

Professional learning of academics enacting Work Integrated Learning

Oriana M. Price^a and Amanda. L. Lizier^{b*}

^aFaculty of Business and Law, University of Wollongong, Wollongong, Australia;

^bFaculty of Arts and Social Sciences, University of Technology Sydney, Australia

* Dr. Amanda Lizier

School of International Studies and Education (Building 10)

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

University of Technology Sydney

PO Box 123

Broadway NSW 2007 Australia

Telephone: +61 411 069 641

Professional learning of academics enacting Work Integrated Learning

New managerialism and neo-liberal discourses have re-shaped traditional academic practices towards the vocational aspects of higher education. One institutional response to the growing graduate employability policy agenda has been the introduction of work-integrated learning (WIL) within Australian universities, a form of learning requiring academics to engage students in work-based or work-like settings to enhance their work-readiness. WIL has required new ways of working and learning for academics who are called on to act as a conduit between the University, students, and industry, raising questions about how academics are developing such skills and knowledges. Adopting the Theory of Practice Architectures, we draw on a study of academics enacting WIL at two Australian universities to consider the ways in which academics undertake professional learning to enact practices in pursuit of the project of WIL. Specifically, we discuss a different conceptualisation of professional learning where academics ‘come to practice differently’ (Kemmis, 2021, p. 3), challenging traditional views of learning as being the results of formal and informal learning activities. We consider how learning activities may enable or constrain academics in coming to academic practices differently.

Keywords: work-integrated learning; higher education; professional learning; practice

Introduction

New managerialism and neoliberal discourses, driven by government agendas via associated higher education policies, continue to play a key role in the re-shaping of academic practices (Birnbaum 2000; Croucher & Lacy 2020). A key shift has been to focus on the vocational aspect of higher education to ensure that universities produce not only “work ready” graduates but also graduates ready for the emerging jobs and workplaces of the future (Penprase 2018).

One institutional response to the growing graduate employability policy agenda in the Australian universities context has been the introduction of work-integrated learning (WIL). WIL as a form of learning requires academics to engage students in work-

based, or work-like, settings or activities throughout their studies to enhance their work-readiness (Enders et al. 2011), reflecting a move away from forms of learning traditionally understood to constitute higher education. The establishment, nurturing, and sustainability of WIL experiences not only continue to necessitate shifts in the curriculum, but also go to the core of academic work practices. Academics therefore must not only focus on student capability development — for knowing ‘how to learn’ (Herbert & van der Laan 2021, p. 2), how to apply knowledge in practice across contexts and disciplinary boundaries, and engaging in lifelong learning — but also their own capability development and learning.

The introduction of WIL in the Australian higher education (HE) context has reframed aspects of the project of HE and consequently the work practices of some academics, as seen in a recent study adopting the Theory of Practice Architectures (TPA) by Sheridan, Price, Sheridan et al., (2021). The authors identified five key (and newly introduced) practices consistently enacted by academics involved in WIL. These practices include *Networking* with industry and *Selling* the value of WIL to industry partners, with the aim of facilitating the creation of opportunities for students. *Negotiating* shared meanings and ways of relating (to students and to industry) to make WIL work in practice. *Collaborating and Innovating*, were practices adopted to maintain WIL experiences sustainable. These practices pertinent as academics were faced with insufficient workload resourcing for developing, implementing, and managing WIL experiences and relationships and, for coming to know how to do WIL. Such changes in the purposes and projects of academic work not only raise questions about academic identities (Sheridan, L., et al. 2021) but also, importantly, the establishment of new academic teaching practices that draw together practices pertaining both to academia and industry (Sheridan, et al. 2021). The aim of our study is to consider how, in the context of ongoing reforms

of academic work and workplaces (Smith et al. 2010), academics come to know what to do. Specifically, what are the kinds of professional development, professional learning, and everyday learning that facilitate the necessary skills and knowledges in the reformed HE contexts. How may agency be implicated in these kinds of academic learning?

In this paper, we build on the research discussed above and discuss a study of academics enacting new ways of working to facilitate WIL in two Australian universities. We are not seeking to re-describe practices of academics enacting WIL but instead to provoke a change in the ways in which professional learning may be conceptualised for academics enacting WIL. We chose to investigate the academics enacting WIL, because the introduction of WIL in the Australian HE sector represents a recent and significant change shifting the practices of work of many academics requiring further professional learning. Specifically, we discuss learning through a TPA lens as ‘coming to practice differently’ (Kemmis 2021, p. 3). We seek to contribute an empirical example to demonstrate the explanatory power of TPA in considering the role of agency in academic’s professional learning and to support theorisations put forward by Kemmis (2021) of learning as coming to practice differently.

