Writing transfer and work-integrated learning in higher education: Transnational research across disciplines

MICHELLE J. EADY[1]
University of Wollongong, Wollongong, Australia
INA ALEXANDRA MACHURA
Justus Liebig University, Giessen, Germany
RADHIKA JAIDEV
Singapore Institute of Technology, Singapore
KARA TACZAK
University of Denver, Denver, CO, USA
MICHAEL-JOHN DEPALMA
Baylor University, Waco, TX, USA
LILIAN W. MINA
Auburn University at Montgomery, Montgomery, AL, USA

This article explores ways that work-integrated learning (WIL) scholarship and the field of writing studies can benefit from intentional engagement in the context of transfer research. This conceptual paper foregrounds writing in WIL contexts, introduces writing transfer and its relationship to writing in WIL contexts, discusses conceptual overlaps of writing transfer research and WIL, and suggests what writing transfer can mean for WIL practitioners. Overall, we argue that intentional engagement with writing transfer can enrich both WIL research and pedagogy.

Keywords: Work-integrated learning, writing transfer, multi-institutional research, critical reflection, curricular design

Universities around the world are at a major turning point as they unveil new strategic plans and embrace the increasing emphasis on work-integrated learning (WIL). WIL is a strategy of teaching and learning that provides opportunities for university students to build on their disciplinary knowledge through workplace learning experiences (Smith et al., 2014). For instance, Patrick et al. (2009) explored a wide range of WIL activities extending beyond placements, while Kay et al. (2018) identified innovative models of WIL that extended traditional understandings. These have emerged through decades of experience in navigating coordinated WIL efforts across institutions and faculties (Orrell, 2011). Universities are striving to support graduates' employability and identify attributes and skill sets that will allow them to successfully transition from the university into workplace environments (Smith et al., 2014). One innovative university's plan is "to enhance *employability* [emphasis added] and professional practice [and] develop mechanisms to ensure pedagogical practice related to the field of work-integrated learning" (University of Wollongong (UOW), 2018, p. 10).

Particularly at junctures of transition, when students shuttle between academic environments and work-integrated learning experiences, they need to be able to transfer learning into new and different contexts. They also need to recognize where their prior knowledge, practices, and skills need to be repurposed, adapted, or supplemented to meet the demands of new contexts (Robertson et al., 2012). Detterman (1993) concluded in his early work that transfer is fundamental to educational philosophy, as it denotes the degree to which a behavior or set of behaviors can be repeated in a new situation, such as a workplace setting. Building on the work of Thorndike and Woodworth (1901), Detterman also

---

noted the difficulty of transfer, as learners often struggle to see opportunities for "near transfer." In such cases, learners move from the specific context in which they have learned what they know and can do, but do not bring this learning to the new context. In today's globalized, digitized, and rapidly changing markets, students' ability to successfully navigate these transitions will need to underwrite life-long processes of re-skilling and adaptation (Billing, 2007; Halpern & Hakel, 2003). The ability to transfer learning across situations is just as relevant as acquiring highly specialized disciplinary knowledge for today's graduates (Winchester-Seeto & Rowe, 2017). Importantly, students' ability to apply this disciplinary knowledge to new contexts would depend on their understanding and practice of metacognition, including conditional, declarative, and procedural elements that undergird successful learning (Beaufort, 2016; Hattie & Donoghue, 2016; Nückles et al., 2010; Schraw & Dennison, 1994; Taczak & Robertson, 2017).

A substantial proportion of the implementations of WIL, as well as the manner in which students' performances in their WIL opportunities are evaluated, unfold through students' texts and written communication with various stakeholders (e.g., academic or workplace supervisors). Typically, these texts take the form of contracts, final reports, and written assessments (Werder, 2017). Also, students may use reflective journals and diaries based on a framework designed for the subject to guide their writing (Donaghy & Morss, 2000; Williams, et al., 2002). For example, Ladyshewsky and Gardner (2008) examined how students respond to one another's blog entries about their progress and challenges at work. Likewise, at the Singapore Institute of Technology, communication tutors provide instruction and consultation to students on how to write reflective reports on their integrated work-study programs (L. Hwee Hoon, personal communication, January 20, 2021). Additionally, written learning agreements are used to promote students' sense of agency in and ownership of their learning (Clear et al., 2016). Similarly, at Simon Fraser University in Canada, WIL-related writing standards are required to be met in order to fulfill the requirements needed for graduation (Bemister, 2020). Drexel University Co-op in Philadelphia also works with their English Department to assist in developing students' WIL skills as well as to assess their reflections for feedback into both the Co-op Department and the academy in general (Nulton et al., 2019). While these examples are promising, these are few and inconsistent across universities.

As evidenced by a lack of research, writing in WIL contexts is often invisible, either taken for granted or not viewed as a central part of professional work. Thus, writing scholarship and expertise may contribute fruitful terminological distinctions as well as teaching practices and empirical findings (Yancey et al., 2012) that can inform textually-mediated WIL designs and assessments. Importantly, writing scholarship offers a conceptualization of writing that does not stop short at writing as a product or writing as transcription, but instead offers a more nuanced stance towards written acts of meaning-making, communication, and collaboration in WIL contexts and beyond. As Wardle and Adler-Kassner (2015) concede, this conceptualization of writing may be surprising, as often writing is seen as a product, not a process. At times, writing as a practice can seem to be straightforward, even automatic; however, writing research has shown that the ways writing is regarded and how it actually works can differ substantially.

Centrally, one particular area of transfer research that offers a plethora of theoretical approaches, research methodologies, and findings, as well as pedagogical frameworks and recommendations on how to best foster students' transfer abilities, is the scholarship of writing transfer. Writing researchers in North America (Reiff & Bawarshi, 2011; Yancey et al., 2014), Australasia (Thomas, 2019), and Europe (Kruse, 2007) have provided theoretical accounts and empirical investigations of how students adapt and repurpose their writing knowledge, practices, and skills to read, write, and repurpose texts across

a variety of academic, disciplinary, professional, and societal contexts (Bawarshi & Reiff, 2010; Beaufort, 2007; Bergmann & Zepernick, 2007; Dias et al., 2013; Russell, 2009; Wardle, 2007). Key findings from the literature on writing transfer illustrate the procedural unfolding of writing transfer processes (Anson & Forsberg, 1990), the aspects of context that mediate and modulate writing transfer (Nelms & Dively, 2007; Nowacek, 2011), and a range of intra-individual factors that influence students' ability to draw on prior writing knowledge, practices, and skills (Baird & Dilger, 2017; Driscoll, 2011; Robertson et al., 2012). While students' processes of adapting to the writing demands in workplace environments have been investigated in internship and post-graduate contexts (e.g., Anson & Forsberg, 1990; Baird & Dilger, 2017), research that specifically addresses fruitful integration of WIL with writing transfer is still lacking.

