

What's in a name? A reference guide to work-education experiences

PHIL GARDNER¹

Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

KENNETH R. BARTKUS

Utah State University, Logan, UT.

Although a multitude of programs in higher education integrate formal pedagogy with practical work experience (e.g., internships, practicum, and cooperative education), their underlying logic is largely the same: to enhance the value of the learning experience through an integration of work and education. To date, however, there appears to be no generally accepted term to describe the overall category of programs. Without reference to a general descriptor, researchers and practitioners may find it more difficult to fully understand and appreciate the differences and similarities among the myriad of programs. The purpose of this article, therefore, is twofold: (1) to propose an umbrella term that describes the overall category of programs and (2) to provide a reference guide that describes the fundamentals of each program. In doing so, this article is intended to contribute to this important discussion. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, 2014, 15(1), 37-54

Keywords: Education, work experience, names, definitions, terminologies

“When I use a word,” Humpty Dumpty said, in rather a scornful tone,
“it means just what I choose it to mean — neither more nor less.”

“The question is,” said Alice, “whether you can make words
mean so many different things.”

“The question is,” said Humpty Dumpty,
“which is to be master — that's all.”

- Lewis Carroll, *Through the Looking Glass*

What do we call experiences that combine practical work with formal education? Intuitively, it might make sense to simply call them “work-education experiences” (alternatively, “education-work experiences”). A review of the relevant literature, however, suggests that “work-education experiences” is not among the most commonly accepted names. Instead, a variety of alternative names have been developed. Examples include: (1) *work-integrated learning* (McCurdy & Zegwaard, 2009), (2) *work-based learning* (Burke, Marks-Maran, Ooms, Webb & Cooper, 2009), (3) *cooperative and work-integrated education* (WACE International), (4) *vocational education and training* (Collier & McManus, 2005), (5) *career and technical education* (Lambeth, Elliot, & Joeger, 2009), (6) *work placement* (Gibson & Busby, 2009), (7) *project-based learning* (Danford, 2006), (8) *experiential education* (Southcott, 2004), (9) *experiential learning* (O'Connor, 2009), (10) *professional development* (Freudenberg, Brimble, & Cameron, 2011), and (11) *community/civic engagement* (Driscoll, 2008). While each may differ with regard to the relative focus on work or education, they all share a fundamental belief that integrating a practical experience (such as work) with an educational experience (such as formal coursework) creates synergies that result in meaningful benefits for students and other stakeholders.

The list of names is also broad for programs designed to *deliver* work-education experiences. Examples include: (1) *cooperative education* (Cedercreutz & Cates, 2010), (2) *internships* (Hyniy, Jensen, Johnny, Wedlock, & Phipps, 2011), (3) *externships* (Feeley, 2007), (4) *apprenticeships*

¹ Corresponding author: Phil Gardner, gardnerp@msu.edu

(Smits, 2006), (5) *practicum* (Smith, 2010), and (6) *service learning* (Levesque-Bristol, Knapp, & Fisher, 2010). While these programs may differ in the way the experience is delivered, they also share a similar philosophical belief that students benefit from the integration of practical work experience and relevant education.

Given this preamble, we wondered how the various terms were used in the literature. With regard to general names, we found some initial evidence of blurring; most notably, with regard to integrated learning and work-based learning. For example, Atkinson, Rizzetti, and Smith (2005) note that: “work-integrated learning (WIL) and work-based learning are umbrella terms to describe the range of educational programs that integrate formal learning and workplace experience” (p. 38). Lee, McGuigan, and Holland (2010) state: “work-integrated learning (WIL) or work-based learning (WBL) is described as independent learning *through work* (Johnson, 2000) or *at work* (Rossin & Hyland, 2003), a concept with historical roots in professional disciplines such as engineering, nursing and education” (Gibson et al., 2009, p. 563). Kaider, Henschke, Richardson, and Kelly (2009) “work-integrated learning at RMIT University refers to work-based learning that includes cooperative education programs (year-long work placements), internships, clinical practice, practicums, industry projects, and related professional practices” (p. 496).

Our initial review also revealed that terms used to describe programs of delivery were sometimes blurred as well. For instance, Chouinard (1993) notes that, internships are also “referred to as field or work-related experiences, practica, and externships” (p. 95). To further complicate matters, sometimes terms were combined to create new ones. For example, Bay (2006) discussed “internship practicum” while Hoz and Perretz (1996) examined “practicum internships”. Additionally, Moriber (1999) refers to “cooperative internships” presumably because “in education, internships as part of cooperative learning programs have also been in existence for many years” (p. 76).

These examples suggest that a more comprehensive analysis of the terminology that is used to define and describe work-education experiences is warranted. To accomplish this objective, we start with a review of general names and then proceed to a review of names used for programs of delivery. At the conclusion of the analysis, we provide recommendations for future research along with suggested guidelines for the appropriate use of names.

REVIEW OF GENERAL NAMES

In an earlier survey of the literature, Gardner and Bartkus (2009) found that names used to describe work-education experiences were often vaguely described. This might be attributed, at least in part, to the fact that many of the names are relatively common. As a result, authors may be assuming that the terms are already well understood. Nonetheless, the fact that different names have been used inter-changeably suggests the assumption may not hold and that there is a need for further clarification. In the current analysis, we were able to identify what we call “benchmark descriptions” that provide a fundamental overview for each term.

General Name 1: Work-Integrated Learning

The concept of work-integrated learning (WIL) appears to have its origins in the concept of *situated learning* (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Billett, 1994) where learning “takes place in the same

context in which it is applied" (p. 40, Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). Today WIL has become a common term to describe work-education experiences.

The literature also indicates that the term is sometimes broadly described and defined. Calway and Murphy (2007), for example, state that it is "often described as an attempt by educators to provide a schooling-to-work pathway to support the employability of graduates" (p. 12). Boud, Solomon, and Symes (2001) classified WIL as "a class of university programs that bring together universities and work organizations to create new learning opportunities in workplaces" (p. 4). Dimenas (2010) notes that WIL occurs when "practical and theoretical learning activities are integrated and related to the workplaces in focus for the different professions" (p. 43).

Atchison, Pollock, Reeders, and Rizzetti, (2002), as quoted in Freudenberg, Brimble, and Cameron (2010), further note that WIL is typically described as "educational programs which combine and integrate learning and its workplace application, regardless of whether this integration occurs in industry or whether it is real or simulated" (p 575). Brown (2010) notes that "although a single definition has not yet been proffered, the term WIL is used to encompass a range of activities and experiences that draw together formal coursework with industry or workplace learning in a purposeful way" (p. 507).

