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Work-integrated learning (WIL) continues to be seen as an important strategy for enhancing graduate employability. While work placements continue to be the dominant approach, there has been a focus on diversifying the types of WIL offerings in recent years, and in particular, the development of innovative models. This is partly in response to calls for universities to be more flexible and responsive in order to better cater for industry and student needs. This Special Issue, stemming from the 2018 Australian Collaborative Education Network National Conference, integrates a number of perspectives and approaches to WIL and employability, with a focus on innovative models, curriculum and research. A number of areas are identified as posing particular challenges and opportunities in WIL. These include: scaffolding of WIL through the curriculum; student preparation for WIL; wellbeing, resilience, persistence, and motivation; and developing quality measures of WIL. It is timely to develop and research more integrated and holistic approaches to WIL and other related areas such as employability and career development learning, both to account for the inherent complexity and diversity of WIL itself and to utilize the new research findings in the WIL literature.
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INTRODUCTION

With the growing emphasis on linking higher education with desirable employability and employment outcomes, many higher education institutions are incorporating WIL into the tertiary education curriculum (Ferns, Campbell, & Zegwaard, 2014; Freudenberg, Brimble, & Cameron, 2011; Jackson, 2013, 2015b; Jackson & Wilton, 2016). This international trend has also been reflected by an increase in engagement in WIL by employers (Universities Australia, 2019). In Australia, such developments can be attributed in part to the forging of the 2015 National Strategy on Work Integrated Learning in University Education (ACEN, 2015), a partnership between several industry, employer, and educational groups, in Canada with the federal governmental investment CAN$150 million into WIL (Beaulne-Stuebing, 2019), in New Zealand with the prominent mention of WIL in the Future of Education discussion document (Ministry of Education, 2019), and internationally with the recent introduction of the WIL Charter (WACE, 2019).

Despite a recent focus on innovative models of WIL, work placement continues to be the dominant approach, with Australia reporting 43% of WIL activities were work placements, with projects, simulations, fieldwork and other activities (e.g., volunteering, mentoring) less common (Universities Australia, 2019). Nevertheless, WIL experiences have diversified in recent years, as evidenced by the recent project, ‘Enhancing student employability through innovative WIL models’ funded by the Australian Technology Network of Universities (Kay, Ferns, Russell, & Smith, 2018). This is in response...
to calls for universities to be more flexible and responsive in their WIL offerings (Universities Australia, 2019), in order to better cater for industry and student needs.

Supporting student learning and development of employability through new approaches to WIL and the assessment of learning through WIL, is the focus of this Special Issue. Conceptions of employability have shifted over time from an emphasis on job-procurement to “having the requisite skills to obtain or create work” (M. Smith, Bell, Bennett, & McAlpine, 2018, p. 8). WIL can provide opportunities for students to develop discipline-specific/technical skills, broader graduate attributes such as communication, team-work, and project management (e.g., Edwards, 2015), as well as broader meta-cognitive capacities, for example, the ability “to find, create and sustain meaningful work across the career lifespan” (Bennett, 2018). Bennett (2018, p. iv) emphasizes the need for employability to be aligned to, and integrated with curriculum, in order to effectively prepare students for future work:

Only when employability development and career guidance is aligned with disciplinary knowledge, skills and practices will it become core business. Employability development is not yet at the core of the curriculum because it has been poorly defined as the acquisition of generic skills which are developed separately from the core business of learning a discipline. Employability development includes but extends beyond discipline skills, knowledge and practices - the technical aspects of doing a discipline. Employability is enabled both for graduates and in the longer term by the ability to conceptualise future life and work through broader employABILITY thinking.

The call for more integrated approaches to employability, WIL, curriculum, assessment, and various aspects of learning and work has been echoed by other scholars (e.g., Coll & Zegwaard, 2011; Jackson, 2016b; Johnston, 2011). It entails a broader role for higher education institutions than that previously proposed by earlier narrower definitions of employability, that is, to “foster students’ cognitive and social development as capable and informed individuals, professionals, and social citizens” (i.e., employABILITY thinking) (Bennett, 2018, p. 1). Similarly, this Special Issue integrates a number of perspectives and approaches to WIL and employability, with a focus on innovative models, curriculum and research.