This paper highlights how theoretical and empirical approaches to writing transfer can enhance and diversify WIL's inventories of theoretical, investigative, and pedagogical frameworks and help optimize students' writing before, during, and after WIL experiences. We illustrate how WIL administrators, faculty, and practitioners can use writing transfer scholarship to articulate how WIL experiences are mediated through texts and written communication, and how students can use writing concurrently with WIL. Additionally, we outline a multi-institutional, transnational research design that tracks students' writing transfer from university into their WIL experiences and back into university.

WORK-INTEGRATED LEARNING

WIL provides university students with opportunities to practice their discipline in a supportive environment, gain workplace or workplace-related experiences, increase confidence, and expand skills and networks. Globally, universities are featuring diverse WIL activities that are nested within units of study or offered across disciplines (Warren, 2012). Different terms are used in the literature to refer to different types of WIL activities; for example, service learning (Gardner & Bartkus, 2014), experiential learning (Cooper et al., 2010), professional practice (Dean et al., 2018), industry-based learning, internships, co-operative education, or authentic learning experiences facilitated through the tertiary setting (Smith et al., 2009). Specifically, in highly uncertain times, such as when a global pandemic is substantially constraining students', employers', and employees' access to regular workplace environments (Gallagher & Schleyer, 2020), the definitions and provisions that constitute WIL are likely to be expanded to include, for example, non-physical, non-placement, online-placement, or simulated WIL (Dean et al., 2020). Importantly, as institutions try to adapt to remote WIL formats, the differentiation between university-sourced and self-sourced WIL may also become more relevant (Jackson et al., 2019). Moreover, paid versus unpaid WIL placements for students (Hoskyn et al., 2020) should be considered, as paid placements can enable students of different socio-economic, educational, and cultural backgrounds to gain access to appropriately designed WIL experiences.

Different institutions use varied definitions and categories for WIL (Billett, 2015). For example, at the University of Wollongong (UOW) in New South Wales, Australia, the Work-Integrated Learning Advisory Committee (WILAC) created university-wide policies and frameworks and released internal articles based on the literature of WIL for the purposes of defining, classifying, and implementing strategies uniformly across its campuses (Dean et al., 2018). Dean et al. (2018) differentiated between five levels of WIL, depending on the degree to which different elements of curricular learning in tertiary education are interwoven with elements of workplace learning.

TABLE 1: Definitions of work-integrated learning

Classification of WIL	Definition	Example
Co-curricular	Coordinated activities within a subject. They often involve sessions led by a teacher or facilitator.	Volunteering.
Foundational	Purposefully designed and no direct participation in the work practices. There are elements of reflection and engaged feedback.	Excursions, observations.
Embedded	There is direct participation in the workplaces, whether it is through the actual workplace, a simulation or a work-based activity.	Role play, simulations.
Applied	Direct participation in the workplace, or work-based activities. There are community partners involved and career development learning.	Professional placements, internships.
Professional	Subjects completely devoted to WIL. They give students the opportunity to practice skills and reflect in a workplace for sustained periods of time. They also involve support and feedback from both teachers and coordinators.	Professional placements, internships over a sustained amount of time.

Note. Adapted from *UOW WIL pedagogy: Definition, classifications and principles* (p. 10-11) by B. Dean, M. J. Eady, T. Glover-Chambers, T. Moroney, N. O'Donnell, and V. Yanamandram, 2018, University of Wollongong. Copyright 2018 by the University of Wollongong.

In a WIL situation, it is imperative for the academic/supervising teacher to create a meaningful and engaging experience for the student (Daniel & Daniel, 2015). It is paramount that students engaged in WIL understand how meaningful learning takes place during this experience and how to apply this learning in their future work (Doolan et al., 2019).

WRITING IN WIL CONTEXTS AND BEYOND

Writing plays a significant role in most WIL experiences for students through the written preparations, documentation, and evaluations that students produce. Thus, students need not only to transfer their discipline-specific knowledge, practices, and skills from their academic contexts into their WIL contexts as part of expected professional behavior, but to behave specifically like "professionals-who-write" (Read & Michaud 2015, p. 430; Parks & Goldblatt 2000). In other words, students need to transfer writing knowledge, practices, and skills to the workplace. WIL scholarship and practice can draw on a substantial body of writing scholarship to illuminate the role that writing can play in WIL design and implementation (Anson & Forsberg, 1990; Baird & Dilger, 2017; Beaufort, 2000; Blakeslee, 2001; Brent, 2012; Freedman & Adam, 1996; Leijten et al, 2014; Rai & Lillis, 2013; Spartz & Weber, 2015).

Writing transfer scholarship in particular highlights how writing knowledge transcends familiarity with the textual conventions of particular text types, such as emails, manuals, or contracts. Instead, writing knowledge encompasses critical awareness of and strategic adaptation to communicative situations in which written products fulfill specific functions within the relational web of the people involved (Roozen, 2015). Accordingly, when WIL administrators, faculty, supervisors, and students make use of texts such as written WIL contracts, WIL diaries, and final WIL reports, they engage in highly complex social and rhetorical activities. Rhetorical activities, not limited to but especially

writing, are activities that writers engage in to consciously, purposefully, and strategically shape their writing processes and products to convey their meaning to their audiences in ways that suit the writers' purpose, that respond to relevant genre conventions, and to contextual exigencies of the situation in which writing happens (Rufner, 2020). Importantly, writing shapes, organizes, and constrains the mutual relationships among participants during WIL (Lunsford, 2015), including the activities that stakeholders in WIL undertake or refrain from undertaking (Russell, 2015), and the assessments of students' performance on WIL as well as the evaluation of WIL curricular provisions and programs (Scott et al., 2015). Additionally, writing also shapes, organizes, and constrains the learning trajectories that educators aim to facilitate as students participate in their WIL experiences (Estrem, 2015).

WRITING TRANSFER AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO WRITING IN WIL CONTEXTS

This paper argues that students need not only to learn and practice transferring discipline-specific skills, but also to draw on their writing knowledge to flourish in the WIL environment and to continue to professionally evolve through writing when engaging in tertiary studies. While writing transfer may be conceptualized as an extension of learning transfer, it differs from learning transfer in that it specifically involves rhetorical knowledge that transforms into rhetorical awareness; thus, writing transfer "refers, broadly, to a writer's ability to repurpose or transform prior knowledge about writing for a new audience, purpose, and context" (Moore & Felten, 2019, p. 343).