To help define WIL more clearly, Coll and colleagues (2009) provided a more comprehensive description:

...a strategy in which students undergo conventional academic learning, mostly at a higher education institution (HEI), and combine this learning with some time spent in a workplace relevant to their program of study and career aims (Houshmand & Papadakis, 2006) WIL goes under a number of names internationally. In the United Kingdom this term is the well-established *sandwich degree* (Ward & Jefferies, 2004), but in the USA and worldwide *cooperative education* and *internships* are more common terms (Groenewald, 2004; Sovilla & Varty, 2004; Walters, 1947). Recently the world body for cooperative education - the World Association for Cooperative Education (WACE) added a by-line to its name - *work-integrated learning* to reflect a broader perspective of the nature of WIL, that can include capstone programs, internships, sandwich degrees, and work-based learning via industry-projects. (Franks & Blomqvist, 2004). (p. 14)

General Name 2: Work-Based Learning

Williams (2010) provides an interesting and relevant summary of the concept of work-based learning. First, she opines that work-based learning (WBL) is "perceived in many organizations as being little more than receiving on-the-job training to perform tasks" (p. 625). As such, it is perhaps not surprising that she found numerous descriptions of WBL that focus on different key features, such as learning that arises from the work itself (Clarke & Copeland 2003), learning that is student centered (Dewar & Walker 1999, Flanagan et al. 2000), learning that uses experiential learning (Little & Brennan 1996, Dewar & Walker 1999) and critical reflection (Rhodes & Shiel 2007) in the creation of new professional knowledge (Clarke & Copeland 2003, Gallagher & Holland 2004), and/or learning that is designed to meet the needs of the work place as well as the learner (Swallow et al. 2001, Clarke & Copeland 2003, Sobiechowska & Maisch 2006). (p. 625)

Williams (2010) argued further that the aforementioned features are largely encapsulated in Raelin's (1997) description of work-based learning as: (1) learning that is acquired in the

midst of action and dedicated to the task at hand, (2) knowledge that is created and utilized as a collective activity where learning becomes everyone's job; and (3) demonstration of a learning to-learn aptitude, which frees individuals to question underlying assumptions of practice.

Further clarification is provided by Lester and Costly (2010) who note that the term 'work-based learning':

...logically refers to all and any learning that is situated in the workplace or arises directly out of workplace concerns. The great majority of this learning is not accredited or otherwise formally recognized, although arguably much of it has the potential to be. It includes learning that takes place at work as a normal part of development and problem-solving, in response to specific work issues, as a result of workplace training or coaching, or to further work-related aspirations and interests. It overlaps with, but is not the same as, experiential learning, continuing professional development, and what is sometimes referred to as informal or non-formal learning. It is frequently unplanned, informal, retrospective and serendipitous, though it may also be planned and organized by the individual learner, the employer, or a third party such as an educational institution, professional or trade body, or trade union. Much of this learning is outside the scope of what higher education institutions could reasonably be expected to engage within that it is either at too low a level academically or is ephemeral in nature, but there is still a substantial proportion that is concerned with higher-level skills and knowledge, and with the development and use of broad, high-level capability that suggests that it has capacity to be recognized and enhanced through university involvement." (p. 562)

In this sense, work-based learning is differentiated from work-integrated learning in that the former focuses primarily on learning that occurs through the work experience and the latter implies a collaboration of work and educational experiences. To the extent that these interpretations are correct, they suggest a subtle, but meaningful, distinction.

General Name 3: Cooperative and Work-Integrated Education

'Cooperative and work-integrated education' is a hybrid term developed by Coll and Zegwaard (2011) to reflect the multitude of alternative terms used in the literature, in particular, cooperative education. As the authors note, there is

... an ever-growing trend to provide international work experiences as a component of co-op programs or as an internship. On some campuses, cooperative education departments or divisions have added internships or experiential education to the unit title to reflect a more diversified work-integrate learning role. The Georgia Institute of Technology and the University of Cincinnati, both with long standing large scale co-op programs, are recent examples of this trend. (p. 14)

To provide context for this term, Drysdale, Johnston, and Chiupka (2011) developed a taxonomy that includes four categories of practices: (1) *Community/Service Focus* (which includes service learning, cooperative education, and community-based learning), (2) *Professional Practice* (which includes apprenticeships, internships, professional practicum, and cooperative education), (3) *Field and Industry Based* (intercalated, sandwich, and cooperative education), and (4) *Other WIL Opportunities* (which include teaching assistantships, work study, work exchanges, research assistantships, select leadership and peer programs). Groenewald, Drysdale, Johnston, and Chiupka (2011) note that this taxonomy "serves as a

guide for practitioners in choosing the appropriate practice within an educational context” (p. 18).

Overall, the emergence of ‘cooperative and work-integrated education’ appears to represent a desire to encapsulate the nature and scope work-education experiences under a single term and provides further evidence that more comprehensive term is needed.

General Name 4: Vocational Education and Training

Vocational and education training has been defined by the terminology of the *European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training (Cedefop)* as “education and training which aims to equip people with knowledge, know-how, skills and/or competences required in particular occupations or more broadly on the labour market” (2008, p. 202). This definition is relatively broad and appears closely aligned with the concepts of both work-integrated and work-based learning. Descy and Tessaring (2002) provide a more comprehensive definition/description:

Broadly defined, vocational education and training (VET) comprises all more or less organized or structured activities – whether or not they lead to a recognized qualification – which aim to provide people with knowledge, skills and competences that are necessary and sufficient in order to perform a job or a set of jobs. Trainees in initial or continuing training thus undertake work preparation or adapt their skills to changing requirements. VET is independent of its venue, of the age or other characteristics of participants, and of their previous level of qualification. The content of VET could be job-specific, directed to a broader range of jobs or occupations, or a mixture of both; VET may also include general education elements. However, the definition of VET and continuing training (CVT) in individual countries is different. (p. 3)

With regard to different countries, Karmel (2007) notes that Australia defines VET “as courses that lead to industry recognized qualifications under the Australian Qualifications Framework while at the same time contributing to the standard Year 12 certificate” (p. 101). In the European Community, Misra (2011) notes that vocational and education training has two popular forms:

Initial vocational education and training (IVET) refers to training that leads to an initial (upper secondary) vocational qualification. The qualification can be taken in an institution-based system or in apprenticeship training. IVET is in most cases education and training for young people aged 16–19, but can also be adult education.

Continuing vocational education and training (CVET) refers to education or training taken after initial education and training or after entry into working life. CVET aims at helping individuals to improve or update their knowledge and skills, to acquire new skills for a career move or retraining and to support their personal or professional development. CVET is provided by a variety of organizations. These can be public or private and regulated by public administration or by the market. In many countries social partners play an important role in CVET. (Volmari et al. 2009, p. 29)

This review suggests that the meaning of vocational education training can differ based on the geo-education region where the training is taking place. As such, researchers should take this into account when studying the nature and scope of vocational and education training.

General Name 5: Career and Technical Education (CTE)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) is a name used primarily in the United States and Canada. The *Association for Career and Technical Education (ACTE)* describes CTE in the following way:

Career and technical education prepares both youth and adults for a wide range of careers. These careers may require varying levels of education – from high school and postsecondary certificates to two- and four-year college degrees. Career and technical education is offered in middle schools, high schools, community and technical colleges and other postsecondary institutions. (n.p.)

