Towards an understanding of faculty members' support for and engagement in work-integrated learning

DENYSE LAFRANCE HORNING
Nipissing University, North Bay, Canada
KRISTIN GERATY
North Central College, Naperville, United States
CATHERINE WILSON
Housing Hub of New Brunswick, Saint John, Canada
LETITIA HENVILLE[1]
Writing Short is Hard Consulting Company, Montréal, Canada

Faculty members hold diverse perspectives on work-integrated learning—a diversity that, we argue, has been underexamined in the literature. This exploratory narrative review discusses the literature on faculty members' support for and engagement in WIL, including a deep dive into the substantial body of research in community service learning (CSL) that considers faculty members' perceptions of—and barriers to facilitating—this specific subtype of WIL. We synthesize and identify gaps in the literature about faculty members' barriers to support for and engagement in WIL, and the facilitators of their engagement in CSL, which, we argue, may be generalizable to WIL more broadly. We close by identifying areas for future research.

Keywords: Faculty engagement, perceptions, barriers, facilitators, community service learning, work integrated - learning

When it comes to undergraduate students' participation in work-integrated learning (WIL), faculty members serve as both stakeholders and gatekeepers. As stakeholders, they are individuals whose pedagogical goals—personal and course-related; departmental and curricular—can be advanced through WIL (Pažur Anicic & Divjak, 2022). For some faculty members, students' WIL participation might also advance their research goals, as students' participation in WIL can provide faculty members with opportunities for strengthened and deepened relationships with external partner organizations, as well as for networking, data collection, and knowledge mobilization or exchange (e.g., Arantes do Amaral & Lino dos Santos, 2018; Strand, 2000).

Yet faculty members are also gatekeepers—individuals who can either facilitate access or put up barriers to students' engagement in WIL, through means both active (e.g., integrating a WIL activity into a course, or telling a student that WIL isn't necessary for their career goals) and passive (e.g., posting a flyer on their office door about WIL options, or voicing concern about the integration of WIL in curricular reforms) (Matusovich et al., 2019). As WIL practitioners and champions, we have seen the mediating role that faculty members can play in students' thinking as they decide whether to join a WIL program, and whether to pursue a work term or to continue with their coursework. The research supports this perception: faculty members influence both work exposure for postsecondary students and their success in WIL programs (McCurdy & Zegwaard, 2009).

In this article, the term 'faculty members' refers to full-time postsecondary instructors who teach academic courses (whether tenured, tenure-track, or adjunct faculty), while' WIL practitioners' refers to individuals who administer co-op, internship, entrepreneurship, and other WIL programs. Some faculty members may also be WIL practitioners—for example, social work faculty members who run

[1] Corresponding author: Letitia Henville, letitia@shortishard.com

their program's practicum may be considered WIL practitioners, while some co-op or internship coordinators (i.e., WIL practitioners) hold faculty positions within their institutions despite not teaching any academic courses. Nonetheless, the bulk of faculty members are not themselves WIL practitioners. This paper focuses on faculty members whose relationship with undergraduate students comes from teaching their courses.

To engage the greatest possible numbers of students in WIL, practitioners need the support and involvement of their institution's faculty members. However, faculty engagement as a topic in WIL research has received substantially less attention than student and employer or host organization engagement. What research does exist on faculty engagement tends to group faculty into large categories: faculty in a university vs. those in a career college (Peters, 2012), or university faculty in vocational vs. non-vocational disciplines (Lloyd et al., 2022). Such large categories fail to account for the heterogeneity within groups of faculty members. There is, moreover, no agreed-upon set of best practices for WIL practitioners to engage faculty members, to foster their active or passive support for WIL. In preparation for a larger research project investigating faculty members' support for and participation in WIL, we reviewed the research literature to investigate the state of the field with regards to WIL and faculty engagement. This discussion draws on and extends this literature review, adopting a narrative approach that draws on the research team's lived experience as WIL practitioners (Henville, Lafrance Horning, & Wilson) and WIL champions (Geraty & Lafrance Horning).

METHODOLOGY

To determine what the research says about the factors that influence faculty members' perceptions of—and ability to facilitate—WIL, the team conducted an exploratory narrative review (Sukhera, 2022). An exploratory review is appropriate for this project because the literature is both diverse—that is, qualitative, quantitative, mixed-methods studies; case studies; and discussion papers—and limited—that is, narrow in its focus on specific countries, disciplines, or types of WIL. We chose to perform a narrative review so that we could describe our findings and also integrate a "subjective … critique" that draws on our lived experience (Sukhera, 2022, p. 414). Unlike systematic reviews, narrative reviews "offer researchers the ability to synthesize multiple points of view and harness unique review team perspectives, which will shape the analysis" (p. 414). Exploratory narrative reviews do not follow a rigid protocol; the lack of a strict methodology enabled us to adapt our approach as we discovered new information.

First, we defined our topic: we sought to identify what the research literature says about the factors that influence faculty members' perceptions of, and engagement in, WIL. Of particular concern were the perceptions of faculty members at four-year, degree-granting postsecondary institutions. The research did not focus on studies about instructors in high schools or community colleges, about university staff who do not hold faculty appointments, or about faculty who do not hold instructional roles; however, some publications did include the perspectives of people holding these roles, in addition to the perspectives of faculty members. Such publications were not excluded from the review. Our review aligns with CEWIL Canada's definition of WIL as "a form of curricular experiential education that formally integrates a student's academic studies with quality experiences within a workplace or practice setting" (Co-operative Education and Work-Integrated Learning (CEWIL) Canada, 2021.). In addition to searching for research about WIL generally, we also sought to find research about any subtype of WIL, and so drew on CEWIL Canada's categorization of nine types of WIL to identify research with a more narrow scope than all of WIL (CEWIL Canada, 2021.).

To identify literature related to our topic, we first attempted to perform a comprehensive search—that is, an exhaustive approach that would enable us to locate all the published research on this topic. To enact this comprehensive search, keywords were identified (listed in Appendix A) and searched for in two relevant databases—Education Source and ERIC (the Education Resources Information Center)—as well as in Google Scholar and JSTOR. We limited our results to findings published in the previous 20 years, and performed this work in September 2022. This search strategy yielded an unfeasibly large number of results. Even when increasingly narrow inclusion and exclusion criteria were introduced, the search continued to yield thousands upon thousands of results. For our chosen topic, a comprehensive search strategy was thus unfeasible—and also, such an approach is misaligned with good practice for syntheses like ours: because we were interested in including qualitative and mixed-methods research, we needed to work with a small starting set of publications in order to paint a rich and detailed picture of the literature (see Ames et al., 2019).

