The contribution of social work field education to work-integrated learning

DOMINIC CHILVERS[1]
Ara Institute of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand
KATHRYN HAY
Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand
JANE MAIDMENT
RAEWYN TUDOR
University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

This article documents an examination of the role and alignment of social work field education within work-integrated learning (WIL) pedagogy. Both social work education and work-integrated learning share a long history of helping students connect with authentic work-related learning opportunities in the context of engagement and partnership with organizations outside of the educational institution, using onsite mentoring. The tensions associated with aligning social work with WIL are explored and pedagogical similarities between the two enterprises are identified. Key tools and processes for strengthening the quality of field education in social work are discussed along with approaches for placement preparation, student supervision and assessment. Three potential contributions that social work field education practice may offer WIL best practice frameworks include the addition of preplacement preparation for students and field educators, professional supervision approaches, and the inclusion of service user feedback within student assessment processes.

Keywords: Practicum, pedagogy, best practice, service user, social work, field education

Work-integrated learning (WIL) and social work education both have extensive histories of engaging with experiential learning and there are multiple pedagogical and theoretical connections between the two fields. Social work education's emergence in the nineteenth century in the United States included lectures, agency visits, and field work (Larkin, 2018). In New Zealand, initial social work tertiary programs were established in universities in the 1970s (Dale et al., 2017) and an integral aspect of these original courses was an experiential component where students had the opportunity to integrate their classroom learning into practice situations in social service organizations. Subsequent social work programs have staunchly maintained a substantive field education (the nomenclature of social work WIL) element in their curriculum. Likewise, WIL has existed since the early 1900s in its original renditions of work experience, co-operative education and internships (Reeders, 2000). These work-based programs historically did not have high status in universities. However, since the 1980s governmental pressure to align the contribution of graduates to the needs of the labor market has meant WIL has gained favor and become more visible in the university sector (Agnew et al., 2017; Ferns & Zegwaard, 2014; Orrell, 2011; Smith, 2016). Employment-focused priorities have made tertiary education providers increasingly outwards-facing and responsible for ensuring graduates have the relevant industry experience and attributes that employers seek (Agnew et al., 2017). These government education agendas have contributed to the growth of WIL within universities offering a raft of programs including internships, e-simulations, community projects, co-operative learning models, work placements, and service-learning initiatives.

---

[1] Corresponding author: Dominic Chilvers, dominic.chilvers@ara.ac.nz

CONNECTIONS AND TENSIONS

Field education is a core component of social work education and as a professional practice program is a distinct tradition of the broad pedagogical domain of WIL (Winchester-Seeto et al., 2016; Orrell, 2011). In New Zealand, the national guidelines on field education state: "This element of the curriculum is a cornerstone in the practice development of beginning social work practitioners." (Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers (ANZASW), 2016, p. 3). A variety of terms have been used historically for WIL in social work programs, including field instruction and student supervision, which possibly led to marginalization of the process and division between theory and practice (Joyce, 1998). In the UK, the introduction of new terminology with the practice teacher award was partially intended to shift the focus from supervision to teaching and learning (Rogers, 1996). For similar reasons, the favored terminology in New Zealand has become field education, a transition that has been strengthened with the introduction of the Social Work Field Education Guidelines (ANZASW, 2016). Field education is underpinned by adult learning principles, which emphasize reciprocal teaching and learning. It "encompasses a wide range of activities including direct practice, policy development, and research" (ANZASW, 2016, p. 2). Further, social work alongside other practice disciplines such as nursing and teaching has made significant contributions to the theory, teaching, and practice of WIL (Cooper et al., 2010; Orrell, 2011). This influence continues with recent WIL scholarship drawing on social work literature to develop critical reflection models (Bandaranaike & Willison, 2017; Harris et al., 2010; Lucas & Fleming, 2012) and understand and manage ethical issues, dilemmas and conflicts (Cameron et al., 2019).

Nonetheless, despite social work field education's position within and contribution to WIL, we note some tensions. Firstly, social work field education tends to make use of singleton placement methods, which within the WIL literature are described as a traditional "Fordist approach to placing large numbers of students from a single discipline into one-on-one placements" (Orrell, 2011, p. 10). These models are criticized for being resource intensive for the university to manage, placing undue pressure on workplaces and affording little scope for expanding the learning opportunities beyond the student to benefit both the work organization and university (Agnew et al., 2017; Jackson et al., 2017; Kay et al., 2019; Macdonald et al., 2008). Furthermore, the singleton method is criticized for being an isolating experience for students and affording them little influence over their learning experience (Agnew et al., 2017; Harris et al., 2010). Secondly, social work's position as both an academic and vocational, occupation-specific education program may be a point of contention. In New Zealand, there are currently 18 social work programs situated in five universities, two wānanga, a private institution and Te Pūkenga (New Zealand Institute of Skills and Technology, the national organization of work-based, vocational learning and training) (SWRB, 2019). Karmel (2011) discusses vocational education as predominantly provided by training institutes with teaching based on competence standards, which are determined by industry stakeholders. Despite WIL often being conflated with employment outcomes for graduates (Orrell, 2011; Agnew et al., 2017), vocational education is distinguished from higher education as predominantly industry-led rather than informed by theory and practice (Karmel, 2011). Nonetheless, despite these perceived distinctions, social work field education, as an example of WIL, can also contribute to the teaching and learning practice of other disciplines.