Others have provided similar descriptions. Scott and Sarkees-Wircenski (2004), for example, state that:

Career and technical education (CTE) instruction aims at developing foundational skills, core workplace competencies, and specific skill competencies in various occupational areas. Internships, practicums, cooperative education, school-based enterprises, dual enrollment programs, and apprenticeships are a few venues that deliver career and technical education by providing meaningful opportunities for learners to apply their academic and technical skills. (n.p.)

From these descriptions, we see that CTE adopts the same work/education philosophy as work-integrated learning, work-based learning, and vocational and education training. Its major differentiating characteristic is that it is terminology that is used primarily within the United States.

General Name 6: Work Placement

Murakami, Murray, Sims, and Chedzey (2009) note that work placement programs “claim to bridge the experience in higher education to that of the world of work” (p. 13). Similarly, Cornelius (2008) states that “work placements have been used to help students develop transferable and work-related skills in ‘real’ workplaces” (p. 288).

Vaezi-Nejad (2009) describes a particular work-placement program that was designed by London Metropolitan University. Called “Work Placement for Professional Experience”, the program has the following objectives:

- Gain a useful experience of the working environment;
- Undertake a work-based project appropriate to their academic level;
- Enhance and extend their learning experience by applying and building on their academic skills and capabilities by tackling real life problems in the workplace;
- Become aware of the culture and structure of a working environment;
- Develop new capabilities and skills. (p. 282).

As with other work/education concepts, work placement reflects the philosophy that integrating practical work experience with formal education can produce meaningful benefits.

General name 7: Project-Based Learning

Unlike other forms of work/education experiences, project-based learning does not necessitate actual work experience. Prince and Felder (2006), note:

project-based instruction centers on an authentic task but is distinguished from other forms of inductive learning by its focus on the creation of a product, often a report

detailing the student's response to a driving question, as a driver for learning. (as cited in Marshall, Petrosino, & Martin, 2010, p. 370)

While project-based learning does not require participation in an actual work environment, it is characterized as a learning model that integrates educational instruction and practice. In this regard, Blumenfeld et al. (1991) as quoted in Lam Cheng and Choy (2010, p. 488) provide a useful summary of what it means to engage in project-based learning:

Project-based learning is part of the instructional approach originating from Dewey (1938), who stressed the importance of practical experience in learning. In project-based learning, students work in small groups on academic tasks. The task can be in the form of investigation or research on a particular topic. The topic being studied usually integrates concepts from a number of disciplines or fields of study. Students in the same small group collaborate with one another to reach a collective outcome over a period of time. They pursue solutions to a problem by asking and refining questions, debating ideas, making predictions, collecting and analyzing data, drawing conclusions, and communicating their findings to others. This approach is widely believed to be a powerful teaching strategy that would enhance student motivation and promote self-directed learning.

This characterization suggests that a differentiating characteristic of project-based learning is a focus on collaborative problem solving.

General Name 8: Experiential Education

Experiential education also shares commonalities with other forms of work/education experiences, but like service learning and project-based learning, it does not necessitate actual work experience. As a movement, experiential education is grounded in the early writings of John Dewey, especially *Experience and Education* (1938). The Association for Experiential Education (2013) defines it as "a philosophy that informs many methodologies, in which educators purposefully engage with learners in direct experience and focused reflection in order to increase knowledge, develop skills, clarify values, and develop people's capacity to contribute to their communities." (*Association of Experiential Education*)

Eyler (2009) provides additional clarification:

Experiential education, which takes students into the community, helps students both to bridge classroom study and life in the world and to transform inert knowledge into knowledge- in-use. It rests on theories of experiential learning, a process whereby the learner interacts with the world and integrates new learning into old constructs. (p. 24)

Experiential education blurs the line between theory and practice; theory lacks meaning outside of practice. In order to develop strong skills for continuous learning, students need opportunities to practice those skills in environments consistent with lifelong use and as they acquire disciplinary mastery. (pp. 28-29)

Experiential education practices include terms familiar to other forms of work-education experiences such as active-based learning, problem-based learning, and project-based learning, among others. One factor that seems to distinguish experiential education from other forms of work-education experiences is that experiential education does not necessarily link the experience to a work assignment. As such, activities as service learning and other community-based projects are often at the forefront of experiential education. But perhaps

the most distinctive quality of experiential education is that, by definition, it requires deep personal reflection on the learning that has occurred and challenges that were overcome. While personal reflection continues to lie at the heart of experiential education, it is important to note that nearly all high quality work-education programs will have a tendency to integrate some form of reflective practice.

General Name 9: Experiential Learning

Although the concept of experiential learning is not a commonly accepted model of work/education experience, *per se*, its theoretical foundation shares some unifying principles. Consider, for example, Kolb's (1984) definition of learning as "a process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience" (p. 38). In this sense, experiential learning can include learning that occurs in a formal educational setting as well in a workplace setting, among others.

It would appear that a major distinction between experiential learning and other terminology used to describe work/education experiences is that while the former implies that each experience (at work or in the classroom) is a relatively separate learning experience, the latter explicitly recognizes that experiences are integrative. In this sense, experiential learning focuses primarily on the independent experience but does acknowledge the synergies that can occur through a combination of instructional education and work.

Burke, Marks-Maran, Ooms, Webb, and Cooper (2009) discuss the importance of the concept of experiential learning to that of work-based learning:

Dewey argued that education must both engage with and enhance experience, and linked to this, education must involve reflection on experience. According to Dewey, this would fulfill and enrich the current lives of students as well as prepare them for the future. Dewey believed that progress, in educational terms, was in the development of new attitudes towards, new interests in, and new understanding of experience. The significance of human experience was a fundamental component of his ideas about learning. Education is a continuing reconstruction of experience (Dewey 1916). In summary, Dewey (1916) defined experience as physical action, the consequences of that action, and the individual's judgment (reflection) of the consequences of that action. This relationship between experience, consequence and reflection is perhaps the earliest model for WBL. (p. 18)

General Name 10: Professional Development

Professional development embraces a broad range of learning opportunities where professionals can continue to gain skills, knowledge, and expertise to advance their professional career. Professions, such as nursing, education, counselors, and tax consultants, often require and expect additional training beyond the terminal degree. This form of learning is often referred to as continuing professional development. In the U.K. a distinction has been made between initial and continuing professional development where initial professional development is defined as a "period of development during which an individual acquires a level of competence necessary in order to operate as an autonomous professional." (The UK Initial Professional Development Forum, n.d.)

Some institutions have recognized that organizations are now demanding higher levels of skills and abilities in order to face the daunting complexity and relentless change occurring

in the workplace. Delivery methods (internships, co-ops, etc) are being re-structured to incorporate both work and professional development.