The research team therefore pivoted to a purposive search strategy—a deliberate and targeted approach to selecting sources most relevant to our research topic. Our aim was to identify the most pertinent and informative sources, rather than attempting to capture all available publications on our topic. A purposive search strategy is appropriate for a narrative review, as "narrative reviews explicitly recognize that they may not include all relevant literature on a topic" (Sukhera, 2022, p. 415). Using a purposive search enabled us to locate and incorporate research that overlaps with but may not necessarily be described as WIL: for example, our search located research into high-impact pedagogical practices and student experiences for undergraduates; high-impact practices and experiences include studying abroad, belonging to a learning community, and working with faculty on research, as well as participating in internships and service learning (e.g., Bringle, 2017; Miller et al., 2021).

We began our purposive search with an adapted journal hand search—meaning that we electronically searched for our keywords in selected journals in our field (listed in Appendix B) between 2002[2] and 2022. In a journal hand search, researchers manually examine relevant journals to identify potentially eligible studies, systematically reviewing the journal's content on an issue-by-issue basis; such searches are usually reserved for journals that are relevant to the literature review but are not fully indexed (Relevo & Belshem, 2011). As our search focused on journals that are indexed, the team did not manually review the tables of contents of these journals. Instead, keyword searches were performed within our selected journals—hence the description of this hand search as 'adapted.'

When we located an article relevant to our topic, we used both forward and backward citation tracking—that is, looking through the sources cited by the relevant article, and sources that cite the relevant article—to identify additional relevant works (Ames et al., 2019; Relevo & Belshem, 2011). Following these chains of citations enabled us to identify additional relevant works, which grew our corpus beyond our initial subset of articles published in our four selected journals.

Ultimately, 86 relevant publications were identified, coming from 47 different journals and six scholarly monographs or research reports. While some of the 86 publications did not name the type of WIL under consideration (e.g., Rook & Sloan, 2021; Winchester-Seeto et al., 2016), our corpus includes research on eight of the nine types of WIL identified by CEWIL Canada: co-operative education (e.g., Fleming & Hickey, 2013), entrepreneurial WIL (e.g., Harima et al., 2021), field placements (e.g., Bilgin et al., 2017), internships (e.g., Matusovich et al., 2019), mandatory professional practicums (e.g., Jovanovic et al.,

[2] We restricted our search to the past twenty years for three of the four journals we selected to initiate our study. One of the four journals we selected, *Higher Education, Skills and Work-based Learning*, released its first issue in 2011.

2018), community service learning (e.g., Abes et al., 2002), community and industry research projects (e.g., Kosnik et al., 2013), and work experiences (e.g., Davis et al., 2020). These types of WIL were often discussed in combination with one another (e.g., Miller et al., 2021) or with non-WIL pedagogical practices (e.g., Bringle, 2017; Sidhu & Gage, 2021). Community-service learning was the type of WIL most often discussed in the literature, being the sole type of WIL discussed in 21 of the reviewed publications. Because of our interest in faculty in four-year, degree-granting institutions, our corpus does not include any studies on apprenticeships.

Our third step was to review the abstracts and titles, coding them for type of WIL, discipline, and country of study; we applied these three codes because we thought it possible that they may enable us to notice patterns across the literature. When these codes could not be discerned from the title or abstract, the content of the publication was quickly reviewed to find these details; in the case of type of WIL, however, it was not always possible to identify a specific subtype that aligned with CEWIL Canada's categories, and so, in addition to the nine types of WIL, the team also used the code "unclear" for "WIL type."

The team then reviewed the titles and abstracts of randomly selected articles to identify key "concepts" that either "are well-defined from earlier literature or can be well defined" (Wolfswinkel et al., 2013, p. 6) barriers and facilitators, from the literature on implementation science and health services research; and perceptions (passive understandings) and engagement (active applications). The idea of categorizing articles by concepts stems from the adaptation of grounded theory methods for literature reviews described by Wolfswinkel et al. (2013); however, because we were not performing a systematic review, we did not follow the five-step method outlined in their paper. Instead, reviewing these preliminary concept codes, the team noticed that (i) no patterns persist across the literature as related to the publications' countries or academic disciplines, and so we did not include a discussion of these in our analysis; (ii) there is much more research related to faculty members' active facilitation of WIL experiences than there is of their perception of WIL, and thus of their role as gatekeepers; and (iii) consideration of the factors that motivate faculty to facilitate WIL are largely restricted to the subset of our corpus focused on community service learning.

In line with a thematic analysis, we then organized the corpus into three thematic clusters: (i) publications related to faculty support of WIL (coded as any type of WIL, as "perceptions" and as "barriers" or "facilitators"); (ii) publications related to faculty engagement in WIL (coded as any type of WIL, as "engagement," and as "barriers" or "facilitators"); and (iii) publications related to facilitators of faculty engagement in community service learning (coded as CSL and "facilitators"). The following draws from and builds on our analysis of the literature within these categories, synthesizing and discussing its findings, and detailing implications for WIL practitioners, champions, and researchers, as well as opportunities for future research.

FINDINGS

Faculty Members' Perceptions of Work-Integrated Learning

There is a difference between faculty members' engaging in WIL—that is, integrating WIL experiences into their classrooms, coordinating WIL experiences outside of their teaching, or supervising WIL students—and faculty members' support for WIL. Supporting without engaging in WIL might take any number of forms: encouraging students to apply for WIL programs, for example, or inviting students to draw on their WIL experiences in classroom discussions or assignments. Many forms of WIL, including co-op and entrepreneurship, can be facilitated through programming separate from a

student's major or degree program; such WIL initiatives are often run by university staff who do not hold faculty appointments, and so involve minimal faculty members' involvement. Yet, as WIL practitioners and champions, we have seen that some faculty members do not value WIL programs, even when these programs come with few pressures on or demands for faculty members' time. As Lloyd et al. (2022) have noted, some faculty members "perceive WIL in conflict with creating good citizens with positive morals" (p. 816). Such perceptions do not align with the research literature, which has found that students who participate in internships (as but one example of WIL) tend to score higher on assessments of civic responsibility than peers without internship experience (Wolinsky-Nahmias & Auerbach, 2022). We were therefore interested in publications that explain the barriers that prevent faculty members from supporting their students' participation in WIL, and the facilitators that enable it.