We argue social work field education is highly contextualized, pedagogically driven, and collaborative. Field education is underpinned by a quadripartite relationship consisting of the student, academic tertiary staff, field educator/mentor, and the host organization (Hay, 2020). These arrangements require a shared understanding about the requirements, values, expectations, and responsibilities for all partners (Fleming, 2012). In New Zealand, the national field education guidelines outline definitions

of field educators, field mentors and field education coordinators (academics) recognizing their specific contributions to student development. These guidelines also highlight the important tasks of the field educator/mentor within the domains of teaching and learning, assessment, administration and quality assurance. Furthermore, each social work program in New Zealand has developed its own curriculum, learning outcomes and graduate attributes. Whilst there is interface with the Social Workers Registration Board (SWRB), the regulatory body, which sets parameters around admission, governance, graduate attributes, staffing, stakeholder collaboration and field education (SWRB, 2021), social work education program providers are active participants in navigating these arrangements. They are part of a strong national network, the Council of Social Work Education Aotearoa New Zealand, which contests and contributes to regulatory program approval and competence standards. For example, recent cross-sector development work has focused on a professional capabilities framework for newly qualified social workers, currently under consideration by the SWRB (Ballantyne et al., 2019). The inclusion of capabilities is considered to better reflect the learning and development of social work field education students, and aligns with recent interest for WIL scholars in the juncture between competencies, capabilities and employability (e.g., Fullan & Scott, 2014; Jorre de St Jorre & Oliver, 2018).

In this article, we discuss the key theoretical concepts and pedagogical practices underpinning social work field education in New Zealand, locating it as an innovative, cohesive, and contemporary WIL program. First, we contextualize social work field education within conceptions of learning theory aligned with WIL. Second, we discuss the field education methods of student and field educator preparation, professional supervision and student assessment, which we believe offer valuable contributions to current WIL scholarship. Moreover, we hope these contributions will stimulate research and practice that may advance the pedagogical framework for WIL as it seeks to capture the diverse range of activities and programs offered under its umbrella (Smith, 2012).

CONCEPTUAL FRAMING OF WIL AND SOCIAL WORK FIELD EDUCATION

Over time the pedagogical foundations of social work field education have been increasingly influenced by adult learning theory and experiential learning (Wayne et al., 2010). Field education has been identified as the signature pedagogy of social work education, and despite the debate around validity, this designation highlights the importance placed on the integration of class and field-based learning (Boitel & Fromm, 2014). In particular, the contextual nature of field-based learning and the importance of developing critical reflection to promote the integration of theory and practice have long been recognized as essential for effective learning during a placement (e.g., Vayda & Bogo, 1991). The influence of learning theory in social work is consistent with recent scholarship that recognizes the social and contextual nature of WIL.

Three interrelated conceptions of learning theory are evident in both field education and WIL. First, a social constructionist understanding which brings to the fore the work environment as central to the process of students being able to construct and integrate knowledge. Learning is considered to be as much constructed by students as it is by the work system - the localized, domain-specific, set of social processes and practices (Hodges et al., 2014). Secondly, situated learning theory is an interrelated conceptualization. Defined by Tennant (1999, as cited in Hodges et al., 2014, p. 198) as "a broad collection of work which shares an emphasis on the importance of context in acquiring knowledge and skill," situated learning represents WIL as a high-level specific form of learning, differentiated from traditional forms of university teaching, learning and assessment approaches. This frame disrupts the notion of work organizations as 'outside' or peripheral (Smith & Smith, 2010), recognizing learning as

both the emergent, informal processes that occur within work contexts and the formal activities which take place in tertiary education settings (Hodges et al., 2014). Lave and Wenger's (1991, 1999) work on communities of practice attends to the aspects of learning through which students work out who they are becoming and form their own sense of identity. From this vantage, WIL is a process of situated enculturation through which over time, students participate in a practice community, develop their expertise and become part of the work system. Thirdly, experiential learning theory emphasizes the process orientation of learning and challenges the behavioral, outcomes focus favored in tertiary education (Smith, 2016). For Kolb (1984), a key theorist in this field, learning in a work environment is unique for each student and is a process in which they bring their own experiences. This demands a view of WIL as a developmental process through which students are guided to make linkages between their prior knowledge and new learning in the workplace and formal education. Experiential learning principles attend to the relational nature of learning, which for WIL mostly occur through mentoring and apprenticeship arrangements (Winchester-Seeto et al., 2016). Taken together these understandings of learning shift the view of field education and WIL as predictable, linear processes for providing and attaining employability outcomes, to a multi-faceted, dispersed and contextual set of activities that demand nuanced and responsive learning and teaching arrangements.