General Name 11: Community/Civic Engagement

The literature tends to treat community and civic engagement as relatively synonymous. However, there are subtle distinctions. Specifically, Illinois State University notes that the difference has to do with the scope of the impact:

“Community engagement impacts a specific localized problem or issue; for example it may be within the campus, within the city or county or maybe even within the state. Civic engagement is social responsibility in a larger context, working on global or national problems or issues and instilling a life-long commitment to the resolution of those problems or similar issues.” (Illinois State University, n.d.)

The difference, therefore, is largely the result of the scope of engagement rather than the nature of the engagement itself. For the purposes of this review, we focus on community engagement with the understanding that the basic principles are relevant to civic engagement as well.

One of the most active entities in community engagement is the Carnegie Foundation. In its classification of colleges and universities, it has an elective community-engagement designation. The Foundation puts forth that:

Community engagement describes the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity. The purpose of community engagement is the partnership of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good. (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, n.d.)

Weerts and Sandmann (2010, p. 632) further note that the distinction between community engagement and other related activities such as service learning and community outreach is that the latter “are typically conceived as one-way approaches to delivering knowledge and service to the public, whereas engagement emphasizes a two-way approach in which institutions and community partners collaborate to develop and apply knowledge to address societal needs (Boyer, 1996; Kellogg Commission, 1999)”. In this sense, community engagement is distinguished from community service by the way in which the activity is administered. In the former, there is a greater focus on collaborative efforts as evidenced by partnership in the activity and reciprocity in terms of value added.

REVIEW OF PROGRAMS OF DELIVERY

Programs of delivery are the means by which work-education experiences are administered. Our review has identified six major forms. The following sections define and provide description of each form.

Delivery Program 1: Cooperative Education

Wilson, Stull, and Visonhaller (1996) state that the “principle strategy of cooperative education is a joint venture between the academy and the workplace with the latter

providing work experiences to students” (p. 158). Additionally, they view the defining characteristics of cooperative education to be “the linkage of work and academics within the curriculum” (p. 158).

Munby, Hutchinson, and Chin (1998) as cited in Drysdale, et al. (2007) provide additional clarification on the meaning of cooperative education based on contributions by Taylor (2002) and Munby, Huthinson, and Chin (1998):

Cooperative education is defined as work-integrated experience that combines classroom learning with skill acquisition in the workforce (Taylor, 2002). While campus based learning is important in providing generalizable skills (e.g., critical thinking, problem-solving, general knowledge), the workplace experience provides situation-specific skills (e.g., application of technical skills) as well as knowledge about the workplace and other employees (e.g., conflict management, interpersonal relations, values, attitudes). (p. 48)

Perhaps the most formal definition was provided through the *National Commission for Cooperative Education 1994*:

Cooperative Education is a structured educational strategy integrating classroom studies with learning through productive work experiences in a field related to a student’s academic or career goals. It provides progressive experiences in integrating theory and practice. Co-op is a partnership among students, educational institutions and employers, with specified responsibilities for each party. (n.p.)

In each of these definitions and descriptions, it is difficult to clearly understand the distinction between cooperative education and other models of delivering a work/education experience. Cedercreutz and Cates (2010) help resolve this issue by noting that traditional cooperative education is defined as “an educational methodology in which periods of classroom instruction *alternate* with periods of paid discipline-related work experience” (p. 20,). It is primarily the planned alternating rotation of practical work and formal educational experiences that most differentiates cooperative education from other similar models.

Delivery Program 2: Internships

Internships are almost ubiquitous in higher education. A review of definitions reveals that internships are describes as structured and supervised, involves academic credit, focuses on relevant work experience, and provides students with an opportunity to apply classroom knowledge to real world practice. For example, Inkster and Ross, (1995), as cited in the ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report (2002), define internships as “structured and supervised professional experiences in an approved organization or agency where students earn academic credit upon completion of the experience” (p. 67). Similarly, Taylor (1988) defines them as “structured and career relevant work experiences obtained by students prior to graduation from an academic program.” (p. 393)

Stretch and Harp (1991) define internships as “...controlled experiential learning where a student receives academic credit while employed by an organization in a chosen area of interest” (p. 67). Finally, Clark, 2003, and D’Abate, Youndt, & Wenzel, 2009 as cited in Liu, Xu, and Weitz (2011) provide a similar definition: “Internship as a form of experiential learning also gives students valuable opportunities to discover the business world firsthand and to apply classroom knowledge to practice”(p. 94).

As a delivery program, internships appear relatively flexible in terms of when they can occur and for how long. As a result, students can conceivably participate in more than one internship experience (should they decide) during their education. This allows students the opportunity to see if the career path they have chosen is suitable.

As a result, it should not be surprising that internship laws and practices tend to vary widely between countries and even within the same country. Even within a college or university, internship practices can differ between departments. Additionally, the quality of internship offerings that employers provide can range widely with some students immersed in significant learning experiences while others may engage in more menial tasks. The lack of clearly defined and generally accepted guidelines, such as found in more formally established programs such as cooperative education, presents a challenge for internship program administrators. In essence, there is a need for more consistency in internship practices.

Delivery Program 3: Externships

The National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) provide this description of an externship:

An externship or job shadowing experience allows a student to spend between a day and several weeks observing a professional on the job. Such experiences are unpaid, however some colleges and universities pick up travel and/or living expenses. Externships and job shadowing experiences are generally not done for academic credit. (n.d.)

When participating in an externship, a student will typically 'shadow' an experienced member of the company throughout the day(s) to get a better understanding of what his/her job entails. Hence, unlike internships (where emphasis is placed on job training), externships focus on giving the student a small taste of the potential career path.

It is also worth noting that externships have been a cornerstone of work-education experiences in law schools. Givelber, Baker, McDevitt, and Miliano (1995), for example, provide a broad description of good fieldwork in law programs. The fieldwork emphasizes the relationships among the practice setting, the legal problem, and the larger socio-political-economic arena. It also distinguishes the difference between the novices who are there to learn the legal practice and the experts. Givelber et al. also suggested law students learn best when their work is complex and when they receive explicit and implicit guidance, feedback, and evaluation.

Additionally, and unlike internships, externships appears to have more formalized guidelines. In particular, the ABA provides guidelines to make sure fieldwork is both meaningful and appropriate. For example, according to ABA Standard 305 (2004, 2005), law faculty must evaluate fieldwork before law students are permitted to participate. The ABA also requires students to successfully complete one academic year before doing fieldwork.

Delivery Program 4: Apprenticeships

The U.S. Department of Labor defines an apprenticeship as "...a combination of on-the-job training and related instruction in which workers learn the practical and theoretical aspects of a highly skilled occupation. Apprenticeship programs can be sponsored by individual employers, joint employer and labor groups, and/or employer associations" (n.d.).