We located six publications that disentangled support for WIL from engagement in facilitating it: two quantitative studies (Miller et al., 2021; Morales et al., 2017), two qualitative studies (Lloyd et al., 2022; Matusovich et al., 2019), one mixed-methods study (McCurdy & Zegwaard, 2009), and one discussion paper (Le Cornu & Ewing, 2008). With such varied approaches, it is perhaps unsurprising that few decisive conclusions emerge from a synthesis of their work. While one quantitative study found that a faculty members' discipline shapes their perception of internships (Miller et al., 2021), the other quantitative study found that career stage, gender, and ethnicity shaped faculty members' perception of work experiences (Morales et al., 2017). The qualitative and mixed-methods studies structured their participant recruitment around academic discipline, which renders them incapable of determining the degree to which discipline may be a controlling variable. It is not possible to disentangle from the existing literature which factors—discipline, demographic characteristics, career stage, personal experience or values, etc.—influence faculty members' perceptions of WIL.

In their study of faculty who supervise students in honors programs, Miller et al. (2021) analyze survey data from 1,487 faculty members at 15 institutions. They found that "the disciplinary area in which the faculty teach seems to be the driving force within perceived importance of internships" (p. 273), with faculty members in education being most associated with seeing participation in WIL as important, and faculty in physical sciences (e.g., physics, chemistry, astronomy) least associated. They also find that faculty who teach in honors programs are "significantly more likely to supervise" internships and field experiences, but are "not significantly more likely to perceive internship or field experiences as important" (p. 276). Miller et al. (2021) were not able to explain this discrepancy between low support and high engagement.

In their qualitative study of engineering faculty and career center staff, Matusovich et al. (2019) sought to understand active support—that is, "how and why people who are influential in student career decision-making talk to students about the benefits and pitfalls of internships" (p. 650). Significantly, however, Matusovich et al. (2019) did not investigate whether faculty members do in fact support students' participation in internships; instead, their two research questions presupposed that faculty members would be actively supportive:

> RQ1. What reasons are given by [career or academic advisors, faculty or career center personnel] to encourage student participation in internships?
> RQ2. What actions do [career or academic advisors, faculty or career center personnel] take to support students' internship participation? (p. 651)

This assumption may be appropriate, given that, for many undergraduate students, engineering is a vocational discipline with a clear connection to a specific industry. Or their questions may have been appropriate given some prior knowledge of their fourteen interviewees. However, Miller et al. (2021) found no relationship between being a faculty member in engineering and seeing internships or field experiences as important—unlike, say, faculty members in seven of the nine other disciplines they considered. In their mixed-methods survey research of science and engineering faculty, McCurdy and Zegwaard found that only "about half of the faculty … felt that it is beneficial for students to have done a [WIL] placement (51% agree)" (2009, p. 40). McCurdy and Zegwaard suggest that science and engineering faculty may perceive WIL as a brain drain: "There was a strong perception, and real concern, among most faculty that students' enhanced interactions with industry as a result of their participation in WIL results in [fewer] students go[ing] on to graduate studies" (2009, pp. 40–1). Given Miller et al. (2021) and McCurdy and Zegwaard's (2009) mixed findings, it is therefore difficult to conclude, based on Matusovich et al. (2019), that engineering faculty are necessarily supportive of students' participation in internships.

Lloyd et al. (2022) performed an interview-based study of 33 faculty in non-vocational disciplines: geography, history, criminology, sociology, mathematics and physics. They found that most faculty members were only aware of "placement-based" WIL approaches, suggesting "that there may be a limited understanding of the broad approaches to WIL" (p. 816). This limited understanding, the authors speculate, may cause faculty in non-vocational disciplines to see WIL as a necessarily "individualistic endeavor" and therefore to "understand WIL as a term that is connected to promoting labor systems that drive neoliberalism" (p. 817). Lloyd et al. conclude by suggesting that such faculty would benefit from professional development programming to help them to understand the positive, socially progressive personal and societal outcomes associated with students' participation in WIL.

By narrowing their focus to faculty in non-vocational disciplines, Lloyd et al. (2022) align with Miller et al.'s (2021) suggestion that a faculty member's disciplinary background shapes their perception of WIL; that is, Lloyd et al.'s work presumes that discipline aligns with perception. Yet Morales et al.'s (2017) survey of potential undergraduate research mentors—that is, potential WIL supervisors of on-campus work experiences—found that individual and demographic characteristics shaped faculty members' perceptions of the value of such mentorship: "late career faculty (as compared to mid-career faculty) were significantly less likely … to be interested in mentoring students … [and] female and Hispanic faculty were more likely to be interested in mentoring students through this program than were males and White (non-Hispanic) faculty members" (p. 534). When career stage, gender, and ethnicity are found to influence faculty members' perceptions of a high-impact pedagogical practice that they value—research—then questions then arise as to whether (i) they may be influenced to value other forms of WIL, and (ii) these individual and demographic boundaries may cross the disciplinary lines that define the boundaries of much research about faculty perceptions of WIL. The research on faculty members' support for WIL is unable to disentangle potentially influential factors; thus, it may be that Lloyd et al. suggested faculty development programming could be valuable for faculty across the disciplines, vocational or non-vocational.

Finally, within education specifically, Le Cornu and Ewing (2008) analyze shifts in faculty members' understanding of WIL by describing how discussions of WIL activities in the literature have changed over time, rather than by surveying or interviewing faculty. Le Cornu and Ewing (2008) argue that instructors in education programs must shift their conception of pre-service WIL to move beyond reflection and incorporate the concept of a "learning community" (p. 1803). Le Cornu and Ewing describe how disciplinary conceptions of WIL in education have shifted over time, from the

"traditional" model of the "professional experience" as "teaching practice" (p. 1801) to the "reflective" model of the "practicum" (p. 1802) to a "constructivist view" that, they argue, involves "more shared learning and joint construction of what it means to teach" (p. 1803). Le Cornu and Ewing's (2008) discussion is not a qualitative or a quantitative study of data; rather, as a chronological synthesis, they surface conceptions of WIL implicit in discipline-specific discourse. It is a limitation of our non-exhaustive search strategy that we were unable to locate and include in our corpus more publications like Le Cornu and Ewing (2008), which are suggestive of faculty members' perceptions without explicitly studying them—and so which may transcend the problems described above, in which implicit assumptions guide research questions and participant recruitment. Nonetheless, the approach of Le Cornu and Ewing (2008) reinforces the persistent assumption that discipline is the determining factor, which may overshadow more nuanced and heterogenous diversity within a discipline, as suggested by findings like those of Morales et al. (2017).

