

# Understanding Student Preference for Universities Over TVET Colleges

A Conceptual Analysis of Perceptions and Institutional Factors

Ms Malebo Mulaudzi and Ms Rachel Khoza  
University of Johannesburg · Johannesburg Business School



**JBS**  
JOHANNESBURG  
BUSINESS SCHOOL



**Our Future  
Reimagined**



**21 YEARS OF IMPACT**

# PRESENTATION OVERVIEW

01

Background of the study

02

Theoretical Foundation

03

Research Methodology

04

Findings (6 Themes)

05

The Integrated Framework

06

Implications & Conclusion

## Three Decades On, the Pattern Hasn't Moved

**1994**

**TVET redesigned to bridge skills gap**

An explicit mandate to address mass post-school enrolment and a labour market starved of intermediate skills

**30yrs**

**Students still choose university first**

Low enrolment, low public esteem, weak throughput, graduate unemployment, despite the sector's developmental promise

**4IR**

**The puzzle sharpens**

Employers now expect digital fluency too. COVID-19 exposed TVET's digital fragility, widening the perceived gap with universities

**Research question: What factors shape student preference for universities over TVET colleges, and how do perceptions of digital readiness contribute?**

# Three Lenses on Why Students Choose

**HCT**

**Human Capital Theory**

*Education as investment*

Students compare expected returns across pathways. Digital competence is now central to perceived returns.

**SIT**

**Social Influence Theory**

*Informational & normative channels*

Parents, peers, teachers and media shape evaluation, consistently shown across African career-choice scholarship.

**InT**

**Institutional Theory**

*Legitimacy & reputation*

Legitimacy is conferred by reputation and visible quality markers; digital readiness is now one of them.

**All three converge on one point: students choose on PERCEIVED returns, socially mediated, legitimised by visible markers, not on directly observed reality.**

# Narrative & Critical Literature Review

## DESIGN

Conceptual research — secondary data only, no human participants. Creswell & Creswell (2017) design; Saunders et al. (2019) narrative review

## SEARCH

Scopus

## SCOPE

English-language sources, 2011–2025, South African & comparable developing-country contexts; foundational pre-2011 theory retained where indispensable

## ANALYSIS

Braun & Clarke (2006) six-phase thematic synthesis: familiarisation → coding → theme search → review → naming → reporting

## TRUSTWORTHINESS

Lincoln & Guba criteria — credibility (triangulation), transferability, dependability, confirmability (traceable coding trail)

## EVIDENTIAL RULE

Every directional pathway in the framework anchored to at least two independent sources — not conceptual assertion alone

# Stigma Runs Deep · Employability Is Now Digitally Framed

## Theme 1

### Societal Perceptions of TVET

#### Three accounts of the SAME stigma:

**Structural:** articulation failures (Majola)

**Intersectional:** disability & vocational identity (Muzite & Gasa)

**Historical-symbolic:** the differentiated system's ordering (Papier & Needham)

Students rarely see employment data — they encounter narratives via family, peers, media that position TVET as second-best. The stigma-transmitting channels must become the repositioning channels.

## Theme 2

### Perceived Employability Differences

#### Three loci one digital frame:

**Supply-side:** graduates lack digital competencies (Mbambo & du Plessis)

**Self-perception:** students underestimate readiness (Mkhize & Reddy)

**Curriculum design:** limited industry exposure (Thakalekoala)

Under Human Capital Theory in 4IR terms: expected returns to TVET depend on perceived digital readiness as much as perceived technical training. University preference partly tracks a digitally inflected employability calculation.

## Real Deficits, Perceptual Lag · Reputation Outruns Reality

### Theme 3

#### Digital Readiness & Technology Infrastructure

Documented deficits at multiple levels: infrastructure, lecturer skills, student competency — traced upstream to under-resourced secondary schools (Flowers & Tanner).

#### TWO FACES OF READINESS

Institutional-real (actual capability) vs Perceptual (what's visible). Under Institutional Theory, what shapes preference is the VISIBLE markers, not underlying capability. Improving infrastructure without communicating it leaves the perception lag intact.

### Theme 4

#### Institutional Reputation & Credibility

Two competing accounts: reputation as a reflection of quality, vs Institutional Theory's view — legitimacy as its own resource, partially DECOUPLED from performance.

Mutungi shows credibility perceptions persist even after programmes improve. Students judge on visible markers — devices, connectivity, modern facilities — which can change faster than reputation does. A credibility ceiling depresses TVET enrolment even where quality is sound.