Since the 1990s, scholars have brought to bear pedagogical and educational viewpoints on WIL (Tynjälä et al., 2003). The one-way view of WIL as the application of knowledge gained from tertiary education to the workplace has been challenged, in recognition of the necessity for active student learning processes and collaborative education-employer relationships (Billett, 2019). Other factors recognized as integral for the success of WIL include the recruitment of host organizations and allocation of students to work placements, effective student preparation, and workplace and academic mentoring (Martin et al., 2011). Billett (2019) also emphasizes the importance of structured post-practicum interventions that contribute to student learning. However, there is still work needed to develop a coherent, pedagogical framework that captures the diverse range of activities and programs offered under the umbrella of WIL (Smith, 2012). Within social work, the attitude of host organizations, collaborative relationships, opportunities for observation and debriefing within actual practice, observation of students followed by feedback and reflective dialogue have all been identified as critical for effective field education (Bogo, 2015). Just as Orrell (2011) proposes that innovations from WIL can be taken up to enhance the creativity of long-standing professional education programs, we argue that social work's field education pedagogies can assist to consolidate and integrate WIL in other disciplines.

POSITIONING SOCIAL WORK FIELD EDUCATION IN THE WIL SPACE

Social work field education and WIL in other disciplines have clearly developed along different lines of the same family tree, only beginning to be integrated in recent times. Despite the different historical developmental process, the shared theoretical perspectives and learning objectives suggest that there is much to be gained from a more active dialogue and closer relationship between social work field education and the wider WIL community. The lengthy experience with WIL in professional programs, such as social work, means that empirical knowledge and practice wisdom has developed that may be beneficial to educators and practitioners in other disciplines who are seeking to facilitate learning in work environments (Orrell, 2011). A template for good practice in WIL developed in New Zealand by Martin et al. (2011) propose six key factors: organization set up, student preparation, skill development, supervision, assessment and pedagogy and professional standards and competencies. An additional element, placement debriefing, was added to this framework by social work scholars following their analysis of good practice in international placements (Lowe & Hay, 2016) with the notion of

partnerships being a further element incorporated by Australian WIL academics (Agnew et al., 2017). We propose that social work field education has made a significant contribution in three key phases of this latter framework: student and field educator preparation, professional supervision and student assessment. Current practices in these areas offer potential contributions to WIL in other disciplines.

Student Preparation

The social work profession has a long history of comprehensively assessing the suitability of students for field education and matching them with field educators in social service agencies. The SWRB (2019a) require that academic institutions assess the professional suitability of social work students on enrolment to the program of study, but this is commonly repeated prior to each placement. This includes checks related to criminal history, character references, health status, and an assessment of suitability to work with children and vulnerable adults. Academic institutions need to have suitably qualified individuals and robust processes to effectively make this assessment. This process involves consideration of sensitive information about an individual's personal history to determine suitability for the profession. Students who do not meet these requirements are provided with advice about the implications of any areas of concern and given support, where appropriate, to gather a portfolio of evidence so that they can demonstrate professional suitability upon graduation. Host organizations are therefore reassured as to the suitability of students and the safety of clients. The Council of Social Work Education New Zealand has developed guidelines to support field education coordinators when making decisions about the professional suitability of students for field education, thereby ensuring greater consistency and good practice across academic institutions. This provides reassurance for host organizations that students from different tertiary providers will all have been assessed as ready and suitable for field education.

The intentional preparation of students for placement is also an important component of social work field education, although each program in New Zealand adopts an individual approach to this process. Research undertaken by Kamali et al., (2017) indicates that social work students experience anxiety prior to completing a placement and it is important to develop their confidence by clarifying expectations and preparing them for what they will encounter on placement. Kanno and Koeske (2010) have found that preparation for field education may have limited effect on students' perceived anxiety, but is related to their sense of efficacy in placement. Commonly in New Zealand, the preparation process involves role-play assessments, clear articulation of the roles and responsibilities of the various actors in WIL, identification of processes when there are concerns from the student or field educator and exploration of support that will be available from supervision, academic liaison staff, family, or others. Students are taught about professional codes of conduct and ethics and the core social work competencies that they are expected to meet during the field education experience. Social work programs incorporate a range of activities that seek to address issues of anxiety and efficacy so that students are well prepared for the learning experience.