Overall, the research that focuses specifically on faculty members' perception of WIL, therefore, has not been able to conclusively demonstrate that a faculty members' discipline is the most important factor that shapes their understanding of WIL. It may be that demographic characteristics, career stage, or other variables not considered in the above studies—previous experience in WIL, perhaps, or personal values—are controlling variables. Yet assumptions of who will necessarily support WIL—faculty in vocational disciplines like engineering, education, or business, for example—shape much of the limited research on faculty perceptions of WIL. Much clearer in the available literature is the factors that make it hard for faculty members to facilitate their students' participation in WIL.

Faculty Members' Engagement in and Facilitation of Work-Integrated Learning

A number of barriers deter faculty from active engagement in WIL initiatives. Arsenault and Fenton (2021) present four main themes that effectively capture these challenges for faculty: administrative load, relationship management, pedagogical differences, and lack of reward.

Most reviewed articles address the issue of incremental workload, although Arsenault and Fenton (2021) also refer to the challenge of administrative load. Faculty members described as a challenge the significant increase in tasks and time commitment required to deliver WIL experiences (Bilgin et al., 2017; Heckert, 2009; Jovanovic et al., 2018; Sutherland & Symmons, 2013). Peters (2012) developed a list of 17 possible WIL tasks and found that, on average, faculty who facilitate in WIL perform 11 or more of these additional administrative tasks per term. Furthermore, Bulot and Johnson (2006) reported that WIL assessment consumes on average an incremental 4.5 hours per week for instructors, while Bilgin et al. (2017) found that student assessment for WIL courses was the highest contributor to workload, requiring an average of 2.5 hours per student per semester. In an effort to measure workload associated with teaching, administering and supporting WIL courses, Clark et al. (2014) identified the following WIL task categories: curriculum development, curriculum delivery, assessment of student learning, other student related tasks (such as information sessions, liaising, problem-solving, etc.), partner-related tasks, risk assessment (such as legal, ethics and insurance matters), and administration (including process and event management, staff coordination, etc.). They refer to "hidden workloads" (p. 1062) and note that this range of tasks has "blurred the traditional boundaries between teaching and administrative roles" (p. 1056). Wraae and Walmsley (2020) likewise point to a lack of institutional support for entrepreneurship educators, even when this form of WIL has been identified as a strategic priority for the institution. Emslie (2011) identified a further concern: that WIL projects are often not accounted for in academic workloads. For instance, Arsenault and Fenton's (2021) case study considered a large university that has fully dedicated and well-staffed departments for managing

external relationships, alumni relations, career centers and co-op placements. Not all institutions are equipped with such supports; therefore, the size and structure of organizations are a valid consideration for future WIL related research.

The need to manage relationships is another identified barrier for faculty engagement in WIL. Much of the reviewed literature acknowledges the incremental efforts required in securing and managing external partnerships (Bates, 2011; Bilgin et al., 2017; Ferns & Moore, 2012). As noted above, some postsecondary institutions may have supports to assist in securing and coordinating WIL partnerships. Often, however, faculty are tasked with all or part of this responsibility. In these cases, instructors must leverage their professional experiences and networks in seeking suitable partners (Kosnik et al., 2013). Unfortunately, many faculty simply do not have the necessary industry or community contacts to easily fulfill this need (Sutherland & Symmons, 2013). Further concerns raised in the literature regarding external partnerships is the reluctance of partners to engage with student assessment (McNamara, 2013) or the need for continuous contact to secure needed feedback (Bates, 2011).

Arsenault and Fenton's (2021) third listed barrier to WIL is pedagogical differences, as faculty must acquire and apply different skills and knowledge than they would use in traditional course settings. The uniqueness of WIL projects requires different curricular, pedagogical, and assessment approaches (Arsenault & Fenton, 2021; Bilgin et al., 2017; Clark et al., 2014). Clark et al. (2014) highlighted this point by citing the work of McLennan and Keating (2008)

> WIL involves new pedagogical approaches to integrate theoretical, professional and experiential models of learning, and re-conceptualisation of the learning and teaching context to one where there is less emphasis on teachers 'controlling' the learning process and more on students' self-management of learning. (p. 1056)

Similarly, Arsenault and Fenton (2021) refer to faculty's needed transformation from frontline subject experts to WIL mentors, role models and coaches. Bilgin et al. (2017) focus specifically on the unique considerations in formally evaluating student performance in WIL. These include the "complexities of assessing holistic student learning" (p. 178), a greater need for individualized feedback given the "situatedness" (p. 169) of each WIL setting, the input of WIL partners, and the challenge of identifying reliable standards of evaluation.

The lack of recognition and reward associated with WIL is another barrier for faculty that is explored in the literature (Arsenault & Fenton, 2021; Clark et al., 2014; McKay & Rozee, 2004; Peters, 2012). WIL contributions are often not included in academic workloads (Emslie, 2011) and tend to be undervalued in the tenure and promotion review process (Smigiel et al., 2015). Interestingly, Peters (2012) found that, while this concern does indeed exist, it was not as prevalent as initially suggested through reviewed literature. In fact, only about one fifth of university respondents indicated that lack of recognition was a challenge of WIL, while even fewer college instructors (14.6%) identified this concern. Peters (2012) proposes that the stringent tenure and promotional requirements of Canadian universities may explain this discrepancy between respondents.

Several studies presented recommendations to address faculty members' challenges. To conserve faculty time and effort, Heckert (2009) proposed two alternative service-learning approaches. The first adapts the parameters of "community" to include internal stakeholders (such as administrative departments, other faculties, etc.), thereby eliminating the incremental demands of coordinating external partnerships. The second initiative is referred to as "end product collaboration" (p. 33). In this case, a community partner is still involved; however, external interaction is minimized, as students'

outputs are developed through iterative rounds of peer and faculty feedback, which ensures adequate preparation for a final client deliverable. While this is a more indirect approach, students continue to benefit from the opportunity to apply course knowledge to real-world issues.

Arsenault and Fenton (2021) also offered recommendations to address each of the presented barriers to WIL. To better manage administrative workload, they recommend that WIL projects be prioritized to balance supply and demand of opportunities and that generalized WIL tools be developed for broad institutional adoption. They also note the importance of offering staff support to ease the administrative burden on faculty. To assist with relationship-building, Arsenault and Fenton (2021) recommend that institutions leverage existing resources and collaborate further with "externally facing departments" (p. 68) such as advancement, career centers, and research hubs. Developing thorough and inclusive WIL frameworks that can be efficiently implemented is suggested as a means to ease pedagogical hurdles and integrating research opportunities into WIL projects is a recommendation to enhance the potential rewards of WIL engagement.