# Choice by Default · 4IR as the Lens Over Everything Else

## Theme 5

### Awareness & Understanding of TVET Pathways

Where students don't understand what TVET offers or leads to, the choice isn't a genuine comparison — it's a default to the more familiar option.

#### THE DIGITAL TWIST

Awareness intersects with digital readiness: students who learn about TVET through outdated websites or thin digital outreach infer that TVET itself is digitally underdeveloped. The communicative infrastructure becomes part of how institutional substance is perceived.

## Theme 6

### 4IR Preparedness & Future Employability

This theme draws the other five together. Three readings of what 4IR preparedness requires — a skills agenda, an institutional reorientation agenda, a self-efficacy agenda — implying complementary, not competing, investments.

Perceptions of 4IR preparedness operate as a LENS through which all five other themes are refracted. Where TVET is seen to lag the 4IR, every other determinant tilts further toward university choice.

## Four Layers, Eight Constructs

### ANTECEDENT LAYER

Awareness · Social Influence · 4IR Preparedness

*Contextual forces in which choice is made*

### MEDIATING INSTITUTIONAL LAYER

Digital Readiness · Institutional Reputation · Employability Expectations

*Institutional-level evaluations student's form*

### SYNTHESISING PERCEPTUAL LAYER

Student Perceptions

*Where all other layers translate into preference — the BINDING pathway*

### OUTCOME LAYER

Student Preference Decisions

*University vs TVET — the observable choice*

## Eleven Directional Pathways — Three Integrating Mechanisms

1

### 4IR as cross-cutting force

Feeds digital readiness (R4), employability (R5) & reputation (R6). 3 of 4 mediating pathways are 4IR-conditioned — TVET lag compounds across all of them.

2

### Social influence, doubly mediated

Acts directly on perceptions (R2) AND indirectly via awareness (R3). TVET perceptions are shaped twice over by the social environment.

3

### Mediating layer is interconnected

Digital readiness shapes both reputation and employability, each of which then shapes perceptions — compounded, not additive, effects.

### R11 — THE BINDING PATHWAY

Student perceptions → Student preference decisions. Every one of the other ten pathways feeds into perceptions; perceptions alone drive choice. Students never directly observe infrastructure, lecturer capability, or graduate outcomes — they observe perceptions of these things, transmitted through social, informational and digital channels.

## Four Testable Propositions

P1

Preference is shaped by an interacting SYSTEM of layers — not any single determinant

P2

4IR preparedness perceptions CONDITION the influence of digital readiness, reputation & employability on perceptions

P3

Social influence operates through BOTH direct and information-mediating pathways — doubling its effect

P4

Shifting preference requires engaging capability AND perception simultaneously — perception is the binding pathway

*Each construct is measurable — survey scales, validated perception instruments, legitimacy/image scales — enabling structural equation modelling on cross-sectional data.*

## Capacity and Perception, Moved Together

### Policy

- DHET + employer associations reposition TVET as a credible 4IR pathway
- Fix TVET-university articulation so vocational choice isn't penalised
- Pool resources regionally — SADC, South-South cooperation on shared challenge

### Institutional

- Visible markers matter: modern LMS, lecturer digital fluency, student-facing digital experience
- Communicate capacity as it's built — don't let perception lag persist
- Track monitorable indicators: awareness levels, digital outreach reach, LMS adoption

### Curriculum

- Embed 4IR competencies across programmes — not bolt-on modules
- Industry exposure & work-integrated learning close employer-expectation gaps
- Graduate-destination tracking to build the missing employability evidence base

## CONCLUSION

# No Single Determinant Explains This Choice

1

### **It's layered, not singular**

University preference is the product of economic calculation, social influence, institutional legitimacy and digital perceptions interacting — not any one factor alone.

2

### **4IR intensifies every layer**

Perceptions of digital readiness and 4IR preparedness condition every other determinant. Where TVET is seen to lag, every mediator tilts toward university choice.

3

### **Repositioning TVET = part of the 4IR response**

This isn't a side issue for South Africa's industrial strategy — it's a core component of it. The framework offers the scaffolding; the four propositions await empirical testing.

# Thank You

---

**Malebo Suzan Mulaudzi · Rachel Tholakele Khoza**

mulaudzim@uj.ac.za · rkhoza@uj.ac.za

Johannesburg Business School · University of Johannesburg