Professional development, professional learning, and everyday learning

Consistently, findings of literature reviews about professional development (PD) (see for example Manley et al. 2018; Njenga 2022; Vázquez-Calatayud et al. 2021; Webster-Wright 2009) maintain that, for professionals across many fields, learning is not only a necessary project in initial education, but one to be undertaken throughout one’s career. In many professions, continuing professional development (CPD) takes the form of codified and structured sets of activities for the purpose of achieving and/or maintaining registration for practising a profession (Boud & Hager 2012). The starting point of much PD discourse, it that of deficiency with formalised PD programs designed to

bridge identified knowledge gaps (Webster-Wright 2009). The deficiency metaphor has also been identified in the discourse and practices of academic developers in the HE context. Leibowitz (2014) argues that taking a deficiency starting point may be counterproductive when working with academics. Academics ‘already consider themselves to be developed in the sense of having a professional or disciplinary identity’ (p. 357). Indeed, a deficiency approach and a focus on PD may play a role in academics’ resistance in taking up the kind of learning that may support shifting teaching approaches beyond the transmission of discipline knowledge.

In a recent review of academic development literature in the Australian HE context, Herbert and van der Laan (2021) identified three typologies of learning and teaching focused professional development of academics: Learning and Teaching informed PD (formally delivered and implemented by academic development units in HE institutions), Community of Practice PD (self-directed, peer to peer within disciplines linked with teaching and research areas) and Policy Driven PD (top down, policy driven and focused on student learning and linked to performance management structures). The authors conclude that key to successful PD take-up necessitates the provision of various PD opportunities, the design of policies, programs, and opportunities that centre around the changing disciplinary and context of work of academics, as well as a deep understanding of academic’s motivations to take up various opportunities for learning. Though not explicitly stated, this recent work draws attention to academics as professionals, their practices and their agency in shaping those practices and associated learning.

Arguing for a paradigm shift, Webster-Wright (2009) has sought to reframe the discourse from professional development to professional learning and positioning professionals as ‘engaged, agentic individuals, capable of self-directed learning’ (p.

724). These reframed understandings about professionals and learning draw attention to learning ‘as continuing, active, social, and related to practice’ (p. 703) as a coming to a ‘professional knowing’ that is ‘embodied contextual and embedded in practice’ (p. 724). It recognises that both research and PD practice needs to focus on supporting professionals in responding to the complexities of the day-to-day practice, the (changing) nature of their professions (e.g., accreditation frameworks and mandatory registration) and the workplace contexts in which they operate. Boud and Hager (2012) echo the sentiments put forward by Webster-Wright (2009), maintaining that the many approaches to CPD tend to adopt the transfer and acquisition metaphors of learning focusing on individual learners. Such approaches not only disconnect professionals from their work, but also oversimplify the practices of professional work. Boud and Hager (2012) further argue that such CPD approaches tend to strip the ‘autonomy and agency’ (p. 20) of those engaged in learning by overshadowing both the value of practice and the tacit learning that happens in day-to-day work, often amid others performing work in other disciplines – in short, through everyday learning. In recognising that learning may be better understood through the metaphors of ‘participation, construction and becoming’ (p. 12) the authors draw attention to both the social aspects of learning as well as the organisational conditions which may inhibit, enhance, and/or transform learning in and through the practices of everyday work. Similarly, in the context of professional learning (of teachers), Olin et al. (2020) also recognise the importance of agency in the learning of professionals. They note that ‘being and becoming a teacher whose agency of knowing is essential for the transformation of educators, educational practices, and education as a whole’ (p. 158).

In extending the above conceptualisations of professional learning to the academic context and adopting a practice-based perspective, Boud and Brew (2013)

reposition academic work as professional practice. The authors bring to the fore that academics, like other practitioners, may indeed find learning most useful and engaging when located in their everyday work. They argue that academic developers and academic managers can seek to better understand academic work, remove barriers to learning and create opportunities for learning ‘everyday work’ of academics (2013, p. 210). They argue for creating *learning conductive work with and for* academics. In TPA discourse we suggest, these changes involve reshaping the architectures of academic work practices. These shifts in conceptualisations and practice architectures, we argue, may go some way in mitigating the challenges for academic development and learning identified by Herbert et al., (2021).