While the barriers are well documented in the literature, there has been less research devoted to identifying and testing effective solutions. So, in addition to not knowing how to best approach faculty with diverse backgrounds, disciplines, and perspectives, to generate support for WIL among faculty members, WIL practitioners and champions who wish to engage faculty in facilitating WIL will likewise be uncertain what levers they may use to decrease the challenges that faculty encounter when they seek to facilitate WIL experiences for their students.

Faculty Members' Engagement in Community Service Learning

Of the nine WIL types defined by CEWIL, the most robust set of findings in the literature about faculty engagement and WIL center on community service learning (CSL). These studies draw on both qualitative and quantitative data across a variety of institutional settings, exploring the motivations and deterrents of faculty participation in this subset of WIL.

Practitioners of community service learning describe it as a form of experiential education as a pedagogy, a philosophy, and a program type (Cooper, 2014). CSL—which may also be called 'community-engaged learning' or 'service learning'—has been described as "a form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community needs, together with structured opportunities for reflection designed to achieve desired learning outcomes" (Jacoby, 2014, pp. 1–2). A key idea in CSL is reciprocity: the idea that practitioners must find a balance between student learning and community outcomes. The outcomes for students who engage with CSL are well documented (for example Celio et al., 2011; Eyler et al., 1997; Wang & Rodgers, 2006), and while it requires significant investment from faculty members who utilize it, the benefits to faculty of pursuing this pedagogy are less clear. The research literature finds that faculty members are motivated to integrate CSL into their teaching by several factors:

- Their own educational or professional background*:* Cooper finds that faculty engage in CSL because of prior experience with service learning and experience in the non-profit sector, as well as personal commitment to civic engagement and the "theoretical underpinnings of service-learning" (2014, p. 418).
- Their understanding of CSL's benefits to students*:* Improved student outcomes including measures of learning, student interest, problem solving skills, and understanding of course material are a key motivator as well (Abes et al., 2002; Banerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Hammond,

1994; O'Meara & Niehaus, 2009), while Pribbenow (2005) finds that CSL contributes to deeper and more meaningful relationships between students and instructors.

- Their personal beliefs*:* Cooper (2014) identifies some personal factors for why faculty members participate in service-learning and these include their own political or personal commitment to social justice and the opportunity for faculty members to connect with others across the institution.
- Their institutional context*:* Abes et al. (2002) find that encouragement from other faculty and students is crucial to engagement with CSL, while Cooper (2014) finds that encouragement from academic deans and a vision for CSL by senior leadership is also a motivating factor for faculty engagement. The literature also emphasizes the importance of fostering a supportive teaching culture, in that faculty confidence and comfort facilitate pedagogical exploration (Darby & Willingham, 2022).
- Their pedagogical goals: The desire to teach well and to build meaningful collaborations (O'Meara, 2008) as well as to express social commitments through service learning are also important motivators for faculty (Hou & Wilder, 2015). Course-based factors include the importance of students participating in service and the ability for students to engage in social change, and these factors are more significant for faculty than more personal factors (Hammond, 1994).

The research on CSL also offers a broader schema to think about the factors that contribute to faculty engagement with WIL at various levels of an organization. Vogel et al. (2010) provide an overview of empirical research that has documented factors that contribute to the sustainability of CSL in higher education. They identify three groups of factors that are key to the institutionalization of CSL within an institution. The first are institutional characteristics and policies, including the centrality of service to an institution's mission and the recognition for CSL and community-engaged research in faculty promotion, tenure, and hiring policies. The second are resources and infrastructure for CSL, including professional development opportunities and incentives to support faculty participation, dedicated funding for service-learning, CSL support centers that are centrally placed within the institution, and the integration of CSL into the curriculum. Finally, strategic activities include strategic planning for the institutionalization of service-learning to advance broader institutional initiatives and priorities and vocal support for the pedagogy among senior leadership and faculty members.

For WIL scholars not focused specifically on CSL who are interested in exploring questions of faculty participation, the scholarship on faculty engagement in CSL provides numerous interventions that could be applied and tested in other forms of WIL. This literature provides a set of research expectations that can be explored with data on co-operative education, internships, applied research, professional practica, clinical placements, field placements, and other WIL experiences. Bringing these literatures together is beneficial for scholars or practitioners who are siloed in one of these spaces. While there are key pedagogical and other differences that will impact how faculty engage with each type of WIL, engaging the disparate literatures will benefit WIL practitioners and champions seeking to mobilize faculty as WIL supporters and facilitators.

DISCUSSION

This narrative review describes the incomplete picture in the literature as to the factors that shape faculty members' understanding of WIL, details the many barriers the impede faculty from engaging in WIL, and suggests potential motivators to engagement that may be transferrable from CSL to WIL. Certainly, the substantial barriers to WIL facilitation described above need to be addressed if we seek

to increase faculty members' engagement in WIL. Yet any attempts to enable faculty to facilitate WIL by removing barriers to and seeking out facilitators of access will be ineffective if they do not effectively persuade faculty members to consider supporting WIL. If WIL practitioners can understand the positions from which WIL-skeptical faculty members are coming and can empathize with their perspectives, then these WIL practitioners will be better positioned to make persuasive, evidence-based arguments and provide relevant professional development. Some faculty may be epistemologically opposed to WIL, believing it to be in conflict with the idea of "education for education's sake," and in line with "neoliberal or market-oriented approaches that cast learners as consumers" (Lloyd et al., 2022, pp. 809-820; Milley & Kovinthan, 2014). This perspective posits WIL as a euphemism for 'job training.' Because the majority of WIL programs are neither positioned to advance nor advocate for the end of capitalism, by extension, WIL as an educational approach could be understood as necessarily pro-capitalist.

