essential to achieving equitable outcomes for young people from low SES backgrounds. Therefore, CDL should begin at a young age, be student-centred and individualised, contextual and culturally sensitive. Programs should be part of a whole-school, partnership approach, which involve key influencers. The programs should be accessible to all, targeted at specific groups when required and evaluated for their effectiveness. Professionals involved in career education should be appropriately trained and involved in professional development and have the support of strong leadership and policy.
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