An important strand of writing transfer research has been the reconceptualization of traditional notions of transfer to fit writing exigencies more specifically (Elon University, 2015; Moore & Bass, 2017). Such work has demonstrated that while writing transfer does involve applying past writing knowledge to new situations, it also entails reshaping, adapting, re-situating, recontextualizing, and remixing writing knowledge and practices (Nowacek, 2011; Robertson et al., 2012). In line with this scholarship, we draw specifically on the notion of adaptive transfer as "writers' conscious or intuitive process of applying or reshaping learned writing knowledge and practices in order to negotiate new and potentially unfamiliar writing situations" (DePalma & Ringer, 2011, p. 135). Students need to be able to recognize the similarities and differences between the requirements of new writing tasks compared to those that they have encountered in the past in order to modify, restyle, reorganize, and even customize their prior knowledge of writing to accomplish new tasks. This need may arise specifically as students transition from their academic environments into their WIL experiences and back into university contexts. Importantly, writing transfer research shows that:

> [w]ith experience, writers do discover that some writing habits developed in one context can be helpful in another. … However, the same writing habits and strategies will not work in all writing situations. … There is no such thing as 'writing in general'; therefore, there is no one lesson about writing that can make writing good in all contexts. (Rose, 2015, p. 60)

Concomitant with a focus on reconceptualizing writing transfer, a rich body of empirical work has been undertaken in an effort to understand how writers in academic contexts reuse and (re)adapt what they learn from one task to another, from one class to another, from one school year to the next (Moore & Bass, 2017). Importantly for WIL contexts, this writing transfer also takes place between classrooms and internship and workplace contexts (Anson & Forsberg, 1990; Baird & Dilger, 2017). Although the term WIL is not widely used in writing studies and there has been little engagement with WIL scholarship among writing specialists, a range of empirical studies of writing transfer have been conducted in workplace contexts. Central contributions from transfer scholars in writing studies who

have conducted research in workplace contexts namely, internships and post-graduate professional environments, are outlined below.

Writing Internships

Research in writing has produced a number of important studies on transfer in the context of writing internships. While other types of internships may involve writing to a lesser extent, the findings from these studies may substantially inform any WIL design that involves writing, as either a workplace task or a means for documenting or critically reflecting on the WIL experience. In a seminal study, Anson and Forsberg (1990), for instance, demonstrated that students passed through four distinct stages during their writing internship experiences, namely, expectation, disorientation, transition, and resolution. Their study is of immense value in calling attention to the difficulty of adapting prior writing knowledge and practices from academic contexts to workplace settings. It is also significant in highlighting possible ways that interns' transitions between academic and workplace writing contexts may constitute systems that integrate experiences and reactions as well as writing itself.

Another important study that focused on the transfer of writing knowledge and practices in the context of writing-internship experiences is Brent's (2012) interview-based study in which he details how students learned to differentiate between writing at university and writing in their internships. Students came to understand how writing tasks, audience requirements, and writing workload in their internships were unlike writing in academic contexts. Similarly, Bremner (2012) gave detailed accounts of students' professional development during writing internships providing input for curricular optimization. Relatedly, Baird, and Dilger's (2017) study of two undergraduate interns focuses on the importance of expectancy-value and self-efficacy—dispositions that can be generative or disruptive—in the transfer of writing knowledge and practices. Their study demonstrated how the two dispositions *ease and ownership* (689) affect writing transfer, and they illustrated the complexity of disposition changes. Additionally, critical assessments of writing-internship design and experiences such as Bourelle (2015) provide input and recommendations for curricular provisions.

On the basis of these studies, WIL administrators, faculty, and practitioners can scaffold the ways students use texts and writing to progress through distinct learning stages during their WIL experiences, develop transfer strategies that manifest in textual output, and use written reflection to track their dispositional changes.

Workplace Writing Studies Among Recent Graduates

Qualitative studies of writing transfer in the context of workplace writing constitute a second important strand of writing transfer research that has been taken up in the context of workplace experiences. Beaufort (2000) investigated the transitions of recent graduates from university to workplace writing contexts. Through these case studies, she provided insight into how discourse-community goals and context-specific goals interact to produce a continuum of writing tasks for the workplace. She found that distinct from academic learning, learning in the workplace was for the purpose of contributing to the organization's goals, not for the sake of acquiring knowledge. Beaufort (2000) thus asserted that to establish social purposes for writing, businesses must be convinced that writing affects their basic goals. She also argued that writing should not be considered a general skill that workers already possess or can learn in a short seminar. Instead, learning to write in a professional discourse community requires extensive immersion, socialization, and explicit guidance from experts in the workplace context.

A second important case study on transfer after graduation from university into the context of workplace writing is Beaufort's (1998) examination of the writing difficulties faced by a recent graduate who was transitioning to the workplace. Based on this case study, Beaufort (1998) found that the student's tertiary-education writing experiences had not prepared them for the writing required in the workplace, a common problem for many novice professionals in WIL contexts. Additionally, Freedman and Adam (1996) explicated the differences between learning to write new workplace genres in classroom versus workplace settings. In studying writers' attempts to learn workplace genres in the context of a university finance course, which used a simulated workplace format, and in the context of a paid government internship position, Freedman and Adam (1996) found that both classroom and workplace contexts used a "learning through doing" (p. 420) approach. Another commonality they discovered is that learners displayed less than full participation in each context, and that these attenuated conditions allowed for the novice or student to participate more fully within the responsibilities they were given. The goals of workplace and classroom contexts differed widely. In the classroom, the primary goal is learning; in the workplace, it is the production of a material product that meets the organization's goals. Because of these divergent aims, mentor-learner relationships in workplaces tended to be more nuanced than the static teacher-student hierarchy often found in the classroom.

On the basis of these studies, WIL administrators, faculty, and practitioners can alert students specifically to how writing in their WIL contexts will be different from writing in their university contexts in terms of communicative goals, textual output, and social embeddedness. Awareness of these differences can assist students in WIL contexts in their efforts to identify situations and exchanges that are critical for understanding how writing functions in these contexts.

PEDAGOGICAL APPROACHES TO WRITING TRANSFER AND THEIR RELEVANCE FOR WIL CONTEXTS

The body of writing transfer scholarship likewise contributes understanding about how curricula (Yancey et al., 2014), meaningful writing experiences (Eodice et al., 2017), and intentional reflection that prompts meta-awareness about writing (Beaufort, 2007; Taczak, 2015; Yancey et al., 2019) can facilitate students' transfer of writing knowledge and practices from academic settings to WIL opportunities. WIL instructors are responsible for raising students' awareness of the types of writing that they encounter during their WIL experiences, so that students are prepared to apply and adapt their prior writing knowledge in these writing tasks. Automaticity of writing involves the instructor assisting students in developing specific knowledge and practices for particular contexts over time (Felten, 2017). However, students' awareness must be directed not just to the existence of a wide range of settings that demand a wide range of rhetorical knowledge, but also to the fact that this writing could be recursively applied back to university settings. This in turn assists the notion of transfer, as it becomes "proactive knowledge" (Felten, 2017, p. 51) that they can apply and reshape in a variety of novel situations.