Recognising that the terms professional development and professional learning continue to be contested, Olin et al. (2020) provide two distinct yet connected conceptualisations of these terms. Professional development, they argue, may be construed as those ‘arrangements established to explicitly support the development of teacher’s knowledge and competence related to the teaching task’ (p. 143). Such may include planned programs, often driven by State or National policy frameworks ensuring teachers’ role focused competency. In contrast, professional learning is understood as situated, participative, emergent, and open-ended engagement by teachers in their day-to-day work practices. A way of being ‘stirred in’ (Kemmis 2014c cited in Olin et al. p.143) to the practices of the teaching profession.

Theory of Practice architectures

In this section we introduce the theory of practice architectures (TPA) as the theoretical framing of this research.

TPA is a practice-based approach that considers social practices as encompassing sayings, doings, relatings (Kemmis 2022) that come together towards the achievement of ends and goals of a practice. By *sayings*, TPA refers to talk “of” and “in” a practice as well as emergent and pre-existing shared understandings; by *doings*, TPA refers to actions and activities, shared and otherwise among those enacting a practice; by *relatings*, TPA refers to the ways in which, through the enactment of a practice, people and things relate to each other (Mahon et al. 2017). Practices come together in sites (social places and spaces where practices happen, see Schatzki 2002), and are framed by three kinds of practice arrangements (architectures) which may enable or constrain possibilities of practices. See Figure 1.

INSERT FIGURE 1 AROUND HERE

Figure 1 Theory of Practice Architectures framework (Kemmis 2022)

Cultural-discursive arrangements enable and constrain the possible discourses and sayings of a practice and may prefigure said practices. For example, the introduction of discourses of students’ work-readiness and WIL shape the kinds of discourse repertoires that academics are expected to engage with and enact in relation to curriculum and teaching practices. Material-economic arrangements enable and constrain material conditions including supporting infrastructures and resourcing, creating certain possibilities for the doings of a practice while excluding others. For example, time allowances in academic workloads for the implementation of WIL initiatives. Social-political arrangements prefigure the ways in which relating among people and objects in/of practice may occur (Kemmis et al. 2014; Mahon et al. 2017). For instance, how WIL focused work is embedded in the broader context of

organisational policy priorities, the degrees to which academics' work focused on WIL is valued (or not) against other kinds of academic work such as research and publications. Consequently, the degree to which certain kinds of learning and development are considered legitimate for academics to engage in. TPA therefore seeks to bring together practices, practitioners, and arrangements, and as reflected in the infinity symbol in Figure 1, arrangements are entangled with practices and guide how practices unfold. At the same time, practices as enacted may reshape aspects of those arrangements as may other contextual conditions (Kemmis 2022).

Adopting TPA shifts understanding towards work and learning as entangled and produced amid practices and practice architectures (Lizier et al. 2023). Learning may be understood as 'an initiation' (Kemmis et al. 2014, 55) or a being 'stirred in' to existing, reformed and new practices (Kemmis et al. 2017, 45). Taking these conceptions further, Kemmis (2021, p. 10) maintains that 'learning is a process of coming to practice differently' whereby learning is not a (separate) practice in itself, but instead an outcome of participating in various social practices. This perspective shifts understandings of learning from more traditional conceptions of knowledge acquisition to mitigate a deficiency of some kind, and towards a situated perspective of learning, and as an inherent and integral part of participating and enacting social practices (Lave and Wenger 1991 cited in Lave 2019). For Kemmis (2021, p. 7) 'learning happens in practices, and learning shapes and reshapes practices' through participation, for example through hearing and sharing stories with others for example academics sharing WIL teaching experiences, observing, listening and questioning that is situated in the context of a practice, for example in *selling and networking* practices enacted by academics in the WIL practice community at a university. Furthermore, in extending the notion of situations 'beyond some place, or in some "context"' Kemmis (2021, p.

12) maintains learning as transformative not only of individuals who may be learning certain practices through various forms of participation, but also those very practices in which one engages with and the sites in which such practices ‘happen’.