ENHANCING STUDENT LEARNING THROUGH REFLECTION AND DEBRIEFING

Assessment remains a challenging and topical issue within the WIL community (Yorke, 2005; Zegwaard, Coll, & Hodges, 2003), especially as traditional assessment practices used in the classroom do not easily transfer to assessing for learning through WIL (Ferns & Zegwaard, 2014). Winchester-Seeto and Rowe (2017) have previously argued that there needs to be a holistic approach to capturing learning through assessment and supporting learning activities. Debriefing and reflection has been recognized as a powerful way to enhancing the student learning through WIL (Harvey, Coulson, Mackaway, & Winchester-Seeto, 2010; Lucas, 2017; Shinnick, Woo, Horwich, & Steadman, 2011) and core to enabling a quality WIL experiences (Ferns, Russell, & Smith, 2015). Research has also shown that effective debriefing can improve work performance (Zebuhr et al., 2012) and difficult to target competencies such as leadership (Kaplan & Ura, 2010), transferable skills, cultural skills (Arthur & Achenbach, 2002), as well as self-efficacy (Eun-Ho, 2015) and attitudinal position (Kaplan & Ura, 2010; Merryman, 2010). Debriefing and contextualized reflection will also accommodate the complexity of workplace variability.

In this Special Issue, Winchester-Seeto and Rowe (2019) continue their work on learning flashpoints by focusing on various practices of debriefing and reflection. They explore university staff and host supervisors from three different countries on how they engaged their students with debriefing and
reflection. They found that some participants were uncertain about debriefing and tended to interchangeably use a range of different terms to describe debriefing. The authors provided a helpful list of overlapping and defining elements of debriefing and reflection, including how participant response categorize into debriefing or reflection and themes within. Their findings showed that participants were using debriefing approaches for each of the learning types (academic, performance, reflective), even if the participants did not realize that it was occurring. Winchester-Seeto and Rowe end by highlighting the importance and effectiveness of debriefing, focusing particularly on the need for the facilitator of the debriefing activity actively involved in the debriefing interaction.

CHARACTERIZING WIL ACTIVITIES

The link between WIL and employability has been one of the driving factors behind the rapidly expanding use of WIL in higher education (Jackson, 2013; A. D. Rowe & Zegwaard, 2017). The rapid expanding of WIL has introduced significant variability in the practice of WIL across the higher education sector, raising questions around how we ensure quality practice of WIL (Bosco & Ferns, 2014; Ferns & Zegwaard, 2014; C. Smith, Ferns, & Russell, 2019). This rapid expansion is reminisced of the federal funding years (1968-1996) in the US that resulted in the proliferation of cooperative education programs (a form of WIL), however, with little shared understanding of what constituted quality, how to achieve quality, and how to measure quality, with many programs developed that were perceived to lack quality (Sovilla & Varty, 2011). This issue became a primary influencer on the withdrawal of the federal funding, to the determinant of many good cooperative education programs (Sovilla & Varty, 2011).

This historical event should serve as an important lesson for WIL practitioners and leaders today, and particularly highlights the importance of establishing a shared understanding of quality WIL, how to achieve quality WIL, and how to measure the quality of WIL practice. There has been valuable work completed by C. Smith, Ferns, and Russell (2016) investigating and determining quality aspects of WIL, but they point out more work is required. Various researchers have attempted to create typologies (see, e.g., Groenewald, Drysdale, Chiupka, & Johnston, 2011; O’Shea, 2014; A. D. Rowe, Winchester-Seeto, & Mackaway, 2012) in order to better understand the boundaries between, and advantages/disadvantages of different approaches (e.g., placement, non-traditional/innovative WIL models). While the work of (Billett, 2015) and others has developed our understanding of how particular approaches can more effectively support diverse learning outcomes, students and situations, there remains considerable variation across the sector as to how WIL is conceptualized, and clearer delineations between categories of WIL are needed (Sachs, Rowe, & Wilson, 2017; Universities Australia, 2019). Hence, there is need for significant work to be undertaken around determining, measuring, and achieving quality in WIL, including the methods of describing and grouping types of WIL activities.