WHAT WRITING TRANSFER MEANS FOR WIL PRACTITIONERS

Writing transfer assists educators, WIL workplace supervisors, and students who are embarking on WIL experiences in various ways. Within WIL scholarship, a substantial number of researchers have already become aware of the role that written critical reflection plays in optimizing students' WIL experiences (Asghar & Rowe, 2017; Ash et al., 2005; Ashton & Arlington, 2019). Results across these articles expressed how students' critical, self-reflective writing on their WIL experiences solidified their knowledge and theoretical understanding. This idea of critical reflections assisting students'

knowledge is a useful way to understand students' experiences. It is also a generative means for helping students consolidate their own understanding. Importantly, writing transfer scholarship helps to refine how students critically reflect on textually-mediated WIL experiences in their written WIL products. This could help WIL practitioners develop a sophisticated understanding of the text types that scaffold WIL experiences in terms of planning and evaluation, but also of what students' writing practices involve and how to improve them (Lundgren et al., 2017). Additionally, WIL practitioners might draw on writing transfer research and teaching to expand the range of textual artefacts they embed in their students' WIL experiences. Along with, for example, placement contracts, written expectations, and written evaluations, practitioners might adapt non-traditional genres as a means to capture their students' WIL experiences more meaningfully. These genres could include, for instance, blogging or bullet-journaling during the experience. Specifically, it has been suggested that journal writing can enhance students' understanding. For students in teacher training in particular, it can help build their teaching philosophy (Birrell, 2011; Boldrini & Cattaneo, 2014).

At present, there is a gap in the research literature on the extent to which academics who are using WIL, on the one hand, and WIL industry partners, on the other, can engage with the distinct writing styles, standards, and expectations that constitute and constrain how students both document and are assessed on their performance in WIL (Alanson & Robles, 2016; Hodges & Burchell, 2003). The assessment instrument itself is more often than not a written report in which workplace practitioners outside of academia use principles of written communication with which they are familiar to assess students' performance for their academic counterparts. The extent to which supervisors within academia as well as practitioners outside of academia are consciously aware of the standards, affordances, and constraints that govern written communication in each respective field is as yet unknown. Likewise, the extent to which supervisors within academia as well as practitioners outside of academia can detect and articulate communication problems that may arise at the intersection of academic and workplace writing is also unknown. Further, whether academic supervisors and outside practitioners can and do adapt their written communication to one another's standards and expectations to ensure a transparent documentation and fair assessment of students' WIL performance has yet to be determined. Therefore, writing transfer expertise may contribute to a shared terminology and communication between professionals inside and outside of academia.

CONCEPTS OF OVERLAP FOR WRITING TRANSFER AND WIL

While the last decade has witnessed an increase of scholarship on writing transfer in workplace settings, no studies to date have connected writing transfer with the other facets of WIL (Billet, 2009; Ferns & Zegwaard, 2014). Given the generative ways that writing transfer scholarship and WIL research have contributed to the enrichment of student-centered curricula, pedagogies, and success, bringing these two areas of scholarship together in conversation offers rich possibilities for the optimization of higher education curricula and for additional research. The nomenclature used in these fields may be different, but conceptual overlap between them will help scholars and practitioners draw on each other's practices and strengths once the common ground has been identified. Ongoing work by the present article's team of authors suggests that there are several areas of overlap, two of which are detailed below.

Critical Reflection

WIL frameworks and writing transfer research continually emphasize students' critical reflection of their knowledge, practices, and dispositions as a highly relevant factor that influences appropriate transfer of prior knowledge and skills. Indeed, Dean et al. (2020) identified critical reflection as a core ingredient of WIL programs that distinguishes WIL from other kinds of work-related learning formats. However, while curricular implementations of and research on WIL highlight the centrality of critical reflection, they usually fall short of acknowledging that critical reflections more often than not unfold through writing, either as a means for or a documentation of critical engagement. Importantly, while scholars like Winchester-Seeto and Rowe (2017) do highlight the fundamental importance of written reflection for efficient WIL programs (p. 188), their studies do not provide information about how writing transfer factors into the support of knowledge transfer in WIL. Even in frameworks in which the development of reflective writing knowledge is specified as an intended learning outcome, writing knowledge is relegated to the skills level, distinct and separate from the professional development level (Harvey et al., 2010). Specifically, how written reflections are valued in internship environments as opposed to academic environments can create tensions that students, as novice writers and novice practitioners, might not be able to resolve.

Alpert et al. (2009), for instance, reported that university faculty ranked reflective written journals highest as a means to assess internship performance, while business practitioners ranked specifically written reflective journals lowest for the purposes of internship assessment. In a similar vein, Dean et al. (2012) documented mixed results in the perceived usefulness of structured reflection among 64 students in an internship program, with some students finding value in critical reflection while others perceiving critical reflection tasks (particularly structured tasks) to be tedious. Importantly, the fact that the whole range of structured and unstructured reflections in the study were written reflections was neither acknowledged nor addressed by the students. Additionally, Lucas (2015) noted in her study that "students who were trying to engage in critical reflection in their journal writing did not know how to approach it in a practical way, and certainly did not see its value" (p. 3).

Conversely, writing transfer research and practice provides a plethora of sources in which arguments for the importance of critical reflection are accompanied by practicable recommendations for scaffolding and assessing specifically written forms of critical reflection. Yancey et al. (2014) for instance, provided course policies, assignments, and schedules designed to help students professionalize their written reflective output. Likewise, Eodice et al. (2017) provided teacher-focused recommendations to help students deepen the meaning they find in written critical reflection. Thus, intentional engagement with the research and practice of writing transfer will enable WIL administrators, faculty members, and practitioners to make the written nature of critical reflection visible and manageable for students in WIL contexts.

Situatedness

WIL frameworks and writing transfer studies frameworks share common ground in acknowledging that learning environments specifically in tertiary education can never fully simulate nor prepare for the context-sensitive, highly situated exigencies, affordances, and constraints that characterize workplace environments. However, both fields agree that the transfer-oriented pedagogies they offer may function as the bridging elements. In WIL contexts, Smith et al. (2014) and Rowe and Zegwaard (2017) focus on the high degree of context sensitivity of learning (see also Jackson et al., 2019; Jeffries & Milne, 2014). In writing transfer studies contributions like Adler-Kassner and Wardle (2015), Moore

(2013) or Pogner (2012) offer educational and critical instruments such as the analysis of rhetorical situations, discourse communities, or communities of practice. These terminological and analytical categories may help students use writing to identify and process the specific exigencies they encounter in their WIL experiences. They may also help students develop strategies and mind-sets that help them to navigate unfamiliar environments and identify overlaps and discrepancies between their familiar learning contexts and the unfamiliar workplace contexts. Accordingly, intentional engagement with the terminological and pedagogical contributions of writing transfer research can fruitfully inform the vocabulary and written scaffolding that WIL administrators, faculty, and practitioners use as they both teach and support teaching.