The fit between a student and a field educator or host organization is an important component of quality field education (Hay, 2020), and field education coordinators work closely with students to match them with suitable placements. The matching process is an important influence on student satisfaction with field education, particularly regarding the relationship between the student and field educator (Moorhouse et al., 2014). This process involves a careful consideration of any potential triggers related to working with certain client groups, the student's learning objectives, and goals for future employment. Field education coordinators also hold knowledge about the personal attributes and teaching approach of individual field educators and where possible will consider whether this will

be a good fit with the student's own personality and learning style. All these considerations are somewhat idealistic and need to be balanced against the availability of placements and the valuable learning potentially gained from being in a placement that is outside of the student's comfort, experience, or known interests. Anecdotal evidence suggests that these kinds of learning experiences can be a turning point for students as they discover a field of practice that they would not have otherwise considered or develop skills that can be transferred to their chosen specialism.

Social work agencies that provide field education are given an opportunity to interview students prior to accepting them for a placement. Some organizations use their recruitment process as a model for assessing student suitability, by using an application form and formal interview, and by completing a further police check and assessment of suitability to work with children and vulnerable adults. In other organizations a more informal interview process is adopted, with an increased focus on getting to know the student. In either case, the purpose of the interview strengthens the matching process undertaken by the field education coordinator and is designed to consider whether the field educator and student feel comfortable working with each other. Placements are only confirmed once this opportunity to interview the student has been provided, even when considerable effort may have gone into negotiating a field education opportunity.

Field Educator Preparation

Constructive stakeholder partnerships are essential for ensuring students are provided with meaningful field education experiences (Agnew et al., 2017). We contend that partnerships depend on notions of reciprocity as well as understanding of the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder. In New Zealand, national guidelines for host organizations and field educators, jointly owned by the social work schools and the largest professional association, provide clarity around four domains: placement administration; teaching and learning; assessment; and quality (ANZASW, 2016). The document offers a quality framework for field education and also stipulates the roles of the key field education stakeholders. It is premised on the rights and responsibilities inherent in Te Tiriti o Waitangi (the Treaty of Waitangi), signed in New Zealand in 1840 between the representatives of the British monarchy and Māori, effectively outlining governance arrangements within the newly colonized nation. Under Treaty obligations all Crown entities such as State funded educational institutions need to ensure effective partnership, participation and protection of Māori rights in all processes and arrangements. The guidelines have been designed as a tool that academic institutions can use alongside other forms of preparation and support, and that field educators can use on a voluntary basis to enhance their practice with students.

Perhaps missing from previous good practice frameworks is the deliberate preparation of those that support, educate, and supervise students within the field education environment. In the social work profession, however, there has been a long-standing understanding that social workers who facilitate field education require specialist preparation and training (e.g., Abramson & Fortune, 1990; Maidment, 2002; Moorhouse et al., 2014). Practitioners find it difficult to differentiate between their role as social workers and field educators (Murdock et al., 2006) and therefore negotiating this transition requires an understanding of educational skills that do not naturally develop in everyday practice (Knight, 2001). Research findings indicate that field educators value training in the purpose of field education, program structure and expectations, learning outcomes, teaching methods, supervision, designing learning experiences, the integration of theory and practice, assessment and managing working relationships (Dettlaff & Dietz, 2004; Fernandez, 2003).

Examples of comprehensive training for field educators are available within social work. In the UK, the postgraduate Practice Teacher Award (the UK nomenclature for social work field education) was introduced in 1996 and involved 150 hours of study (Rogers, 1996). Unfortunately, this model was extremely resource intensive and the expectation for practitioners to complete the award prior to working with students was ultimately withdrawn due to fiscal constraints (Bellinger, 2010). A more modest example was developed on a local basis in Australia that provided 75 hours of training for potential field educators (Fernandez, 2003). In New Zealand, there are examples of academic institutions collaborating in the provision of professional development for field educators, but overall, the availability of training has been institution specific and normally eight to 16 hours in duration. Recently, the Council of Social Work Education Aotearoa New Zealand has begun to develop a national orientation program for field educators working with any academic institution and a process for developing professional development events collaboratively. This initiative represents a very welcome attempt to continue to improve the quality and consistency of social work field education in New Zealand.

Interestingly, Chilvers (2017) has argued that training and professional development may be of limited utility in the quest to develop the quality of social work field education. His doctoral research explored the factors that impact the way in which social workers support students on placement. Professional isolation and lack of collaborative learning was identified as an important factor that impinges on the identification of challenges in the activity of field education. Chilvers (2017) proposes professional learning communities as a potential model to catalyze a process of continuous learning and development in WIL that is driven by field educators themselves. This model could potentially be developed on an inter-disciplinary basis to support practitioners involved in WIL across industries to share knowledge, identify challenges and develop solutions that can be contextualized to specific work settings.