Key to understanding the practices and practice architectures of academic work is the concept of agency. Agency has been a long debated and contested concept (Stetsenko 2019). We focus here on how it has been conceptualised within TPA, as a way of accounting for and acknowledging the impact of human actors on practices and the practice architectures that enable and constrain practices. Practice architectures are understood as the ‘products of human agency’ (Kemmis et al. 2016, p. 248) which are key to the production of practices. While the TPA focuses on the production, reproduction, and transformation of practices, our ‘agency lies in coming to understand the constraints within which we operate but also that, when appropriate or needed, we can open up opportunities to imagine and enact alternative conditions that make new practices possible’ (p. 249). With respect to the above perspective on agency, it may be said therefore that academics may have had limited or no agency in the adoption of WIL as an institutional policy yet they may enact agency in the ways in which WIL is enacted in their teaching practices and, consequently, impact the WIL practice architectures institutionally.

More recently, Kemmis (2022) has positioned agency as ‘the energy that flows through practices’ where the ‘project is a unifying source of agency across the complex of practices involved, both for the individual people involved, and for them collectively’ (p. 136). The project then provides a focus for agency and is strengthened by common understandings of, and commitment to, the project individually and collectively. It is not merely a flow of energy but a flow of energy towards a common goal or project – agency ‘galvanises practices and ecologies of practices to *act and get things done*’

(Kemmis 2022, p. 137). In this conceptualisation, agency is then perhaps best conceived of as part of the conditions of possibility for practices, possibilities that flow around and through practices, enabled and constrained (like practices), by the practice arrangements of a site. This is the conceptualisation of agency that we use in this article.

In summary, we argue that professional development (PD), professional learning (PL), and everyday learning (EL) are processes that academics undertake as ‘engaged, agentic individuals’ (Webster-Wright 2009, p. 724) and as ways of ‘coming to practice differently’ (Kemmis 2021, p. 3). Learning then, is not merely the activities of an individual that occur apart from those practices for which learning is sought, but a coming to practice differently, enabled and constrained by the practice architectures present at a site. Agency is also not entirely associated with individuals but has collective elements and is ‘the energy that flows through practices’ (Kemmis, 2022, p. 136) in pursuit of a project – in this case knowledgeably enacting WIL in teaching practices.

Methodology

Research sites and participants

This research was undertaken in two Australian universities, one located in a large regional centre and the other located in a metropolitan area. Academics at both sites were invited to participate in this research because of their experience and commitment to developing, implementing, and managing WIL experiences and relationships in their subjects. We draw on interviews from ten academics from across the two institutions who agreed to participate in this research.

Participants represented various disciplines (i.e., engineering, careers, international studies, education, academic development, business) and were involved in

teaching both undergraduate and postgraduate courses. Most participants had a level of industry experience, were PhD qualified in their discipline, and experienced teachers in the HE sector.

Research methods and analysis

Aligned with the qualitative practice-based approach discussed above, the data collection adopted a semi-structured interview approach along with analysis of organisational documents. The documents included those outlining the various professional development programs offered to academics in the respective sites. Interviews were transcribed and the full transcripts were analysed using an iterative process using a thematic analysis (Miles & Huberman 1994). In the next section, we explore conceptualisations of professional learning through two lenses – traditional and TPA – using evidence from the study.

Exploring conceptualisations of the learning of academics

Traditional views of the learning of academics

Initially taking a traditional view of learning that categorises learning into professional development (PD), professional learning (PL), and everyday learning (EL), we found that the participants relied most heavily on professional learning and everyday learning even in where formal professional development programs were initially available.

One participant, *Tony*, an academic in a Business School for over 12 years, talked how in his early years he had participated in professional development program designed for university teachers called the Learning and Teaching Program comprised of four modules.

...the Learning and Teaching program (LTP) made me reflect. I did LTP 1, 2, and 3 and [these courses] made me reflect about my teaching practice. I've benefited

greatly... I did my LTP3 report, so I did the literature report about work-integrated learning...

The purpose of this PD program was to 'enhance teaching effectiveness and provide an educational context for ongoing career development' and provide 'immediate and practical assistance to participants enabling them to further their own exploration of teaching and learning' (Anon 2012, p. 1). Participants could choose to complete the module *LTP3 Negotiated Project* and obtain articulation for one subject in Grad Cert/ Master of Higher Education, a formal qualification for teaching in the HE context.

Although having benefited from the PD program, *Tony* also reported that at his stage in his academic career, and in seeking to stablish himself as a researcher in his field, he is engaging in further learning about WIL practices, by adopting a professional learning approach and accessing:

... great resources without actually studying or doing extra courses, necessarily. I've thought about a master's in higher education myself, but I've just at the moment decided not to... So, you've got to tap into those resources...