CONCLUSION: MOVING FORWARD FOR PROSPECTIVE RESEARCH FOR WIL AND WRITING TRANSFER ACROSS DISCIPLINES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

WIL provides support to students' learning and employability skills. However, there have been no formal connections made between students' writing knowledge and their preparation for and reflection on their WIL experiences. This paper provides opportunities to examine the recursive nature of WIL experiences and writing transfer. WIL can create a valuable way for researchers to understand and dissect the under-explored transfer of students' writing knowledge (Anson & Forsberg, 1990; Baird & Dilger, 2017).

Recursive Research Design for Writing Transfer and WIL

In contrast to post-graduate transitions into the workplace, WIL experiences give students the opportunity to return to pre-graduation coursework at university, thus, to apply and adapt what they have learned during their WIL experience in their academic work, and to adjust their lens on their academic courses on the basis of the workplace experience they have acquired. Accordingly, recursive research designs are needed to monitor students' transitions from university courses into their WIL experiences and back. Recursive design techniques provide a unique methodology for further research in this area (Blalock, 1964, 1971; Duncan, 1966; Goldberger & Duncan, 1973; Land, 1969).

Writing processes are non-linear and recursive in nature (Zemliansky & Amant, 2013). Thus, recursive research designs would be useful in providing validity and reliability, especially with respect to writing transfer (Perl, 2014). Recursive research is designed to return to what is already known from prior research to find out where to go next, and to expand that knowledge base (Christ, 2007). An important strand of empirical inquiry that has yet to be fully explored is writers' recursive transfer between university contexts and WIL experiences and back.

Our multi-institutional, transnational research project seeks to fill this gap by examining how WIL experiences affect writers' recursive transfer of writing knowledge and practices by investigating the following question: how do WIL experiences affect writers' recursive transfer of writing knowledge and practices from one context to another? Taking up this question itself constitutes an adaptive transfer of this research; specifically, our study takes a fruitful comparative approach that addresses teaching and writing modalities, reflective practices, linguistic and sociocultural diversity, and students' diverse experiences in higher education. By documenting transitions away from and back into academic coursework, we hope to enrich the discussion of unidirectional transfer within academia (from course to course) and unidirectional transfer outside of academia (from university to the WIL experience) with a discussion of multi-directional transfer.

Additionally, the research will address the need for multi-institutional empirical studies of writing transfer. Scholarship on transfer has a rich history of case studies that are situated solely within one institutional context. Such studies often focus on a single student (or a small number of students) at a single university site. With the exception of a few recent studies (e.g., Yancey et al., 2018, 2019), multi-institutional studies of transfer are rare. By embracing the benefits of multi-institutional research, our study is well positioned to contribute to generalizable knowledge about writing transfer within and beyond a single institution.

It also seeks to address the need for more transnational studies of transfer in the context of WIL. To date, although the vast majority of research on writing transfer has been exclusively conducted in US educational settings, the WIL framework is widely employed across the globe. Given the generative ways that writing transfer and WIL scholarship have contributed to the enrichment of pedagogies, there are possibilities for putting these areas of scholarship in conversation for theoretical and pedagogical benefits in transnational contexts.

This paper has provided a spotlight that illuminates the thinking about, and possibilities for, research between WIL and writing transfer for students, academics, industry partners, curriculum designers, and teaching and learning support units worldwide. It opens a door to a new area of investigation and best practices for enhancing writing knowledge across all categories and phases of WIL experiences. In the future, we intend to examine the relationships among the set of variables in this paper in an effort construct a theoretical framework and a recursive model (Anderson & Evans, 1974) that accounts for the multiple ways writing transfer and WIL are interanimated. We hope that the audience embraces the need for further interdisciplinary and transnational research of writing transfer across WIL and higher education, and that a new body of work ensues.

REFERENCES

Adler-Kassner, L., & Wardle, E. (2015). *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies.* Utah State University Press.

Alanson, E., & Robles, R. (2016). Using electronic portfolios to explore essential student learning outcomes in a professional development course [Special issue]. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Co-Operative Education, 17*(4), 387–397.

Alpert, F., Heaney, J. G., & Kuhn, K. L. (2009). Internships in marketing: Goals, structures and assessment: Student, company and academic perspectives. *Australasian Marketing Journal, 17*(1), 36–45.

Anson, C. M., & Forsberg, L. L. (1990). Moving beyond the academic community: Transitional stages in professional writing. *Written communication, 7*(2), 200–231.

Anderson, J. G., & Evans, F. B. (1974). Causal models in educational research: Recursive models. *American Educational Research Journal, 11*(1), 29–39.

Ashton, J. R., & Arlington, H. (2019) My fears were irrational: Transforming conceptions of disability in teacher education through service learning. *International Journal of Whole Schooling, 15*(1), 50–81.

Asghar, M., & Rowe, N. (2017). Reciprocity and critical reflection as the key to social justice in service learning: A case study. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 54*(2), 117–125.

Ash, S. L., Clayton, P. H., & Atkinson, M. P. (2005). Integrating reflection and assessment to capture and improve student learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 11*(2), 49–60.

Baird, N., & Dilger, B. (2017). How students perceive transitions: Dispositions and transfer in internships. *College Composition and Communication, 68*(4), 684–712.

Bawarshi, A. S., & Reiff, M. J. (2010). *Genre: An introduction to history, theory, research, and pedagogy*. Parlor Press.

Beaufort, A. (1998). Transferring writing knowledge to the workplace: Are we on track? In M. S. Garay & S. A. Bernhardt (Eds.), *Expanding literacies: English teaching and the new workplace* (pp. 179–199). State University of New York Press.

Beaufort, A. (2000). Learning the trade: A social apprenticeship model for gaining writing expertise. *Written Communication, 17*, 185–223.

Beaufort, A. (2007). *College writing and beyond: A new framework for university writing instruction*. Utah State University Press.

Beaufort, A. (2016). Reflection: The metacognitive move towards transfer of learning. In K. Yancey (Ed.), *A rhetoric of reflection* (pp. 23–41). Utah State University Press.

Bemister, D. (2020). *Co-op Practicum*. Simon Fraser University.

Bergmann, L. S., & Zepernick, J. (2007). Disciplinarity and transfer: Students' perceptions of learning to write. *WPA: Writing Program Administration, 31*(1-2), 124–149.