Professional Supervision

Winchester-Seeto et al. (2016) suggest that supervision has been under-explored and under-theorized in the WIL literature. The delivery of professional supervision for students is one of the key contributions that social work as a discipline can make to the WIL enterprise. While the aims and functions of professional supervision have traditionally been poorly defined (Ducat & Kumar, 2015), in social work this process relates to where a field educator supports a student or group of students to engage in knowledge and skill development during their placement. This development occurs through exposure to genuine practice opportunities with service users, by fostering critical reflection, providing feedback, and facilitating a broad range of experiential learning activities in a safe environment. Undertaking supervision is one activity that significantly contributes to student socialization into a professional group (McCarthy et al., 2020). Students and newly qualified social workers note that the quality of professional supervision provided on placement has a direct impact upon their readiness to practice at graduation (Maidment et al., 2021). While the use of structured professional supervision for students is most evident in some health occupations (Ducat & Kumar, 2015), it is not a process universal to all WIL encounters.

The term professional supervision is not to be confused with academic supervision where students receive support from an academic staff member throughout the duration of their WIL experience. Professional supervision is embedded in supporting learning and development within organizational settings where students are exposed to working with complex situational dynamics with individuals, families, groups, or communities on a day-to-day basis. While the student's placement may involve

direct practice, policy development, research, or a mix of these activities the role of the field educator in professional supervision is to guide student's learning with a particular emphasis on connecting the theory learned in the classroom with practice realities encountered in the field (Clapton & Forbes, 2009). Although the process of integrating theory with practice has been identified as complex (Homonoff, 2008), students who have had opportunities to make these connections in a structured way also report increased satisfaction with their learning in the field (Lee & Fortune, 2013). An advantage of professional supervision compared with academic supervision is that the field educator understands the intricacies of the WIL environment and can thus engage in deeper critical reflection and theory-practice integration with the student.

Providing professional supervision for students in social work has been subject to considerable research. Findings from these studies repeatedly confirm the quality of the supervision relationship between the field educator and student has significant bearing upon the learning trajectory and satisfaction derived by students during the practicum (Hay et al., 2019; Kanno & Koeske, 2010; Maidment, 2001). While a range of models can be used to guide professional supervision with students in the field, possibly the most well-known and highly cited in social work originates from Canadian authors Bogo and Vayda (1998). These authors propose using an integration of theory with practice loop structure within supervision sessions where students are guided through a process of retrieval of work experiences, critical reflection upon these events and making linkages with conceptual understandings. This process aims to bring together and relate immediate work-related activities with specific knowledges that inform the student's social work practice and professional development.

Davys and Beddoe (2010) offer a helpful typology of four different approaches to professional supervision that can be used across disciplines based upon the primary supervision style adopted during the process. These approaches include 'Developmental' where the supervisee's level of experience and professional transition points influence content and process; 'Reflective learning', like Bogo and Vayda's model above, supervisees are encouraged to follow an action-reflection model; 'Strengths-based' where the discussion is focused upon exploration of existing strengths and helping supervisees to find solutions based upon existing knowledge from experiences; 'Cultural' where cultural rituals shape the supervision engagement and the field educator takes account of spiritual and traditional knowledge using an holistic frame of reference (Davys & Beddoe, 2010, pp 46-47). These authors note that the agency mandate alongside the social and cultural context in which professional supervision is offered will significantly shape how the process is managed (Davys & Beddoe, 2010). Although for the purposes of developing the typology these four approaches have been separated out, it is entirely possible that elements of each approach can be integrated in the delivery of professional supervision. Through engagement with these processes, the field educator has sufficient opportunity to provide feedback to students in an ongoing way and make informed decisions about student competency assessment during placement.

Student Assessment

Currently social work students in New Zealand need to demonstrate the core competencies stipulated by the SWRB during their field placements in order to become qualified. The assessment process is primarily shaped by the initial learning goals developed with the field educator at the beginning of the placement. Methods used to assess competence on placement are diverse and include different types of strategies to evaluate the level of student knowledge, skills, and values for entering the profession. This level of discretion that education providers, field educators and students have in devising learning goals and learning outcomes for field placements in New Zealand has been noted as a potential

pedagogical limitation due to a lack of consistency evident in assessment processes used between tertiary education providers (Hay & O'Donoghue, 2009). While all tertiary institutions offering social work education have assessment activities that students must undertake, with all students needing to demonstrate the SWRB core competencies during their field placements, the methods used for assessment of competence differ.