In the Special Issue, Jones, Millar, and Chuck (2019) point out that the challenge of employability for Australian graduates is increasing, with graduate full-time employment dropping from 84.5% in 2007 to 71.8% in 2017, with science graduates in particularly struggling with only 59% full time employment in 2017 (Graduate Careers Australia, 2016). Within this context, Jones, Millar, and Chuck conducted an evaluation of all science WIL activities in their educational institution. After discussing a series of frameworks, the authors proceeded with using the framework developed by Edwards, Perkins, Pearce, and Hong (2015). The findings showed a mixture of practice across the sciences with mathematics indicating the lowest level of engagement with WIL. Using a fairly broad definition of WIL, the researchers found that WIL-related activities were occurring in science offerings when these activities were not identified as WIL or related to WIL (e.g., learning activates related to employability skills that fall within the proposed modified framework of WIL by (Edwards et al., 2015).
DEVELOPING VERSATILE WORK-INTEGRATED LEARNING GRADUATES

The rapidly changing world of work has placed much greater emphasis on graduates possessing diverse and transferable skills, allowing them to be dynamic adaptive in response to change (Jackson, Fleming, & Rowe, 2019). Early employability literature argued for the focus on graduates possessing well developed technical skills, however, this argument has broadened to include non-technical skills, with research starting to show that even in highly technically-focused professions (e.g., engineering and science), some non-technical skills were valued more highly that technical skills (Coll & Zegwaard, 2006; Zegwaard, Khoo, Adam, & Peter, 2018). More recent research has widened the focus on including professional ethics (Campbell & Zegwaard, 2011; Trede & McEwen, 2016) and professional identity (Jackson, 2016a; Zegwaard, Campbell, & Petti, 2017) as requirements for graduates entering the workplace. In a similar vein, in technically-focused professions there was an emphasis on I-shaped professionals – those who had highly developed technical skills allowing for thorough, detailed exploration of a process. Increasingly, within the climate of rapid workplace change, the discussion has shifted toward T-shaped professionals who possess a broad knowledge base and the ability to quickly adapt when changes occur. The description of I-shaped and T-shaped professionals, within the context of WIL, was thoroughly explored by Gardner (2017). Gardner argued the case that high impact, full immersion forms for WIL (e.g., work placement, practicums, co-op, curriculum-based internships) are promising for cultivating T-shaped professionals.

Martin and Rees (2019) build on the work Gardner (2017) by testing the model through thematically coding of reflective assignments submitted by students as part of their WIL activities. The testing found support of the argument by Gardner that WIL provides learning activities that support the development of T-shaped professionals. The reflective assessment practice common for many full immersion practices of WIL, was found to be particularly well suited for developing T-shaped attributes because it allowed for reflection around diverse elements and skills. Martin and Rees also found that the central focus of the T-shaped professional of ‘me’ may not capture the true essence of the T-shaped professional, and that the importance of concepts such as self-efficacy, self-conception, and perception of ‘self’ were overlooked. Therefore, Martin and Rees propose a focus shift in the T-shaped model by replacing the central focus of ‘me’ with a central focus of ‘self’.