Yet perspectives that dismiss WIL because of its implication in capitalist systems negate the value of forms of WIL that do resist late capitalist ideology—service learning, for example, or entrepreneurship programs that focus on social innovation and social impact. Such a perspective also presupposes that students are not bringing the theoretical and analytical lenses that they cultivate on campus into their workplaces. If a history major spends three years learning to engage critically with primary sources, or if a gender studies major spends three years learning to engage critically with written texts, why would they not apply those same skills to a job posting, a corporate annual report, or a piece of website copy? The criticism of WIL as "cast[ing] learners as consumers" is a systems-level critique that positions students as not having any agency to act within or resist that system. Problematically, it also positions academia as separate from neoliberal systems—the 'ivory tower' trope—and ignores the very real material conditions that shape students' ability to pursue postsecondary education. An individual student's socioeconomic status, caregiving responsibilities, and levels of financial support all may make it difficult for them to pursue education for education's sake, and may require them to consider their education's potential financial return—which is, of course, correlated with participation in WIL (Finnie & Miyairi, 2017; Jackson & Rowe, 2022; Wyonch, 2020). It would be an asset for WIL practitioners to know if faculty members' own experiences with financial precarity or WIL participation—or other experiences or demographic characteristics—predispose them to support for WIL, so that these practitioners can seek out potential WIL champions within broad groups of faculty members.

As mentioned, there are opportunities for WIL scholars more generally to learn from lessons suggested above about the institutionalization of CSL as a pedagogy within many institutions and the success of CSL scholars' and practitioners' ability to develop a visible and robust research agenda. Yet there are also challenges in generalizing the lessons from CSL research to other forms of WIL. In *Service Learning Essentials,* Jacoby (2014) traces CSL's roots in Dewey's theory of experience and education and its short-lived presence on US college campuses in the late 60s and 70s. She outlines the resurgence of CSL efforts in the late 1990s and early 2000s with the establishment of CSL centers on college campuses, the increase in professional organizations focused on CSL, and a national call for colleges and universities to embrace citizenship and a commitment to democracy as core institutional goals. Research on CSL demonstrates that faculty practitioners' goals are often about teaching students about civic responsibility. As Cooper (2014) finds in his study of faculty members' motivations for engaging in service-learning, "An interest in community engagement and responsible citizenship are often the starting points for many faculty" (p. 425). And, as Cress and Donahue (2011) explain, researchers have "promoted the vehicle of service learning as an important educational and pedagogical strategy for teaching students democratic values, principles, and practices" (p. 1). How might the rhetoric associated with WIL—with its focus on employability and transferrable skills—be compatible or

incompatible with the ideological aims of CSL? If we were to emphasize the civic outcomes associated with WIL participation, what ripple effects might that shift have on our ability to engage students and WIL employers? Any set of best practices for engaging faculty in learning about or facilitating WIL must account for the impacts of these practices on our students and their employers or host organizations.

LIMITATIONS

As an exploratory narrative review, this discussion draws on themes identified in the literature, integrating our own lived, professional experiences as WIL practitioners and champions who hold positions as faculty, non-instructional staff, and administrative leaders. Because our search strategy was necessarily non-exhaustive, we may have unintentionally omitted from our corpus some publications relevant to our topic that would have been discovered using a systematic or scoping methodology. For instance, as mentioned above, our non-exhaustive search strategy meant that we were unable to locate and include in our corpus more of the discipline-specific publications similar to Le Cornu and Ewing's (2008) papers that are suggestive of the perceptions of faculty members in a specific discipline, but that may either omit WIL-related keywords or may not yet be substantially cited in the WIL research literatures. Moreover, because we conducted our research in September–December 2022, the set of texts that we reviewed also omits from consideration articles and reports published in 2023 or later.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We see the need for mixed-methods research across types of institutions to determine the barriers to and facilitators of WIL for faculty members in a diverse range of institutions, disciplines, professional and educational backgrounds, demographic characteristics, and personal values. Such research should account for the heterogeneity of faculty populations, considering the intersecting factors that may influence their perceptions of and interest in WIL.

Based on the gap between faculty members' perceptions of WIL and the research evidence, faculty should be informed of the broad range of benefits associated with students' participation in WIL—benefits that both include and extend beyond financial and career outcomes. One of the key factors that has contributed to the sustainability of CSL in higher education over the past few decades has been the centrality of service to both the CSL pedagogy and to the mission and institutional identity of universities (Vogel et al., 2010). As university boards and administrators are increasingly focused on persistence and retention, particularly of students from under-represented backgrounds, WIL champions will need to consider how their programs are positioned to resonate with the institutional mission. However, before beginning to develop educational materials or resources for faculty, we also see a need to understand faculty members' concerns about the personal and political implications of WIL participation, as their concerns will also be shared by the students they teach, mentor, and influence. Any attempts to bridge the gap between faculty members' perceptions of WIL and the research evidence should be approached from the perspective of knowledge exchange—one that positions both faculty and WIL practitioners as experts with valuable understandings—rather than seeking only to confront misperceptions.

For faculty members seeking to integrate WIL into their teaching, we see a need for the development and assessment of interventions that can reduce barriers faced by faculty, thereby making it easier for those who support WIL to bring it into their courses. Integral to such interventions should be

institution-level support and strategies that ensure that work related to WIL is rewarded in hiring, tenure and promotion decisions.

Future directions for practitioner-engaged research might include:

- large-scale surveys to capture faculty members' perceptions of work-integrated learning as a pedagogical approach across disciplines and program types (including in research-intensive graduate programs, as well as undergraduate programs that do not have a clear application to a specific industry or sector);
- interrogations of faculty perceptions of different types of WIL to delineate the barriers to faculty support for and engagement in WIL across a range of institutions (e.g., community colleges, small liberal arts colleges, teaching-intensive universities, and research-intensive, doctoral-granting universities);
- developing and evaluating interventions to lower or eliminate these barriers across varied institutions, disciplines and student populations; and
- developing, evaluating, and refining interventions to support faculty understanding of the diverse benefits of WIL for students' learning and lives, including but not exclusively related to their career development.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project developed from our participation in the Elon University Center for Engaged Learning's 2022–24 research seminar on Work-Integrated Learning. Learn more about the seminar at https://www.centerforengagedlearning.org/research-seminars/. The authors wish to express sincere gratitude to the Elon CEL for their support of this work.

Letitia Henville owns Writing Short is Hard, a writing and editing consulting company, which has no interests or connections to this work. The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

REFERENCES

Abes, E., Jackson, G., & Jones, S. R. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *9*(1), 5–17.

Ames, H., Glenton, C., & Lewin, S. (2019). Purposive sampling in a qualitative evidence synthesis: A worked example from a synthesis on parental perceptions of vaccination communication. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, *19*, Article 26.. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-019-0665-4

Arantes do Amaral, J. A., & Lino dos Santos, R. J. R. (2018). Combining project-based learning and community-based research in a research methodology course: The lessons learned. *International Journal of Instruction*, *11*(1), 47–60.