Students are required to provide a broad range of evidence to demonstrate competence, necessitating the field educator and student to agree on what form this evidence will take when developing the initial learning goals. Common forms of assessment used with social work students include direct observation of student practice with clients, in team meetings and in consultations with external agencies; and appraisal of written formats including case notes, client assessment reports, email communications, referral letters, and documentation associated with conducting research and developing policy. Seeking feedback from service users and agency staff as part of the assessment process is common and ways for facilitating this feedback is negotiated early in the placement. Although receipt of service user feedback is standard practice in social work it appears to be absent from current good practice guidelines in WIL.

A number of specific tools have been devised to contribute to the learning, teaching and assessment process in social work field education. A sample of these include the use of process recordings to provide students with an opportunity for a detailed 'think aloud' about a particular interchange with a client or team member (Medina, 2010; Mullin & Canning, 2007); utilizing a 'critical incident analysis' to write or present a deconstruction of an event or interaction that has occurred during the placement (Lister & Crisp, 2007); compiling a digital learning portfolio including journaling and pieces of evidence gathered during field education (Venville et al., 2017); or adopting a structured assessment tool for observing practise (Murphy & Laxton, 2014). Some of these methods have also been used for assessment in other disciplines.

CONCLUSION

From this examination of social work field education through the lens of WIL it is possible to both demonstrate pedagogical alignment with good practice frameworks, and identify three notable areas that could further enhance existing WIL arrangements. These contributions include processes to facilitate preparation of students and field educators for effective learning on placement. In addition, specific models of professional supervision derived from social work research could have utility in other disciplines, especially those who most typically use an academic supervision approach. Finding ways to inform potential supervisors about specific models of supervision could support those in the host organizations to feel more confident when taking on the supervisory role that incorporates integrating relevant theory with practice alongside assessment of industry and professional competencies and capabilities. Finally, the variety of assessment methods used in social work field education, including the use of client feedback, may have utility in other WIL contexts. In summary, this discussion of social work field education demonstrates its distinct contribution to learning and teaching within work-integrated learning.

REFERENCES

Abramson, J. S., & Fortune, A., E. (1990). Improving field instruction: An evaluation of a seminar for new field instructors. *Journal of Social Work Education*, *26*(3), 273–286.

Agnew, D., Pill, S., & Orrell, J. (2017). Applying a conceptual model in sport sector work integrated learning contexts. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, *18*(3), 185-198.

ANZASW [Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers] & Council of Social Work Educators Aotearoa New Zealand. (2016). *Social work field education guidelines.* https://anzasw.nz/wp-content/uploads/ANZASW-Social-Work-Field-Education-Guidelines.pdf

Bandaranaike, S., & Willison, J. (2017). Building learner autonomy into work-integrated learning: Challenges for the 21st century. In K. E. Zegwaard, & M. Ford (Eds.), *Refereed proceedings of the 20th WACE world conference on cooperative and work-integrated education, 2017, Chiang Mai, Thailand* (pp. 1-9). WACE.

Ballantyne, N., Beddoe, L., Hay, K., Maidment, J., Walker, S., & Merriman, C. (2019). *Enhancing the readiness to practise of newly qualified social workers in Aotearoa New Zealand (Enhance R2P). Report on phase three the professional capabilities framework.* Ako Aotearoa. https://tinyurl.com/yx5yd3fs

Bellinger, A. (2010). Studying the landscape: Practice learning for social work reconsidered. *Social Work Education*, *29*(6), 599–615. https://doi.org/10.1080/02615470903508743

Billett, S. (2019). Curriculum and pedagogic principles and practices for implementing post-practicum interventions. In S. Billett, J. Newton, G. Rogers, & C. Noble (Eds.), *Augmenting health and social care students' clinical learning experiences* (pp.333-362). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-05560-8_15

Bogo, M. (2015). Field education for clinical social work practice: Best practices and contemporary challenges. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, *43*(3), 317–324. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10615-015-0526-5

Bogo, M., & Vayda, E. (1998). *The practice of field instruction in social work: Theory and process* (2nd ed.). University of Toronto Press.

Boitel, C. R., & Fromm, L. R. (2014). Defining signature pedagogy in social work education: Learning theory and the learning contract. *Journal of Social Work Education*, *50*(4), 608–622.

Cameron, C., Dodds, C., & Maclean, C. (2019). Ethical risks in work-integrated learning: A study of Canadian practitioners. *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning*, *20*(1), 83-95.

Chilvers, D. (2017). *Social work field educator practice: Expanding the vision* [Doctoral thesis, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand]. UC Research Repository. http://hdl.handle.net/10092/15038

Clapton, G., & Forbes, R. (2009). Barefoot tutors? Navigating the barriers between student, university and field in social work education. *Journal of Practice Teaching and Learning, 9*(1), 5-19.