Billett, S. (2009). Realising the educational worth of integrating work experiences in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 34*(7), 827–843.

Billett, S. (2015). The practices of using and integrating practice-based learning in higher education. In M. Kennedy, S. Billett, S. Gherardi, & L. Grealish (Eds.), *Practice-based learning in higher education. Professional and practice-based learning* (pp. 15–30). Springer.

Billing, D. (2007). Teaching for transfer of core/key skills in higher education: Cognitive skills. *Higher Education, 53*, 483–516. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-005-5628-5

Birrell, S. (2011). The use of blogs to prompt learner reflection during first co-operative education work terms. In P. Balcaen (Ed.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on e-Learning* (pp. 423–430). Curran.

Blakeslee, A. M. (2001). Bridging the workplace and the academy: Teaching professional genres through classroom-workplace collaborations. *Technical Communication Quarterly, 10*(2), 169–192.

Blalock, H. M., Jr. (1964). *Causal inferences in nonexperimental research*. University of North Carolina Press.

Blalock, H. M., Jr. (1971). Causal models involving unmeasured variables in stimulus-response situations. In H. M. Blalock, Jr. (Ed.), *Causal models in the social sciences (*pp. 335–347*).* Aldine-Atherton.

Boldrini, E., & Cattaneo, A. (2014). Scaffolding collaborative reflective writing in a VET curriculum. *Vocations and Learning, 7*(2), 145–165.

Bourelle, T. (2015). Writing in the professions: An internship for interdisciplinary students. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly, 78*(4), 407–427.

Bremner, S. (2012). Socialization and the acquisition of professional discourse: A case study in the PR industry. *Written Communication, 29*(1), 7–32.

Brent, D. (2012). Crossing boundaries: Co-op students relearning to write. *College Composition and Communication, 63*(4), 558–92.

Christ, T. W. (2007). A recursive approach to mixed methods research in a longitudinal study of postsecondary education disability support services. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 1*(3), 226–241.

Clear, T., McDermott, R., Parsjö, E., Cajander, Å., Daniels, M., & Lagerqvist, N. (2016). A framework for writing learning agreements. In *Proceedings 2016 IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference (FIE)* (pp. 1-8). https://doi.org/10.1109/FIE.2016.7757718

Cooper, L., Orrell, J., & Bowden, M. (2010). *Work integrated learning: A guide to effective practice*. Routledge.

Daniel, R., & Daniel, L. (2015). Enhancing capacity for success in the creative industries: Undergraduate student reflections on the implementation of work-integrated learning strategies. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education, 16*(3), 199–209.

Dean, B., Eady. M. J., Glover-Chambers, T., Moroney, T., O'Donnell, N., & Yanamandram, V. (2018). *UOW WIL pedagogy: Definition, classifications and principles*. University of Wollongong.

Dean, B., Sykes, C., Agostinho, S., & Clements, M. (2012). Reflective assessment in work-integrated learning: to structure or not to structure, that was our question. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education, 13*(2), 103–113.

Dean, B., Yanamandram, V., Eady, M. J., Moroney, T., O'Donnell, N., & Glover-Chambers, T. (2020). An institutional framework for scaffolding work-integrated learning across a degree. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice, 17*(4), 6.

DePalma, M., & Ringer, J. (2011). Toward a theory of adaptive transfer: Expanding disciplinary discussions of 'transfer' in second-language writing and composition studies. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 20*(2), 134–147.

Detterman, D. K. (1993). The case for the prosecution: Transfer as an epiphenomenon. In D. K. Detterman & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *Transfer on trial: Intelligence, cognition, and instruction* (p. 1–24). Ablex Publishing.

Dias, P., Freedman, A., Medway, P., & Pare, A. (2013). *Worlds apart: Acting and writing in academic and workplace contexts*. Routledge.

Donaghy, M., & Morss, K. (2000). Guided reflection: A framework to facilitate and assess reflective practice within the discipline of physiotherapy. *Physiotherapy Theory and Practice, 16*, 3-14.

Doolan, M., Piggott, B., Chapman, S., & Rycroft, P. (2019). The benefits and challenges of embedding work integrated learning: A case study in a university education degree program. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 44*(6), 91–108.

Driscoll, D. L. (2011). Connected, disconnected, or uncertain: Student attitudes about future writing contexts and perceptions of transfer from first year writing to the disciplines. *Across the Disciplines, 8*(2), 1-31.

Duncan, D. J. (1966). Purchasing agents: Seekers of status, personal and professional. *Journal of Purchasing, 2*, 17–26.

Elon University. (2015). *Elon Statement on Writing Transfer.* https://www.centerforengagedlearning.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/elon_statement_writing_transfer.pdf

Eodice, M., Geller, A. E., & Lerner, N. (2017). *The meaningful writing project: Learning, teaching and writing in higher education*. University Press of Colorado.

Estrem, H. (2015). Writing is a knowledge-making activity. In L. Adler-Kassner & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 89–104). Utah State University Press.

Felten, P. (2017). Writing high-impact practices: Developing proactive knowledge in complex contexts. In J. Moore & R. Bass (Eds.), *Understanding writing transfer: Implications for transformative student learning in higher education* (pp. 49–58). Stylus.

Ferns, S., & Zegwaard, K. E. (2014). Critical assessment issues in work-integrated learning. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education, 15*(3), 179–188.

Freedman, A., & Adam, C. (1996). Learning to write professionally: Situated learning and the transition from university to professional discourse. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication, 10*(4), 395–427.

Gallagher, T. H., & Schleyer, A. M. (2020). "We signed up for this!"—student and trainee responses to the COVID-19 pandemic. *New England Journal of Medicine, 382*(25), Article e96.

Gardner, P., & Bartkus, K. (2014). What's in a name? A reference guide to work-education experiences. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education, 15*(1), 37–54.

Goldberger, A. S., & Duncan, O. D. (1973). *Structural equation models in the social sciences.* Seminar Press.

Halpern, D. F., & Hakel, M. D. (2003). Applying the science of learning to the university and beyond: Teaching for long term retention and transfer. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 4*, 37–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/00091380309604109

Harvey, M., Coulson, D., Mackaway, J., & Winchester-Seeto, T. (2010). Aligning reflection in the cooperative education curriculum. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education, 11*(3), 137–152.

Hattie, J. A., & Donoghue, G. M. (2016). Learning strategies: A synthesis and conceptual model. *npj Science of Learning, 1*, Article 16013.

Hodges, D., & Burchell, N. (2003). Business graduate competencies: Employers' views on importance and performance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education, 4*(2), 16–22.