RESEARCHING WIL ACTIVITIES IN SITU

Work-integrated learning is an established educational approach in university education and, as with all forms of university education, a fundamental principle of university education is the requirement for research-informed education – WIL should not be exception to this principle (Zegwaard, 2015). Observers of research in WIL have noted the development and advancement of the quality of WIL research, where, for example, in 1988 Wilson (1988) remarked that the research up to that time seemed focused on processes of delivery of WIL and lacked theory informed discussion, while Bartkus and Stull (1997) were critical of research up to 1997 as being sketchy and uncertain. However, Coll and Kalnins (2009) reported the advancement of the research activities since the earlier reviews and strongly advocated further development of mixed methods to approaching the research. More recent observations of WIL research note that research has significantly advanced (Bartkus & Higgs, 2011), matured (Zegwaard, 2012), and become more theory-informed (Zegwaard & Coll, 2011). The WIL community is made up of a diverse range of members (Zegwaard et al., 2019), and includes emerging researchers who need mentoring as they develop their research careers (Zegwaard, 2015) and may often find commencing research easiest by investigating challenges within their own WIL program. Fleming
(2018) discussed the challenges of investigating one’s own WIL program through a positioning called ‘insider researcher’, arguing that WIL staff members are often best positioned to undertake research and incorporate their research activities with their day-to-day activities. Design and careful ethical considerations need to be carried out to successfully conduct such research.

Dean (2019) presents a helpful methodological paper on how to conduct observational research of students engaged in WIL. Specifically, Dean highlight how student perceptions can be captured through approaches such as surveys and interviews, noting that this form of research approach appears to be favored by researchers publishing in the International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning. However, there are limitations in that students are not always able to explain (or understand) why or how something has occurred (Pader, 2006). Drawing from her own research experiences, Dean (2019) explains how trustworthiness of observational research can be established and provides useful detailed examples on how other researchers can successfully implement an observational research approach, including the collection of artifacts such as documental material and photographs, and understanding the limitations and challenges of the interpretative nature of observational research approaches.

GRADUATE INTERNSHIPS

Often within the literature, WIL is discussed in the context of undergraduate studies, reflecting the assumption that the bulk of WIL learning activities occurred at this level. However, the recent WIL in Universities report by the Universities Australia indicated that a third of the WIL activities were occurring at postgraduate level, with a similar activity profile (e.g., placement, project fieldwork, simulation) as that observed for undergraduate students (Universities Australia, 2019). In Canada it has been reported that a third of the higher educational institutions offered postgraduate WIL by way of cooperative education in at least one postgraduate degree offering (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 2011) and the Australian Government announced AUS$28 million funding support for 1,400 postgraduate research internships in the non-profit sector. Furthermore, a review conducted by P. Rowe (2011) described a number of postgraduate level cooperative education activities in Canadian higher education, for example University of Waterloo and University of Victoria, going on to describe the general increase in students enrolling in postgraduate programs, and the need to further explore how WIL could be included in the postgraduate curriculum.

Valencia-Forrester (2019) continues along the lines of P. Rowe’s (2011) research by exploring the potential of WIL within PhD programs internationally, ultimately focusing on the Australian context. The state of play of the PhD career is described, highlighting the increasing uncertainty of tenured positioned at universities in Australia and no doubt also for other countries. The increasing challenge of PhD employability is of concern, however, WIL activities as part of the PhD program may be a way to increase the employability (and employment) outcomes for PhD graduates. Valencia-Forrester then reports on an investigation of PhD students’ views around employability, and of including WIL in PhD programs.

INNOVATIVE MODELS FOR WORK-INTEGRATED LEARNING

A significant challenge for graduates entering the modern workforce is the rapidly changing nature of work. Work-integrated learning is recognized as a powerful educational approach that helps reduce the gap between education and employment through the development of employability outcomes (Hagel, Brown, Mathew, Wool, & Tsu, 2014; Jackson, 2013, 2015a; A. D. Rowe & Zegwaard, 2017), with

---

2 The terms graduate studies and postgraduate studies tend to be used interchangeably. Here it is meant as any degree that requires prior completion of an undergraduate degree.
an increasing number of governments investing into the development and embedding of WIL in higher education curriculum (see, e.g., Ministry of Education, 2019; Universities Australia, 2019; Walker, 2019). With increasing attention and expansion of WIL practices, there is a growing need to be innovative, especially in response to the increased competition for WIL opportunities created by universities increasing their WIL practices. For example, in the Australian context of 25 million people, where virtually every university provides a range of WIL offerings, there were reportedly 555,403 WIL experience taken by 451,263 students (Universities Australia, 2019). Such high numbers initiates discussions around concerns of market saturation and could cause significant competition for WIL opportunities between universities and institutions of technology. These numbers also highlight the importance of creating new innovative and alternative WIL practices that generate the same learning outcomes that would be expected from contemporary WIL practices.