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

Dale, M., Mooney, H., & O'Donoghue, K. (2017). *Defining social work in Aotearoa: Forty years of pioneering research and teaching at Massey University*. Massey University Press.

Davys, A., & Beddoe, L. (2010). *Best practice in professional supervision: A guide for the helping professions*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Dettlaff, A. J., & Dietz, T. J. (2004). Making training relevant: Identifying field instructors' perceived training needs. *The Clinical Supervisor*, *23*(1), 15–32. https://doi.org/10.1300/J001v23n01_02

Ducat, W. H., & Kumar, S. (2015). A systematic review of professional supervision experiences and effects for allied health practitioners working in non-metropolitan health care settings. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Healthcare, 8*, 397-407. https://doi.org/10.2147/JMDH.S84557

Fernandez, E. (2003). Promoting teaching competence in field education. *Women in Welfare Education*, *6*, 103–129.

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

Fleming, J. (2012). Partnership and relationships in cooperative education: Are stakeholder perspectives aligned? *Proceedings of the Australian Collaborative Education Network National Conference, 88-93.* https://acen.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/ACEN-2012-National-Conference-Proceedings.pdf?x51605

Fullan, M., & Scott, G. (2014). *Education plus.* NPDL.

Harris, L., Jones, M., & Coutts, S. (2010). Partnerships and learning communities in work-integrated learning: Designing a community services student placement program. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *29*(5), 547-559.

Hay, K. (2020) What is quality work-integrated learning? Social work tertiary educator perspectives. *International Journal of Work - Integrated Learning, 21*(1), 51-61.

Hay, K., Maidment, J., Ballantyne, N., Beddoe, L., & Walker, S. (2019). Feeling lucky: The serendipitous nature of field education. *Clinical Social Work Journal, 47*(1), 23-31. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10615-018-0688-z

Hay, K., & O'Donoghue, K. (2009). Assessing social work field education: Towards standardising fieldwork assessment in New Zealand. *Social Work Education, 28*(1), 42-53. https://doi.org/10.1080/02615470802020881

Hodges, D., Eames, C., & Coll, R. K. (2014). Theoretical perspectives on assessment in cooperative education placements. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, *15*(3), 189-207.

Homonoff, E. (2008). The heart of social work: Best practitioners rise to challenges in field instruction. *The Clinical Supervisor, 27*(2), 135-169. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325220802490828

Hodges, D., Eames, C., & Coll, R. K. (2014). Theoretical perspectives on assessment in cooperative education placements. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, *15*(3), 189-207.

Jackson, D., Ferns, S., Rowbottom, D., & McLaren, D. (2017). Improving the work-integrated learning experience through a third-party advisory service. *International Journal of Training Research*, *15*(2), 160-178.

Jorre de St Jorre, T., & Oliver, B. (2018). Want students to engage? Contextualise graduate learning outcomes and assess for employability. *Higher Education Research & Development, 37*(1), 44-57. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2017.1339183

Joyce, E. (1998). Practice teaching: What's in a name? *Social Work Review, 10*(1), 23–25.

Kamali, A., Clary, P., & Frye, J. (2017). Preparing BSW Students for practicum: Reducing anxiety through bridge to practicum course. *Field Educator, 7*(1), 1-16.

Kanno, H., & Koeske, G. F. (2010). MSW students' satisfaction with their field placements: The role of preparedness and supervision quality. *Journal of Social Work Education, 46*(1), 23-38. https://doi.org/10.5175/JSWE.2010.200800066

Karmel, T. (2011). *As clear as mud: Defining vocational education and training*. National Council for Vocational Educational Research.

Kay, J., Ferns, S., Russell, L., Smith, J., & Winchester-Seeto, T. (2019). The emerging future: Innovative models of work-integrated learning. *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning, 20*(4), 401-413

Knight, C. (2001). The process of field instruction: BSW and MSW students' views of effective field supervision. *Journal of Social Work Education, 37*(2), 357–379.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice Hall.

Larkin, S. (2018). *A field guide for social workers: Applying your generalist training*. Sage.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1999). Learning and pedagogy in communities of practice. In J. Leach, & B. Moon (Eds.), *Learners & pedagogy* (pp. 21-34). Sage.

Lee, M., & Fortune, A. E. (2013). Patterns of field learning activities and their relation to learning outcome. *Journal of Social Work Education, 49*(3), 420-438. https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2013.796786

Lister, P. G., & Crisp, B. R. (2007). Critical incident analyses: A practice learning tool for students and practitioners. *Practice, 19*(1), 47-60. https://doi.org/10.1080/09503150701220507

Lowe, S., & Hay, K. (2016). *Good practice in international placements: Ideas for students and tertiary staff.* Ako Aotearoa.