Hoskyn, K., Eady, M. J., Capocchiano, H., Lucas, P., Rae, S., Trede, F., & Yuen, L. (2020). GoodWIL placements: how COVID-19 shifts the conversation about unpaid placements. *International Journal of Work Integrated Learning, 21*(4), 439–450.

Jackson, D., Fleming, J., & Rowe, A. (2019). Enabling the transfer of skills and knowledge across classroom and work contexts. *Vocations & Learning, 12*(3), 259–478. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12186-019-09224-1

Jeffries, A., & Milne, L. (2014). Communication in WIL partnerships: The critical link. *Journal of Education and Work, 27*(5), 564-583. https://doi.org/10.1080/13639080.2013.774081

Kay, J., Ferns, S., Russell, L., & Smith, J. (2018). *Expanding work integrated learning possibilities: Enhancing student employability through innovative WIL models*. Australian Technology Network.

Kruse, O. (2007). Schreibkompetenz und Studierfähigkeit: Mit welchen Schreibkompetenzen sollten die Schulen ihre Absolvent/innen ins Studium entlassen? [Writing competence and college readiness. Which writing skills should secondary schools foster in students before they enter university?]. *Texte schreiben,* 117–143.

Ladyshewsky, R., & Gardner, P. (2008). Peer assisted learning and blogging: A strategy to promote reflective practice during clinical fieldwork. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 24*(3), 241-257

Land, K. C. (1969). Principles of path analysis. *Sociological Methodology*, *1*, 3–37.

Leijten, M., van Waes, L., Schriver, S., & Hayes, J. R. (2014). Writing in the workplace: Constructing documents using multiple digital sources. *Journal of Writing Research, 5(3)*, 285–337. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2014.05.03.3

Lucas, P. (2015). *Exploring critical reflection in cooperative education: A case study* [Doctoral thesis]. Deakin University. http://dro.deakin.edu.au/view/DU:30084875

Lundgren, H., Bang, A., Justice, S. B., Marsick, V. J., Poell, R. F., Yorks, L., Clark, M., & Sung, S. Y. (2017). Conceptualizing reflection in experience-based workplace learning. *Human Resource Development International*, *20*(4), 305–326.

Lunsford, A. A. (2015). Writing addresses, invokes, and/or creates audiences. In L. Adler-Kassner & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 20–21). Utah State University Press.

Moore, J. (2013). Mapping the questions: The state of writing-related transfer research. *Composition Forum,* 26. http://compositionforum.com/issue/26/map-questions-transfer-research.php

Moore, J. L., & Bass, R. (2017). *Understanding writing transfer: Implications for transformative student learning in higher education.* Stylus.

Moore, J. L., & Felten, P. (2019). Understanding writing transfer as a threshold concept across the disciplines. In J. Timmermans & R. Land (Eds.), *Threshold concepts on the edge* (pp. 341–352). Brill Sense.

Nelms, G., & Dively, R. (2007). Perceived roadblocks to transferring knowledge from first-year composition to writing-intensive major courses: A pilot study. *Writing Program Administration, 31*(1–2), 214–240.

Nowacek, R. (2011). *Agents of integration: Understanding transfer as a rhetorical act.* Southern Illinois University Press.

Nückles, M., Hübner, S., & Renkl, A. (2010). Expertise reversal effects in writing-to-learn. *Instructional Science, 38*(3), 237–258.

Nulton, K., Gallo-Zdunowski, K., & Johnston, N. (2019, September 11). *Work-integrated learning assessment* [Pre-conference workshop]. Drexel University Annual Conference on Teaching & Learning Assessment, Philadelphia, PA, United States. https://tinyurl.com/jna4dpk9

Orrell, J. (2011). *Good practices report: Work-integrated learning.* Australian Learning and Teaching Council.

Parks, S., & Goldblatt, E. (2000). Writing beyond the curriculum: Fostering new collaborations in literacy. *College English*, *62*(5), 584–606. https://doi.org/10.2307/378963 .

Perl, S. (2014). Research as a recursive process: Reconsidering "The composing processes of unskilled college writers" 35 years later. *Composition Forum, 29*. https://compositionforum.com/issue/29/perl-retrospective.php

Pogner, K.-H. (2012). A social perspective on writing in the workplace: Communities of discourse (CD) and communities of practice (CoP). In A. Rothkegel & S. Ruda (Eds.), *Communication on and via technology: Vol. 10. Text, translation, computational processing* (pp. 83–107). DeGruyter Mouton.

Patrick, C.-J., Peach, D., Pocknee, C., Webb, F., Fletcher, M., &. Pretto, G. (2008). *The WIL (work integrated learning) report: A national scoping study.* Australian Learning and Teaching Council. https://eprints.qut.edu.au/44065/1/WIL-Report-grants-project-jan09.pdf

Read, S., & Michaud, M. (2015). Writing about writing and the multimajor professional writing course. *College Composition and Communication, 66*(3), 427–457.

Rai, L., & Lillis, T. (2013). 'Getting it write' in social work: Exploring the value of writing in academia to writing for professional practice. *Teaching in Higher Education, 18(4)*, 352–264.

Reiff, M., & Bawarshi, A. (2011). Tracing discursive resources: How students use prior genre knowledge to negotiate new writing contexts in first-year composition. *Written Communication, 28*(3), 312–337.

Robertson, L., Taczak, K., & Yancey, K. B. (2012). Notes toward a theory of prior knowledge and its role in college composers' transfer of knowledge and practice. *Composition Forum 26*, 201.

Roozen, K. (2015). Writing is a social and rhetorical activity. In L. Adler-Kassner & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 17–19). Utah State University Press.

Rose, S. (2015). All writers have more to learn. In L. Adler-Kassner & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 59-61). Utah State University Press.

Rowe, A. D., & Zegwaard, K. E. (2017). Developing graduate employability skills and attributes: Curriculum enhancement through work-integrated learning. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education, 18*(2), 87–99.

Rufner, S. (2020). *Writing and the sciences. An anthology*. https://ua.pressbooks.pub/writingandthesciences

Russell, D. R. (2009). Uses of activity theory in written communication research. In A. Sannino, H. Daniels, & K.D. Gutiérrez (Eds.), *Learning and expanding with activity theory* (pp. 40–52). Cambridge University Press.

Russell, D. R. (2015). Writing mediates activity. In L. Adler-Kassner & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 26–27). Utah State University Press.

Schraw, G., & Dennison, R. S. (1994). Assessing metacognitive awareness. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 19*, 460–475.

Scott, A., Inoue, A., Adler-Kassner, L., & Wardle, E. (2015). Assessing writing shapes contexts and instruction. In L. Adler-Kassner & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 29–31). Utah State University Press.

Smith, C., Ferns, S., Russell, S., & Cretchley, P. (2014) *The impact of work integrated learning on student work- readiness.* Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching.