Others have offered similar descriptions/definitions. For example, McIntosh (2005) describes an apprenticeship as “a structured programme of vocational preparation, sponsored by an employer, juxtaposing part-time education with on-the-job training and work experience, leading to a recognised vocational qualification at craft or higher level (see Ryan & Unwin, 2001)” (p. 251). Apprenticeships also offer “an ‘earn while you learn’ opportunity.... apprentices start working and earning immediately and complete their training as they work” (Christine Hauser, *pers. comm.*, as cited in Reece, 2010, p. 8).

Typically, apprentices start out at about half the salary of a fully qualified journeyman. Pay increases incrementally as the apprentice gains more experience. Towards the end of the apprenticeship, it is reported that wages can rise to approximately 90 percent of what a journeyman would receive (Laurence Shatkin, *pers. comm.* as cited in Reece, 2010, p.9).

Delivery Program 5: Practicum

Price (1987) notes that purpose of a practicum is to “link theory with practice by providing regular structured and supervised opportunities for students to apply and test knowledge, skills and attitudes, developed largely in campus-based studies, to the real world” (p. 109). Similarly, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 1988) describes a practicum as “provid[ing] an opportunity to perform, on a limited basis and under supervision, some of the activities that a regularly employed staff member in the setting would be expected to perform” (p. 28). Williams (2009) further notes that practica “are considered opportunities to apply theoretical knowledge and skills, previously gained in the classroom, to authentic educational settings” (p. 68).

These descriptions imply that practicum is broadly defined and, as a result, can conceivably include a number of related concepts. For example, Yan and He (2010) maintain that the practicum is a form of experiential learning (see also Boud, 1989; Boud, Cohen, & Walker, 1993; Henry, 1989; Kolb, 1984) and can be “described as *field-based learning* (Lonergan & Andersen, 1988), *work-based learning* (Foster & Stephenson, 1998), *learning by doing* (Schön, 1987), *learning from action* (Hutton, 1989) or, in community settings, *service-learning* (Applegate & Morreale, 1999)” (p. 58).

Similarly, Ryan, Toohey, and Hughes (1996) maintain that the “practicum constitutes an integral part of many professional courses in higher education; and is manifest in several different forms depending on the discipline: field experience, cooperative education, sandwich programs, internships, clerkships, clinical practicum, and the like” (p. 355).

This brief review suggests that the concept of the practicum has been characterized as a generic term for work/education experiences.

Delivery Program 6: Service Learning

Service learning is similar to other forms of work/education experiences in that it views the integration of practical and education experiences as a fundamental tenet of the learning process (Eyler & Giles, 1997). And, like project-based learning, it does not necessarily require actual work experience. It does, however, require engagement with the “real” world. As Sherman and MacDonald (2009) note: “Service Learning is an innovative way to integrate experiential learning, academic study, and community service. It builds upon a tradition in education of social responsibility and brings a philosophy of outreach to the undergraduate academic experience” (p. 236).

In this way, service learning has been considered a core component of civic engagement. In particular, Bringle and Hatcher (1995) define service learning as a:

“..course-based, credit bearing educational experience in which students (a) participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs, and (b) reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of personal values and civic responsibility.” (p. 112)

DISCUSSION AND GUIDELINES FOR RESEARCHERS

This review is intended to serve as a reference for terms used to define and describe work/education experiences. Our hope was to discern a shared language in order to establish a stronger foundation upon which to build and sustain scholarship in this area and enhance practice. Although the area of study includes a multitude of names, our analysis suggests that they share, more or less, a common philosophical belief that integration of educational instruction with practical work improves the learning experience. Amongst the delivery programs, barriers emerge that detract from collaborative research. Purists to a specific program may hold rigidly to their prescribed definitions and, as a result, may discount the work of others in a different delivery program. Alternatively, in the absence of adequate clarification, some researchers and practitioners alike might conflate terms that are not meant to be used interchangeably. The purpose of this essay is designed to at least partially mitigate these concerns.

The question that now needs to be addressed is how to move forward. In this regard, we propose the following guidelines:

1. Researchers should *not* regard the individual terms as entirely different. While there may be distinct differences, they are all intended to meet similar goals and objectives (more or less). As such, when researchers are conducting literature reviews, they should be careful so as to not be overly restrictive or overly broad.
2. Researchers are encouraged to utilize definitions and descriptions that are appropriate and, most importantly, documented in the literature. In doing so, the potential for ambiguity is reduced.
3. Researchers should be cognizant of the fact that names for very similar models and programs of work/education experiences may differ depending on the geographical region or the specific discipline. Knowledge of these different names helps improve our research.
4. Researchers are cautioned not to develop new names without philosophical rationale. That said, we would be remiss to not re-acknowledge that we proposed a new name ourselves: work/education experiences. However, we have proposed this name based on the philosophical foundation already established for all of the programs described in this essay; That is, they involves experiences that include recognition of both work and education. Furthermore, the intended outcome of all of these programs is, of course, a meaningful learning experience.
5. Researchers are encouraged to continue the discussion regarding the nature and scope of work/education experiences. We maintain that a more systematic understanding of the names we use to describe (and define) models and programs will improve the quality of our research.

In conclusion, we remind readers that the purpose of our analysis was to critique (but not to criticize), the manner, rationale, and/or motives for the names. We have argued that while clinical descriptions and definitions for names used to describe work/education experiences may differ, it is not all that apparent from a review of the literature. As such, we propose that greater care should be taken with regard to how names are defined and described. The rationale for this proposition is summarized by Adams (2002):

- Definition precedes classification
- Classification enables analysis
- Analysis allows critical reasoning
- Critical reasoning contributes to creative problem solving.

Hence, a better understanding of what names mean and how they are used will help enhance our ability to effectively address and respond to issues relevant to the science and practice of work/education experiences.

REFERENCES

- Adams, D. (2002). *Creative Problem Solving* [power point]. Parallax Consulting. Retrieved from <http://http://parallaxconsulting.com/>
- Applegate, J., & Morreale, S. (1999). Service learning in the communication discipline: A natural partnership. In D. Dorge, E. Zlotkowski, & B. Ortega Murphy (Eds.), *Voices of strong democracy: Concepts and models for service learning in communication studies* (pp. 9-14). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report (2002). Transforming the curriculum: Preparing students for a changing world. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*, 29(3), 1–101. DOI: 10.1002/aehe.2903
- Association for Career and Technical Education. (n.d.). *What is career and technical education?* Retrieved from: https://www.acteonline.org/factsheets/#.UbDGFp3D_IU
- Association for Experiential Education. (2013). *What is experiential education?* Retrieved from <http://www.aee.org/about/whatIsEE>
- Atkinson, L., Rizzetti, J., & Smith, S. (2005). Online resources for work-integrated learning: A case study in re-usability and flexibility. In *Balance, fidelity, mobility: Maintaining the momentum?* (pp. 37-45). Brisbane, Qld, Australia: Australian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education.
- Bay, J. (2006). What should college English be? Preparing undergraduates for careers: An argument for the internship practicum. *College English*, 69(2), 134-141.
- Billett, S. (1994). Situated learning - A workplace experience. *Australian Journal of Adult and Community Education*, 34(2), 112-130.
- Boud, D. (1989). Some competing traditions in experiential learning. In S. W. Weil & I. McGrill (Eds.), *Making sense of experiential learning*, (pp.38-49). Buckingham, U.K.: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Boud, D., Cohen, R., & Walker, D. (1993). Introduction: Understanding learning from experience. In D. Boud, R. Cohen, & D. Walker (Eds.), *Using experience for learning*, (pp. 1–17). Buckingham, U.K.: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Boud, D., Solomon, N., & Symes, C. (2001). *New Practices for New Times*. In D. Boud & N. Solomon (Eds.), *Work-based learning: A new higher education*. Buckingham, U.K.: Open University Press.
- Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2009). Innovative practices in service-learning and curricular engagement. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 147, 37-46.
- Brown, N. (2010). WIL[ing] to share: An institutional conversation to guide policy and practice in work-integrated learning. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 29(5), 507-518.
- Burke, L., Marks-Maran, D. J., Ooms, A., Webb, M., & Cooper, D. (2009). Towards a pedagogy of work-based learning: Perceptions of work-based learning in foundation degrees. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 61(1), 15-33.