Lucas, P., & Fleming, J. (2012). Reflection in sport and recreation cooperative education: Journals or blogs? *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning, 13*(1), 55-64.

Macdonald, I., Sheridan, A., Fields, K., & Hogan, K. (2008). Building innovative partnerships for work integrated learning: observations from a community services initiative. In *WACE Asia Pacific Conference E-Proceedings* (pp. 217-223). ACEN-WACE. https://tinyurl.com/548anzth

McCarthy, L. P., Imboden, R., Shdaimah, C. S., & Forrester, P. (2020). 'Ethics are messy': Supervision as a tool to help social workers manage ethical challenges. *Ethics and Social Welfare, 14*(1), 118-134. https://doi.org/10.1080/17496535.2020.1720265

Maidment, J. (2001). *Social work field education in New Zealand*. [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand).

Maidment, J. (2002). Understanding the theory of practice teaching. *Social Work Review, 14*(1), 36–42.

Maidment, J., Hay, K., Beddoe, L., Ballantyne, N., & Walker, S. (2021). The contribution of field education towards professional capability. In R. Egan, N. Hill, & W. Rollins (Eds.), *Challenges, opportunities and innovations in social work field education* (pp.106-117). Routledge.

Martin, A., Rees, M., & Edwards, M. (2011). *Work integrated learning. A template for good practice.* Ako Aotearoa.

Medina, C. K. (2010). The need and use of process recording in policy practice: A learning and assessment tool for macro practice. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 30*(1), 29-45. https://doi.org/10.1080/08841230903479474

Moorhouse, L., Hay, K., & O'Donoghue, K. (2014). Listening to student experiences of supervision. *Aotearoa New Zealand Social Work, 26*(4), 37–52.

Mullin, W. J., & Canning, J. J. (2007). Process recording in supervision of students learning to practice with children. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 27*(3-4), 167-183. https://doi.org/10.1300/J067v27n03_11

Murdock, V., Ward, J., Ligon, J., & Jindani, S. (2006). Identifying, assessing, and enhancing field instructor competencies. *The Journal of Baccalaureate Social Work, 12*(1), 165–183.

Murphy, A., & Laxton, J. (2014). Views of a structured assessment tool for observing practice. *Social Work Education, 33*(2), 190-208. https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2012.745845

Orrell, J. (2011). *Good practice report: Work-integrated learning*. Australian Learning and Teaching Council. https://ltr.edu.au/resources/GPR_Work_Integrated_Learning_Orrell_2011.pdf

Reeders, E. (2000). Scholarly practice in work-based learning: Fitting the glass slipper. *Higher Education Research & Development, 19*(2), 205-220.

Rogers, G. (1996). Training field instructors British style. *Journal of Social Work Education, 32*(2), 265–276.

Smith, C. (2012). Evaluating the quality of work-integrated learning curricula: A comprehensive framework. *Higher Education Research and Development, 31(2), 247-262.* https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2011.558072

Smith, C. D. (2016). The emergence and development of work-integrated learning (WIL): Implications for assessment, quality and quality assurance in higher education. In C. C. Ng, R. Fox, & M. Nakano (Eds.), *Reforming learning and teaching in Asia-Pacific universities* (pp. 337-364). Springer.

Smith, J., & Smith, R. (2010). Work integrated learning: An industry partners' perspective. *Proceedings of the Australian Vocational Education and Training Research Association conference.* https://www.avetra.org.au/data/Conference_2010_pres./123._Jude_Smith_Ray_Smith_paper.pdf

SWRB [Social Workers Registration Board]. (2019). *2019 Annual Education Providers Report.* https://swrb.govt.nz/about-us/news-and-publications/publications/.

SWRB [Social Workers Registration Board]. (2021). *Programme recognition standards.* http://swrb.govt.nz/about-us/policies/

Tynjälä, P., Välimaa, J., & Sarja, A. (2003). Pedagogical perspectives on the relationships between higher education and working life. *Higher education*, *46*(2), 147-166.

Vayda, E., & Bogo, M. (1991). A teaching model to unite classroom and field. *Journal of Social Work Education*, *27*(3), 271–278.

Venville, A., Cleak, H., & Bould, E. (2017). Exploring the potential of a collaborative web-based E-portfolio in social work field education. *Australian Social Work, 70*(2), 185-196. https://doi.org/10.1080/0312407X.2017.1278735

Wayne, J., Raskin, M., & Bogo, M. (2010). Field education as the signature pedagogy of social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education*, *46*(3), 327–339.

Winchester-Seeto, T., Rowe, A., & Mackaway, J. (2016). Sharing the load: Understanding the roles of academics and host supervisors in work-integrated learning. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, *17*(2), 101-118.

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.