In this Special Issue, Kay, Ferns, Russell, Smith, and Winchester-Seeto (2019) reports on an investigation of a number of emerging WIL practices. These emerging practices were grouped into five clusters; micro-placements, online projects/placements, hackathons, competitions and events, and incubators/startups and consultations, with a particular focus on stakeholder engagement, design, and co-design including partners. The research includes the comparison of contemporary practices with that of emerging WIL practices, highlighting defining elements of difference, and drawing attention to the enablers and challenges within. The researchers observed that as universities engage with a broader range of organizations, they need to ensure curricula becomes more agile to allow for the increased variability of external organizational requirements.

**ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS**

There are a number of topics raised in this Special Issue which present both opportunities and challenges in WIL. However, in addition to the important topics covered, there are other areas in need of attention and development. The below addresses some of these, however, it is not an exhaustive list.

**Scaffolding of WIL through the Curriculum**

Scaffolding in WIL entails sequencing WIL experiences and/or the curriculum in such a way that there is structure and meaning to student learning (e.g., Jackson, 2015b; Kaider & Bussey, 2018). Recently, there has been a focus on integrating multiple WIL experiences within degree programs (i.e., sequencing WIL experiences across the years rather than a single standalone offering in one year usually towards the end of a degree program) supported with pre-WIL professional preparation and post-WIL debriefing and reflection around skill development and professional identity. This follows a somewhat similar structure to cooperative education models, common in the US and Canada. Models such as the one advocated by Kaider and Bussey (2018) propose to gradually introduce students to their relevant graduate industry sector/s, building up to more authentic and complex learning opportunities which model professional practice contexts. For example, simulation and virtual WIL (e.g., clinical simulation laboratories) can provide opportunities for students to gain exposure to practice and develop skills in a controlled standardized environment in the earlier years of their study, prior to entering professional contexts (Sachs et al., 2017). There is a need to further develop and research these more complex WIL structures which, when underpinned with good understanding of quality WIL, will allows students to progress through their studies with increasingly more complex WIL experiences, scaffolded from the first year to the final year of study.
**Student Preparation for Work-Integrated Learning**

Effective preparation of students prior to engaging with WIL is a key quality indicator of WIL (Billett, 2015; C. Smith et al., 2016, 2019). However, there is continued debate on what constitutes good practice in preparation and what would suffice as good ‘minimum’ preparation. According to Billett (2015) effective preparation consists of preparatory experiences that go beyond providing information, to ones where students actively engage with potential scenarios that may affect the quality of their learning experiences. This might include orientating them to requirements for effectively engaging in the practice setting, identifying capacities required to effectively undertake tasks, clarifying expectations around roles and responsibilities, and preparing them for contestations that might arise. A particularly important aspect of effective preparation is supporting students to be agentic and reflexive learners (Billett, 2006, 2015). Some students will need more prompting and support in this regard, in order to maximize their learning outcomes during WIL. It is important that preparation focus on both educational and psychological aspects (Drewery, Pretti, & Barclay, 2016; C. Smith et al., 2016), however preparation for student wellbeing during WIL is often overlooked (Grant-Smith, Gillett-Swan, & Chapman, 2017). With the increasing practice of WIL, and increasing policy focus of student care (Tertiary Education Commission, 2019), it is pertinent that WIL practitioners and program developers have a shared understanding of good practice for student preparation for WIL.