- Calway, B., & Murphy, G. (2007). The educational imperatives for a work-integrated learning philosophy. *Journal of Cooperative Education and Internships*, 41(2), 12-22.
- Carnegie Foundation- Community Engagement. (n.d.). *Classification description*. Retrieved from: http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/community_engagement.php
- Cedercreutz, K. & Cates, C. (2010). Cooperative education at the University of Cincinnati: A strategic asset in evolution. *Peer Review*, 12(4), 20-23.
- Chouinard, N. (1993). Some insights on meaningful internships in sport management: A cooperative education approach. *Journal of Sport Management*, 7(2), 95-100.
- Collier, K., & McManus (2005). Setting up learning partnerships in vocational education and training: Lessons learnt. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 57(3), 251-274.
- Coll, R., & Zegwaard, K. (2011). The integration of knowledge in cooperative and work-integrated education programs. In R. Coll & K. Zegwaard (Eds.), *International handbook of cooperative and work-integrated education*. (2nd ed., pp. 297-304). Lowell, MA: World Association for Cooperative Education.
- Coll, R., Eames, C., Paku, L., Lay, M., Hodges, D., Bhat, R, ... & Martin, A. (2009). An exploration of the pedagogies employed to integrate knowledge in work-integrated learning. *Journal of Cooperative Education and Internships*, 43(1), 14-35.
- Cornelius, S., Medyckyj-Scott, D., Forrest, D., Williams, A., & Mackaness, W. (2008). The virtual placement: An alternative to the traditional work placement in the geographical sciences? *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 32(2), 287-302.
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). (1988). *Accreditation procedures manual and application*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Danford, G. L. (2006). Project-based learning and international business education. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 18(1), 7-25. doi:10.1300/J066v18n01_02
- Descy, P., & Tessaring, M. (2002). Training and learning for competence. (Second report on vocational training research in Europe: Executive summary, Rev. ed., *CEDEFOP Reference Series*; 31) Luxembourg: Office. Retrieved from the Official Publications of the European Communities website: http://www2.trainingvillage.gr/etv/publication/download/panorama/4009_en.pdf
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Collier-MacMillan.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Drysdale, M., Goyder, J., Nosko, A., Easton, M., Frank, K., & Rowe, P. (2007). The role of co-op in the transition from high school to post-secondary education. *Journal of Cooperative Education and Internships*, 41(1), 48-55.
- Dimenäs, J. (2010). Beyond dichotomization: A different way of understanding work integrated learning. *Journal of Cooperative Education & Internships*, 44(2), 44-49.
- Driscoll, A. (2008). Carnegie's community-engagement classification: Intentions and insights. *Change*, 10(1), 38 - 41.
- Drysdale, M., Johnston, N., & Chiupka, C. (2011). *Experiential learning in post-secondary education: A proposed model*. (Unpublished work, University of Waterloo, Canada).
- European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training (Cedefop). (2008). *Terminology of European education and training policy*. Retrieved from http://www.cedefop.europa.eu/EN/Files/4064_en.pdf
- Eyler, J., Giles, D. E., & Braxton, J. (1997). The impact of service-learning on college students. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 4(1), 5- 15.
- Eyler, J. (2009). The power of experiential education. *Liberal Education*, 95(4), 24-31.
- Feeley, B. T. (2007). Examining the use of for-profit placements in law school externship programs. *Clinical Law Review*, 14(1), 37-60.
- Foster, E., & Stephenson, J. (1998). Work-based learning and universities in the UK: A review of current practice and trends. *Higher Education Research and Development* 17(2), 155-70.
- Franks, P., & Blomqvist, O. (2004). The World Association for Cooperative Education: The global network that fosters work-integrated learning. In R. K. Coll & C. Eames (Eds.), *International handbook for cooperative education: An international perspective of the theory, research and practice of*