Arsenault, C., & Fenton, D. (2021). Good WIL hunting: Addressing common barriers to engaging faculty in work-integrated learning at a research-intensive university. In A. E. Stirling & T. J. Pretti (Eds.), *The practice of co-op and work-integrated learning in the Canadian context* (pp. 58–70). CEWIL Canada; WACE. https://tinyurl.com/yj4ucf9e

Banerjee, M., & Hausafus, C. O. (2007). Faculty use of service-learning: Perceptions, motivations, and impediments for the human sciences. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 14*(1), 32–45.

Bates, M. (2011). Work-integrated learning workloads: The realities and responsibilities. *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning, 12*(2), 111–124.

Bilgin, A., Rowe, A. D., & Clark, L. (2017). Academic workload implications of assessing student learning in work-integrated learning. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, *18*(2), 167–183.

Bringle, R. (2017, Fall). Hybrid high-impact pedagogies: Integrating service-learning with three other high-impact pedagogies. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 49–63.

Bulot, J., & Johnson, C. (2006). Rewards and costs of faculty involvement in intergenerational service-learning. *Educational Gerontology*, *32*(8), 633–645. https://doi.org/10.1080/03601270500494121

Celio, C. I., Durlak, J., & Dym Nicki, A. (2011). A Meta-analysis of the impact of service-learning on students. *Journal of Experiential Education, 34*(2), 164–181.

Clark, L., Rowe, A., Cantori, A., Bilgin, A., & Mukuria, V. (2014). The power dynamics and politics of survey design: Measuring workload associated with teaching, administering and supporting work-integrated learning courses. *Studies in Higher Education, 41*(6), 1055–1073. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2014.966071

Cooper, J. (2014). Ten years in the trenches: Faculty perspectives on sustaining service-learning. *Journal of Experiential Education, 37*(4), 415–428. https://doi.org/10.1177/1053825913513721

Co-operative Education and Work-Integrated Learning (CEWIL) Canada. (2021). *What is work-integrated learning (WIL)?* https://cewilcanada.ca/CEWIL/CEWIL/About-Us/Work-Integrated-Learning.aspx

Cress, C. M., & Donahue, D. M. (2011). Introduction: Competing democratic values in teaching and learning. In C. M. Cress & D. M. Donahue (Eds.), *Democratic dilemmas of teaching service-learning* (pp. 1–13). Routledge.

Darby, A., & Willingham, L. (2022). Faculty motivation in service-learning based on expectancy x value theory. *Journal of Experiential Education, 45*(3), 337–353. https://doi.org/10.1177/10538259211058292

Davis, S., Jones, R., Mahatmya, D., & Garner, P. (2020). Encouraging or obstructing? Assessing factors that impact faculty engagement in undergraduate research mentoring. *Frontiers in Education*, *5* Article 114. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2020.00114

Emslie, M. (2011). Where's WIL? Including work integrated learning in descriptions of what it is that academics do. *Journal of Cooperative Education and Internships, 45*(1), 34–44.

Eyler, J., Giles, D., & Braxton, J. (1997). The Impact of Service-Learning on College Students. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 4,* 5–15.

Ferns, S., & Moore, K. (2012). Assessing student outcomes in fieldwork placements: An overview of current practice. *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning, 13*(4), 207–224.

Finnie, R., & Miyairi, M. (2017). *The earnings outcomes of post-secondary co-op graduates: Evidence from tax-linked administrative data.* Education Policy Research Initiative, University of Ottawa. https://doi.org/10.20381/ruor-26382

Fleming, J., & Hickey, C. (2013). Exploring cooperative education partnerships: A case study in sport tertiary education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, *14*(3), 209–221.

Hammond, C. M. (1994). *Integrating service and academic study: Service-learning and faculty motivation in Michigan higher education* [Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University]. University of Nebraska at Omaha Digital Commons. https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slcedt/31

Harima, A., Kroczak, A., & Repnik, M. (2021). Role ambiguity in entrepreneurship education: Expectation gaps between educators and students in venture creation courses. *Education & Training*, *63*(9), 1309–1325. https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-07-2020-0204

Heckert, T. (2009). Alternative service learning approaches: Two techniques that accommodate faculty schedules. *Teaching of Psychology, 37*(1), 32–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/00986280903175681

Hou, S.-I., & Wilder, S. (2015). Changing pedagogy: Faculty adoption of service-learning: Motivations, barriers, and strategies among service-learning faculty at a public research institution. *SAGE Open, 5*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244015572283

Jackson, D., & Rowe, A. (2022). Impact of work-integrated learning and co-curricular activities on graduate labour force outcomes. *Studies in Higher Education*, *48*(3), 490-506. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2022.2145465

Jacoby, B. (2014). *Service-learning essentials: Questions, answers, and lessons learned.* John Wiley & Sons.

Jovanovic, J., Fane, J., & Andrew, Y. (2018). Giving institutional voice to work-integrated learning in academic workloads. *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning*, *19*(2), 93–109.

Kosnik, R., Tingle, J., & Blanton, E. (2013). Transformational learning in business education: The pivotal role of experiential learning projects. *American Journal of Business Education 6*(6), 613–630. https://doi.org/10.19030/ajbe.v6i6.8166

Le Cornu, R., & Ewing, R. (2008). Reconceptualising professional experiences in pre-service teacher education… reconstructing the past to embrace the future. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *24*(7), 1799–1812.

Lloyd, G., Dean, B. A., Eady, M., West, C., Yanamandram, V., Moroney, T., Glover-Chambers, T., & O'Donnell, N. (2022). Academic's perceptions of work-integrated learning in non-vocational disciplines. *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning*, *12*(5), 809–820. https://doi.org/10.1108/HESWBL-09-2021-0181

Matusovich, H., Carrico, C., Harris, A., Sheppard, S., Brunhaver, S., Streveler, R., & McGlothlin Lester, M. B. (2019). Internships and engineering: Beliefs and behaviors of academics. *Education + Training*, *61*(6), 650–665. https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-02-2017-0017

McCurdy, S., & Zegwaard, K. E. (2009). Faculty voices: What faculty think about work-integrated learning. *Journal of Cooperative Education and Internships, 43*(1), 36–53.

McKay, V., & Rozee, P. (2004). Characteristics of faculty who adopt community service learning pedagogy. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 10(2), 21–33.