**Wellbeing, Resilience, Persistence, and Motivation**

There has been an increasing focus on resilience, persistence, and wellbeing of students in the education sector (Hattie, Biggs, & Prudie, 1996; Waxman, Gray, & Padron, 2003). A number of recent reports have raised concerns about the mental health of university students, and, in particular, for groups such as international students (Forbes-Mewett, 2019). Participating in WIL can add additional stress on students, potentially having an adverse impact on their physical and psychological health (Drewery, Cormier, Pretti, & Church, 2019; Drewery et al., 2016; Gillett-Swan & Grant-Smith, 2018). A recent report by Grant-Smith et al. (2017) found that “WIL participants experience multiple and connected stresses as a result of undertaking a WIL placement” (p. 3). These may be experienced in response to a combination of factors including the unpaid nature of many WIL placements, additional costs incurred, relational stressors and the financial impacts of lost wages. Further, students may experience personal challenges in WIL such as confronting situations with clients or work colleagues (Billett, 2011). Such findings point to the need for more diverse (non-placement) WIL options, in addition to better quality preparation and support during WIL experiences, particularly for students undertaking work placements. This could be achieved through the introduction of educational interventions focused specifically on resilience (Mate & Ryan, 2015) and quality supervision (pastoral care) (Grant-Smith et al., 2017). Gillett-Swan and Grant-Smith (2018) advocate for more “systematic focused support for wellbeing for all students” arguing that this “will result in better outcomes for all students, not just those experiencing challenges” (p. 10). There has been research focused on student wellbeing, resilience, persistence and motivation in the context of WIL (e.g., Cormier & Drewery, 2017; Drewery et al., 2019; Drysdale & McBeath, 2014; Gillett-Swan & Grant-Smith, 2018; Reddan, 2013; Usher, 2019), however, given that WIL activities are associated with significant risks (Cameron, 2018) and some governments are mandating pastoral care needs of students in higher education (Tertiary Education Commission, 2019), there is still considerable work needed around the development of a good understanding of student wellbeing, resilience, persistence, and motivation within the context of WIL.
Developing Quality Measures of WIL

Considering the observations by Sovilla and Varty (2011) on the underpinning causes of withdrawal of the federal funding for cooperative education in the US, it is vitally important that there is development of a shared understanding of what constitutes quality in WIL and frameworks by which the quality of WIL can be measured. Some work has already begun in this space, for example, work by Smith, Ferns, and Russell (2016, 2019) provides important insights to the curricular elements important for WIL and the impact of quality placements, Khampirat and McRae (2016) have offered a global approach for quality assessment, and York and Vidovich (2014) present arguments on quality policies and standards for assessment in WIL. The Co-operative Education and Work-Integrated Learning (CEWIL Canada) has developed standards for program accreditation reviews, however, the application limited to the practice of cooperative education. To ensure the quality of the learning experience for the student and the quality of the delivery of the WIL program, there needs to be a quality standards WIL framework developed that can be applied across the diverse range of WIL practices. Related to this is the need for a carefully thought out, well planned, and (in some cases) ongoing evaluation (Rowe et al., 2018; Winchester-Seeto et al., 2019). Evaluating quality in WIL, however, is a challenging endeavor (Smith et al., 2019), as evidenced by the lack of large-scale measures of quality for WIL (Winchester-Seeto, 2019). A complicating element of good quality WIL is the significant reliance on people and, especially, the reciprocity of relationships between people across the higher education institution and external organizations, which are difficult to measure. Regardless of the challenges, it is important to have clearly defined and measurable indicators of quality of WIL, both for the purpose of quality assurance and quality enhancement (Winchester-Seeto, 2019).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, more integrated and holistic approaches are needed to advance employability and WIL such as, for example, the model advocated by M. Smith et al. (2018) which combines WIL and career development principles and practices. They argue that integrated approaches will lead to better outcomes such as more effectively meeting national productivity challenges (M. Smith et al., 2018). There is merit to M. Smith et al.’s proposed approach, and similar approaches, that can bring together diverse perspectives, especially since WIL is inherently complex and diverse in its offerings. Furthermore, research in WIL has advanced considerably since the turn of the century, with increased theory-informed research and critical literature-informed interpretation that can inform the development of new innovative approach to how WIL is offered. As the practice of WIL continues to expand, it is indeed timely to broaden the range of types of WIL that are offered to higher education students.
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