- work-integrated learning*. (pp. 283-289). Boston, MA: World Association for Cooperative Education.
- Freudenberg, B., Brimble, M., & Cameron, C. (2010). Where there is a WIL there is a way. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 29(5), 575-588.
- Freudenberg, B., Brimble, M., & Cameron, C. (2011). WIL and generic skill development: The development of business students' generic skills through work-integrated learning. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, 12(2), 79-93
- Gardner, P. D., & Bartkus, K.R. (2010). An analysis of U.S. learn-and-earn programs. Retrieved from <http://knowledgecenter.completionbydesign.org/sites/default/files/125%20Gardner%20ULL%202010.pdf>
- Gibson, P., & Busby, G. (2009). Experiencing work: Supporting the undergraduate hospitality, tourism and cruise management student on an overseas work placement. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 61(4), 467-480.
- Gibson, E., Brodie, S., Sharpe, S., Wong, D. Y., Deane, E., & Fraser, S. (2009). Towards the development of a work integrated learning unit. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.127.8122&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Givelber, D. J., Baker, B. K., McDevitt, J., & Miliano, R. (1995). Learning through work: an empirical study of legal internship. *Journal of Legal Education*, 45(1), 1 - 48.
- Groenewald, T. (2004). Towards a definition of cooperative education. In R. K. Coll & C. Eames (Eds.), *International handbook for cooperative education: An international perspective of the theory, research and practice of work-integrated learning*. (pp. 17-25) Boston, MA: World Association for Cooperative Education.
- Groenewald, T., Drysdale, M., Johnston, N., & Chiupka, C. (2011). Towards a definition and models of practice for cooperative and work-integrated education. In R. K. Coll & K. E. Zegwaard (Eds.), *International handbook for cooperative and work-integrated education*. (pp. 17-24). Lowell, MA: World Association for Cooperative Education.
- Henry, J. (1989). Meaning and practice in experiential learning. In S. W. Weil & I. McGill (Eds.), *Making sense of experiential learning* (pp. 25-37). Buckingham, U.K.: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Hepker, L. (2000). What's work-study? *Campus Life*, 59(5), 58-59.
- Hines, G., & Moorthy, R. S. (1995). The workplace - Needs and changes. *Journal of Cooperative Education*, 31(1), 53-59.
- Hoyle, T. (2010). Credentials for success: An evolution in the IT industry. *T+D*, 64(7), 48-51.
- Hoz, R., & Peretz, A. (1996). The residence teaching practicum internship at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 22(2), 149-170.
- Houshmand, A. A., & Papadakis, C. (2006). *One century of cooperative education in the United States 1906-2006*. Philadelphia, PA: Drexel University.
- Hutton, M. (1989). Learning from action: A conceptual framework. In S. W. Weil & I. McGill (Eds.), *Making sense of experiential learning* (pp. 50-59). Buckingham, U.K.: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Hynie, M., Jensen, K., Johnny, M., Wedlock, J., & Phipps, D. (2011). Student internships bridge research to real world problems. *Education + Training*, 53(1), 45-56.
- Illinois State University (n.d). The Focus Initiative. Normal, IL: Illinois State University.
- Johnson, D. (2000). The use of learning theories in the design of a work-based learning course at masters level. *Innovations in Education and Training International*, 37(2), 129-133.
- Kaider, F., Henschke, K., Richardson, J., & Kelly, M. P. (2009). Designing blended spaces to maximise student learning in work integrated learning programs. In Atkinson, R. J., & McBeath, C. (Eds), *Same places, different spaces*, (pp. 496-505). Auckland, New Zealand: Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education (Ascilite). Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/auckland09/procs/kaider.pdf>
- Karmel, T. (2007). Vocational education and training in Australian schools. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 34(3), 101-117.
- Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Lam, S., Cheng, R. & Choy, H. (2010). School support and teacher motivation to implement project-based learning. *Learning & Instruction*, 20(6), 487-497.
- Lambeth, J. M., Elliot, J., & Joeger, R. (2009). A new vision for CTE research: The national CTE research agenda logic model. *Techniques: Connecting Education & Careers*, 84(4), 50-55.
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, G., McGuiggan, R., & Holland, B. (2010). Balancing student learning and commercial outcomes in the workplace. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 29(5), 561-574.
- Lester, S. & Costley, C. (2010). Work-based learning at higher education level: value, practice, critique. *Studies in Higher Education*, 35(5), 561-575.
- Levesque-Bristol, C., Knapp, T., & Fisher, B. (2010). The effectiveness of service-learning: It's not always what you think. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 33(3), 208-224.
- Liu, Y., Xu, J., & Weitz, B. A. (2011). The role of emotional expression and mentoring in internship learning. *Academy Of Management Learning & Education*, 10(1), 94-110.
- Lonergan, N., and L. W. Andersen. (1988). Field-based education: Some theoretical considerations. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 7(1), 63-77.
- Marshall, J. A., Petrosino, A. J., & Martin, T. (2010). Preservice teachers' conceptions and enactments of project-based instruction. *Journal of Science Education & Technology*, 19(4), 370-386.
- Mcintosh, S. (2005). The returns to apprenticeship training. *Journal of Education & Work*, 18(3), 251-282.
- McCurdy, S. & Zegwaard, K.E. (2009). Faculty voices: What faculty think about work integrated learning. *Journal of Cooperative Education & Internships*, 43(1), 36-53.
- Misra, P. K. (2011). VET teachers in Europe: Policies, practices and challenges. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 63(1), 27-45
- Moriber, A. C. (1999). Cooperative internships that work. *Community Review*, 76-79.
- Murakami, K., Murray, L., Sims, D., & Chedzey, K. (2009). Learning on work placement: The narrative development of social competence. *Journal of Adult Development*, 16(1), 13-24.
- National Association of Colleges and Employers. (n.d.). Internships, co-ops, practicums, and externships: What's the difference? Retrieved from: <http://www.directemployers.org/2013/02/01/internships-co-ops-practicums-and-externships-whats-the-difference/>
- National Commission for Cooperative Education. (1994). Retrieved from: <http://schoolgrantsfor.com/national-commission-cooperative-education.html>
- O'Connor, K. (2009). Northern exposures: Models of experiential learning in indigenous education. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 31(3), 415-419.
- Price, D. A. (1987). The practicum and its supervision. In K. J. Eltis (Ed.), *Australian Teacher Education in Review*, Bedford Park, South Australia, Australia: South Pacific Association for Teacher Education Inc.
- Reece, T. (2010). The other four-year plan. *Career World*, 38(6), 7-9.
- Rossin, D., & Hyland, T. (2003). Group work-based learning within higher education: An integral ingredient for the personal and social development of students. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 11(2), 153-162.
- Ryan, G., Toohey, S., & Hughes, C. (1996). The purpose, value and structure of the practicum in higher education: A literature review. *Higher Education*, 31, 355-377.
- Ryan, P. & Unwin, L. (2001). Apprenticeship in the British 'training market', *National Institute Economic Review*, 178(1) 99 - 114.
- Schön, D.A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Scott, J. L., & Sarkees-Wircenski, M. (2004). *Overview of career and technical education* (3rd ed.). Homewood, IL: American Technical.
- Sherman, A., & McDonald, L. (2009). Service learning experiences in university science degree courses. *Innovative Higher Education*, 34(4), 235-244.
- Smith, K. (2010). Assessing the Practicum in teacher education – Do we want candidates and mentors to agree? *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 36(1/2), 36-41.
- Smits, W. (2006). The quality of apprenticeship training. *Education Economics*, 14(3), 329-344.
- Southcott, J. (2004). Seeing the big picture: Experiential education in tertiary music education. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 27(1), 1-14.