McNamara, J. (2013). The challenge of assessing professional competence in work integrated learning. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 38(2), 183–197. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2011.618878

Miller, A., Silberstein, S., & BrckaLorenz, A. (2021). Honors college faculty support for high-impact practice participation. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, *44*(3), 260–285. https://doi.org/10.1177/01623532211023599

Milley, P., & Kovinthan, T. (2014). Examining the research base on university co-operative education in light of the neoliberal challenge to liberal education. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, *60*(2), 377–402. https://doi.org/10.11575/ajer.v60i2.55898

Morales, D., Grineski, S., & Collins, T. (2017). Faculty motivation to mentor students through undergraduate research programs: A study of enabling and constraining factors. *Research in Higher Education*, *58*, 520–544. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-016-9435-x

O'Meara, K. (2008). Motivation for faculty community engagement: Learning from exemplars. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *12*(1), 7–30.

O'Meara, K., & Niehaus, E. (2009). Service-learning is... How faculty explain their practice. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning 16*(1), 17-32.

Pažur Anicic, K., & Divjak, B. (2022). Work-integrated learning in higher education: Student, teacher and employer motivation and expectations. *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning*, *23*(1), 49–64.

Peters, J. (2012). Faculty experiences with and perceptions of work-integrated learning (WIL) in the Ontario postsecondary sector. Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario. https://heqco.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/WILFacultyENG.pdf

Pribbenow, D. (2005). The impact of service-learning pedagogy on faculty teaching and learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *11*(2), 25–38.

Relevo, R., & Belshem, H. (2011). Finding evidence for comparing medical interventions: AHRQ and the effective health care program. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, *64*(11), 1168–1177. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.11.022

Rook, L., & Sloan, T. (2021). Competing stakeholder understandings of graduate attributes and employability in work-integrated learning. *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning*, *22*(1), 41–56.

Sidhu, R., & Gage, W. (2021). Enhancing the odds of adopting e-learning or community-focused experiential learning as a teaching practice amongst university faculty. *Heliyon*, *7*(4) Article e06704. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06704

Smigiel, H., Macleod, C., & Stephenson, H. (2015). Managing competing demands in the delivery of work integrated learning: An institutional case study. In M. Kennedy, S. Billett, S. Gherardi, & L. Grealish (Eds.), *Practice-based learning in higher education: Jostling cultures* (pp. 59–172). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9502-9_11

Strand, K. J. (2000). Community-based research as pedagogy. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *7*(1), 85–96.

Sukhera, J. (2022). Narrative reviews: Flexible, rigorous, and practical. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, *14*(4), 414–417. https://doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-22-00480.1

Sutherland, K., & Symmons, M. (2013). Issues and challenges identified in the development of a broad multidisciplinary work integrated learning package. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, *14*(4), 295–304.

Vogel, A., Seifer, S., & Gelmon, S. (2010). What influences the long-term sustainability of service-learning? Lessons from early adopters. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *17*(1), 59–74.

Wang, Y., & Rodgers, R. (2006). Impact of service-learning and social justice education on college students' cognitive development. *NASPA Journal*, *43*(2), 316-337.

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.

Wolfswinkel, J., Furtmueller, E., & Wilderom, C. (2013). Using grounded theory as a method for rigorously reviewing literature. *European Journal of Information Systems*, *22*(1), 45–55. https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.2011.51

Wolinsky-Nahmias, Y., & Auerbach, A. H. (2022). Evaluating the design and benefits of internship programs. *Journal of Political Science Education*, *18*(4), 584–604. https://doi.org/10.1080/15512169.2022.2109481

Wraae, B., & Walmsley, A. (2020). Behind the scenes: Spotlight on the entrepreneurship educator. *Education & Training*, *62*(3), 255–270. https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-01-2019-0009

Wyonch, R. (2020). Work-ready graduates: The role of co-op programs in labour market success. C.D. Howe Institute Commentary 562. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3520206

APPENDIX A: Keywords used in initiating search strategy.

- Faculty
- Instructional staff
- Work-integrated learning (WIL)
- Experiential learning (EL) or experiential education (EE)
- Co-operative education
- Internships
- Applied research
- Community- and industry-partnered research
- Entrepreneurship
- Service learning
- Mandatory professional practicums
- Fieldwork
- Faculty AND WIL OR Co-op OR Placements OR Field Projects OR Practicum OR Placements, etc.
- Faculty OR Instructors OR Educators / Education OR Scholars AND WIL OR co-op OR practicum, OR placement OR internship, etc.
- WIL OR Experiential Learning OR Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL), etc.

APPENDIX B: Journals used in initiating search strategy.

- International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning, formerly the Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education
- Higher Education Research and Development
- Education + Training
- Higher Education, Skills and Work-based Learning

International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning
ISSN: 2538-1032
www.ijwil.org

About the Journal

The International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning (IJWIL) publishes double-blind peer-reviewed original research and topical issues related to Work-Integrated Learning (WIL). IJWIL first published in 2000 under the name of Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education (APJCE).

In this Journal, WIL is defined as:

> *An educational approach involving three parties – the student, educational institution, and an external stakeholder – consisting of authentic work-focused experiences as an intentional component of the curriculum. Students learn through active engagement in purposeful work tasks, which enable the integration of theory with meaningful practice that is relevant to the students' discipline of study and/or professional development* (Zegwaard et al., 2023, p. 38*).

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, student consultancies, etc. WIL is related to, and overlaps with, the fields of experiential learning, work-based learning, and vocational education and training.

The Journal's aim is to enable specialists working in WIL to disseminate research findings and share knowledge to the benefit of institutions, students, WIL practitioners, curricular designers, and researchers. The Journal encourages quality research and explorative critical discussion that leads to the advancement of quality practices, development of further understanding of WIL, and promote further research.

The Journal is financially supported by the Work-Integrated Learning New Zealand (WILNZ; www.wilnz.nz), and the University of Waikato, New Zealand.

Types of Manuscripts Sought by the Journal

Types of manuscripts sought by IJWIL is primarily in 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 good 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.

Good practice and program description papers. On occasions, the Journal seeks manuscripts describing a practice of WIL as an example of good practice, however, only if it presents a particularly unique or innovative practice or it 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.

Reference
Zegwaard, K. E., Pretti, T. J., Rowe, A. D., & Ferns, S. J. (2023). Defining work-integrated learning. In K. E. Zegwaard & T. J. Pretti (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of work-integrated learning* (3rd ed., pp. 29-48). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003156420-4

International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning
ISSN: 2538-1032
www.ijwil.org

Publisher: Work-Integrated Learning New Zealand (WILNZ)
www.wilnz.nz