Smith, M., Brooks, S., Lichtenberg, A., McIlveen, P., Torjul, P., & Tyler, J. (2009). *Career development learning: Maximising the contribution of work-integrated learning to the student experience*. *Australian Learning & Teaching Council final project report.* University of Wollongong.

Spartz, J. M., & Weber, R. P. (2015). Writing entrepreneurs: A survey of attitudes, habits, skills, and genres. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication, 29(4)*, 428–455. https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651915588145

Taczak, K. (2015). Reflection is critical in the development of writers. In L. Adler-Kassner & E. Wardle (Eds.) *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts in writing studies* (pp. 78–83). Utah State University Press.

Taczak, K., & Robertson, L. (2017). Metacognition and the reflective writing practitioner: An integrated knowledge approach. Contemporary perspectives on cognition and writing. In P. Portanova, J. Rifenburg, & D. Roen (Eds.), *Contemporary Perspectives on Cognition and Writing* (pp. 211–229). University Press of Colorado.

Thomas, S. (2019). The WAC-driven writing center: The future of writing instruction in Australasia? *Across the Disciplines*, *16*(3), 80-90.

Thorndike, E. L., & Woodworth, R. S. (1901). The influence of improvement in one mental function upon the efficiency of other functions. *Psychological Review, 8*, 247–261.

University of Wollongong. (2018). *UOW WIL Plan*. https://www.uow.edu.au/about/learning-teaching/curriculum-transformation/work-integrated-learning/

Wardle, E. (2007). Understanding "transfer" from FYC: Preliminary results of a longitudinal study. *Writing Program Administration*, *31*(1–2), 65–85.

Wardle, E., & Adler-Kassner, L. (2015). Metaconcept: Writing is an activity and a subject of study. In L. Adler-Kassner & E. Wardle (Eds.), *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (pp. 15–16). Utah State University Press.

Warren, J. L. (2012). Does service-learning increase student learning? A meta-analysis. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *18*(2), 56–61.

Werder, C. M. (2017). Telling expectations about academic writing: If not working, what about knotworking? In J. L. Moore & R. Bass (Eds.), *Understanding writing transfer: Implications for transformative student learning in higher education* (pp. 69–78). Stylus.

Williams, R. M., Wessel, J., Gemus, M., & Foster-Seargeant, E. (2002). Journal writing to promote reflection by physical therapy students during clinical placements. *Physiotherapy Theory and Practice, 18*(1), 5-15.

Winchester-Seeto, T., & Rowe, A. (2017). Assessment strategies for new learning. In J. Sachs & L. Clark (Eds.), *Learning through community engagement: Vision and practice in higher education* (pp. 185–197). Springer Science+Business Media. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-0999-0_12

Yancey, K. B., Anderson, P., Anson, C. M., & Townsend, M. (2012). Beyond composition: Creating an outcomes statement for writing across the curriculum. In D. H. Holdstein, G. R. Glau, & N. Behm (Eds.), *The WPA outcomes statement: A decade later*. Parlor Press.

Yancey, K. B., Davis, M., Robertson, L., Taczak, K., & Workman, E. (2018). Writing across college: Key terms and multiple contexts as factors promoting students' transfer of writing knowledge and practice. *The WAC Journal*, *27*, 44–66.

Yancey, K. B., Davis, M., Robertson, L., Taczak, K., & Workman, E. (2019). The teaching for transfer curriculum: The role of concurrent transfer and inside and outside-school contexts in supporting students' writing development. *College Composition & Communication*, *71*(2), 268-295.

Yancey, K. B., Robertson, L., & Taczak, K. (2014). *Writing across contexts: Transfer, composition, and sites of writing.* Utah State University Press.

Zemliansky, P., & St. Amant, K. (2013). The state of technical communication in the former USSR: A review of the literature. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication, 43*(3), 237–260.

About the Journal

The International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning (IJWIL) publishes double-blind peer-reviewed original research and topical issues dealing with Work-Integrated Learning (WIL). IJWIL first published in 2000 under the name of Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education (APJCE). Since then the readership and authorship has become more international and terminology usage in the literature has favored the broader term of WIL, in 2018 the journal name was changed to the International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning.

In this Journal, WIL is defined as "*an educational approach that uses relevant work-based experiences to allow students to integrate theory with the meaningful practice of work as an intentional component of the curriculum. Defining elements of this educational approach requires that students engage in authentic and meaningful work-related task, and must involve three stakeholders; the student, the university, and the workplace*". Examples of practice include off-campus, workplace immersion activities such as work placements, internships, practicum, service learning, and cooperative education (Co-op), and on-campus activities such as work-related projects/competitions, entrepreneurships, student-led enterprise, etc. WIL is related to, but not the same as, the fields of experiential learning, work-based learning, and vocational education and training.

The Journal's main aim is to enable specialists working in WIL to disseminate research findings and share knowledge to the benefit of institutions, students, co-op/WIL practitioners, and researchers. The Journal desires to encourage quality research and explorative critical discussion that leads to the advancement of effective practices, development of further understanding of WIL, and promote further research.

The Journal is ongoing financially supported by the Work-Integrated Learning New Zealand (WILNZ), www.nzace.ac.nz and the University of Waikato, New Zealand, and received periodic sponsorship from the Australian Collaborative Education Network (ACEN) and the World Association of Cooperative Education (WACE).

Types of Manuscripts Sought by the Journal

Types of manuscripts sought by IJWIL is primarily of two forms; 1) *research publications* describing research into aspects of work-integrated learning and, 2) *topical discussion* articles that review relevant literature and provide critical explorative discussion around a topical issue. The journal will, on occasions, consider best practice submissions.

Research publications should contain; an introduction that describes relevant literature and sets the context of the inquiry. A detailed description and justification for the methodology employed. A description of the research findings - tabulated as appropriate, a discussion of the importance of the findings including their significance to current established literature, implications for practitioners and researchers, whilst remaining mindful of the limitations of the data, and a conclusion preferably including suggestions for further research.

Topical discussion articles should contain a clear statement of the topic or issue under discussion, reference to relevant literature, critical and scholarly discussion on the importance of the issues, critical insights to how to advance the issue further, and implications for other researchers and practitioners.

Best practice and program description papers. On occasions, the Journal also seeks manuscripts describing a practice of WIL as an example of best practice, however, only if it presents a particularly unique or innovative practice or was situated in an unusual context. There must be a clear contribution of new knowledge to the established literature. Manuscripts describing what is essentially 'typical', 'common' or 'known' practices will be encouraged to rewrite the focus of the manuscript to a significant educational issue or will be encouraged to publish their work via another avenue that seeks such content.

By negotiation with the Editor-in-Chief, the Journal also accepts a small number of *Book Reviews* of relevant and recently published books.