- Sovilla, E. S., & Varty, J. W. (2004). Cooperative education in the USA, past, present: Some lessons learned. In R. K. Coll & C. Eames (Eds.), *International handbook for cooperative education: An international perspective of the theory, research and practice of work-integrated learning* (pp. 3-16). Boston, MA: World Association for Cooperative Education.
- Stretch, S., & Harp, S. (1991). Retail internships: An experiential learning challenge. *Marketing Education Review*, 1, 66-75.
- Swallow V., Chalmers H., Miller J., Piercy C., & Sen B. (2001). Accredited work-based learning (AWBL) for new nursing roles: Nurses experiences of two pilot schemes. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 10(6), 820-821.
- Taylor, S. M. (1988). Effects of college internships on individual participants. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(3), 393-401.
- Taylor, S. (2002). An investigation into the possibility of a growing trend in cooperative education: 'Reserve cooperative education'. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, 3(2), 45-52.
- Taylor, A. (2006). The challenges of partnership in school-to-work transition. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 58(3), 319-336.
- The UK Initial Professional Development Forum (n.d.) *Definition*. Retrieved from <http://www.ukipdforum.co.uk/>
- U.S. Department of Labor. *Training*. Retrieved from: <http://www.dol.gov/dol/topic/training/apprenticeship.htm>
- Vaezi-Nejad, S.M. (2009). Work placement for professional experience in electronics and communications engineering education. *Journal of Electrical Engineering Education*, 46(3), 280-294.
- Volmari, K., Helakorpi, S., & Frimodt, R. (Eds). (2009). *Competence framework for VET professions handbook for practitioners*. Retrieved from http://www.opf.fi/instancedata/prime_product_julkaisu/opf/embeds/111332_Competence_framework_for_VET_professions.pdf.
- WACE International. (n.d.). Retrieved from: <http://www.waceinc.org/>
- Walters, R. (1947). Herman Schneider: Founder of the cooperative system. In *University of Cincinnati – Four decades of the cooperative system*. Fortieth anniversary program. October 16, 1946, Cincinnati, OH: Cincinnati University Library.
- Ward, N., & Jefferies, A. (2004). 'The analytical club': A unique cooperative education link between industry and academia. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, 5(1), 15-18.
- Weerts, D. J., & Sandmann, L. R. (2010). Community engagement and boundary-spanning roles at research universities. *Journal of Higher Education*, 81(6), 632-657.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, C. (2010). Understanding the essential elements of work-based learning and its relevance to everyday clinical practice. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 18(6), 624-632.
- Williams, J. (2009). Beyond the practicum experience. *English Language Teachers Journal*, 63(1), 68-77.
- Wilson, J. W., Stull, W. A., & Vonsonhaler, J. (1996). Rethinking cooperative education. *Journal of Cooperative Education*, 31,154-165.
- Yan, C. & He, C. (2010). Transforming the existing model of teaching practicum: A study of Chinese EFL student teachers' perceptions. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 36(1), 57-73.



About the Journal

The Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education publishes peer-reviewed original research, topical issues, and best practice articles from throughout the world dealing with Cooperative Education (Co-op) and Work Integrated Learning/Education (WIL).

In this Journal, Co-op/WIL is defined as an educational approach that uses relevant work-based projects that form an integrated and assessed part of an academic program of study (e.g., work placements, internships, practicum). These programs should have clear linkages with, or add to, the knowledge and skill base of the academic program. These programs can be described by a variety of names, such as work-based learning, workplace learning, professional training, industry-based learning, engaged industry learning, career and technical education, internships, experiential education, experiential learning, vocational education and training, fieldwork education, and service learning.

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

Submitting Manuscripts

Before submitting a manuscript, please ensure that the 'instructions for authors' has been followed (www.apjce.org/instructions-for-authors). All manuscripts are to be submitted for blind review directly to the Editor-in-Chief (editor@apjce.org) by way of email attachment. All submissions of manuscripts must be in MS Word format, with manuscript word counts between 3,000 and 5,000 words (excluding references).

All manuscripts, if deemed relevant to the Journal's audience, will be double blind reviewed by two reviewers or more. Manuscripts submitted to the Journal with authors names included will have the authors' names removed by the Editor-in-Chief before being reviewed to ensure anonymity.

Typically, authors receive the reviewers' comments about a month after the submission of the manuscript. The Journal uses a constructive process for review and preparation of the manuscript, and encourages its reviewers to give supportive and extensive feedback on the requirements for improving the manuscript as well as guidance on how to make the amendments.

If the manuscript is deemed acceptable for publication, and reviewers' comments have been satisfactorily addressed, the manuscript is prepared for publication by the Copy Editor. The Copy Editor may correspond with the authors to check details, if required. Final publication is by discretion of the Editor-in-Chief. Final published form of the manuscript is via the Journal website (www.apjce.org), authors will be notified and sent a PDF copy of the final manuscript. There is no charge for publishing in APJCE and the Journal allows free open access for its readers.

Types of Manuscripts Sought by the Journal

Types of manuscripts the Journal accepts are primarily of two forms; *research reports* describing research into aspects of Cooperative Education and Work Integrated Learning/Education, and *topical discussion* articles that review relevant literature and give critical explorative discussion around a topical issue.

The Journal does also accept *best practice* papers but only if it present a unique or innovative practice of a Co-op/WIL program that is likely to be of interest to the broader Co-op/WIL community. The Journal also accepts a limited number of *Book Reviews* of relevant and recently published books.

Research reports should contain; an introduction that describes relevant literature and sets the context of the inquiry, a 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 for practitioners, and a conclusion preferably incorporating suggestions for further research.

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



EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor-in-Chief

Dr. Karsten Zegwaard

University of Waikato, New Zealand

Copy Editor

Yvonne Milbank

Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education

Editorial Board Members

Ms. Diana Ayling

Unitec, New Zealand

Mr. Matthew Campbell

Queensland Institute of Business and Technology, Australia

Dr. Sarojni Choy

Griffith University, Australia

Prof. Richard K. Coll

University of Waikato, New Zealand

Prof. Rick Cummings

Murdoch University, Australia

Prof. Leigh Deves

Charles Darwin University, Australia

Dr. Maureen Drysdale

University of Waterloo, Canada

Dr. Chris Eames

University of Waikato, New Zealand

Mrs. Sonia Ferns

Curtin University, Australia

Ms. Jenny Fleming

Auckland University of Technology, New Zealand

Dr. Phil Gardner

Michigan State University

Dr. Thomas Groenewald

University of South Africa, South Africa

Dr. Kathryn Hays

Massey University, New Zealand

Prof. Joy Higgs

Charles Sturt University, Australia

Ms. Katharine Hoskyn

Auckland University of Technology, New Zealand

Dr. Sharleen Howison

Otago Polytechnic, New Zealand

Dr. Denise Jackson

Edith Cowan University, Australia

Dr. Nancy Johnston

Simon Fraser University, Canada

Dr. Leif Karlsson

Kristianstad University, Sweden

Dr. Mark Lay

University of Waikato, New Zealand

Assoc. Prof. Andy Martin

Massey University, New Zealand

Ms. Susan McCurdy

University of Waikato, New Zealand

Ms. Norah McRae

University of Victoria, Canada

Prof. Beverly Oliver

Deakin University, Australia

Assoc. Prof. Janice Orrell

Flinders University, Australia

Dr. Deborah Peach

Queensland University of Technology, Australia

Dr. David Skelton

Eastern Institute of Technology, New Zealand

Prof. Heather Smigiel

Flinders University, Australia

Dr. Calvin Smith

Griffith University, Australia

Assoc. Prof. Neil Taylor

University of New England, Australia

Ms. Susanne Taylor

University of Johannesburg, South Africa

Assoc. Prof. Franziska Trede

Charles Sturt University, Australia

Ms. Genevieve Watson

University of Western Sydney, Australia

Prof. Neil I. Ward

University of Surrey, United Kingdom

Dr. Nick Wempe

Whitireia Community Polytechnic, New Zealand

Dr. Marius L. Wessels

Tshwane University of Technology, South Africa