For *Tony* learning how to do WIL was a combination of PD and ongoing professional learning encompassing reflecting on his own experiences as a university student and learning from experience of past lecturers to inform his approach to teaching:

... my richest learning experience, reflecting back on that, was whenever the professor took us out of the university, into industry environments...talked to practitioners... the effort that they went through, to teach us meaningfully... so there's always that balance between theory and practise, and so forth... now I'm in a position where I can create those environments, to create a similar rich learning experience for students...

Although Learning and Teaching (LTP) program had been established for some time and had achieved some success, it was discontinued in favour of a more flexible and

discipline specific professional learning approach. The LTP program was replaced by the introduction of the *Continuing Professional Development - Learning & Teaching* (CPD L&T) Portfolio program. The new program encompassed the production of teaching portfolios which, through a process of peer evaluated provided academics with intra-institutional levels of recognition with respect to learning and teaching accomplishment. Encompassing four levels of accomplishment in university teaching and learning (Anon 2016). The CPD (L&T) *Level 1* (Anon 2020, p. 5) portfolio is further linked to the formal employment probation process for newly appointed academics who are required to teach as part of their employment at the university.

Specifically, the policy states:

Academic staff are required to have completed as a minimum CPD Level 1 Portfolio ... Learning, Teaching & Curriculum will provide information on CPD status including: whether the academic staff member has completed CPD level 1 [to supervisors and Human Resources Division]

Beyond probation, achievements reflecting higher levels of accomplishment in the CPD L&T are encouraged within organisational policy. Specifically the Academic Performance Framework and Guidelines (APFG) (Anon 2018) representing the key evaluative criteria for academic promotion at one university, recognises completion of the “*Continuing Professional Development (Learning & Teaching) Level 2*” as legitimate “*evidence of continued professional development for self and of others, in relation to learning and teaching...*”.

Numerous participants noted that there were no professional development options available to them and so they felt left to their own devices in terms of learning how to enact WIL in their context. For example, when *Jason*, an academic from a Faculty of Social Sciences was asked if he had received any sort of support or development from his institution he replied,

Gosh, no. [Name] who works as one of the WIL support team, she provides a little bit of administrative support every time I get work up and running but the most support has been really from the teams within [University] like [learning design team] or the [educational technology team] and it's been enthusiasm and generosity rather than any specific or learning.

Jason's comment above highlights that the participants largely relied on professional learning via networks from both across their institutions and within industry. Such networks provided support in learning how to enact WIL, a way in which to make contacts in industry to help with WIL placements, and a way in which to share ideas and discuss issues with likeminded academics also interested in WIL. As Heidi, an International Studies academic noted,

...that's why I joined the [WIL institute] ...board, because I thought just the monthly meetings, the updates from people all around [the State] to hear what's going on and they're from very different areas like a lot in health and nursing and so on so areas I don't know much but I want to know about. Some of them are researchers, some of them are directors and so on so I feel like I get a lot of information just in that group. I can feed that forward and report back and so on so that helps me a lot.

Activities such as being involved in university networks or WIL-oriented professional networks outside of the university were an important part of the learning of the participants. This perspective was also reflected by *Angela*, a Careers Development Academic. *Angela* talked about initially engaging in professional learning through academic bodies such as Australian Collaborative Education network (ACEN) and associated conferences, and more local networks as well supplementing her learning through more structured learning opportunities:

The people at the ACEN community... really know what they're doing, just going to the conferences I can see that they're really plugged in... I think that's just true WIL in general, that people are really passionate about what they're doing, but it's

not an established field with parameters and we're kind of all learning by doing...at the ACEN Conference this year they said, 'Hey, do you want to sign up for a Global WIL module'...it's more like a community of practice than class, yes we've been given a few papers to read about learning theories and WIL and we've had webinars and we're doing online discussion about what kind of WIL we're practicing and that sort of thing...I go to the Teaching & Learning network meetings when things concern WIL...my manager's got her finger on the pulse of all of that stuff, my team, the community of practice, most of the time we talk to each other like everybody in the WIL space.

This supplemented and supported the main way in which the participants learned which was via what is often termed everyday learning – learning through participation in work. Working through issues and needing to develop ideas for enacting WIL was the primary way in which the participants learned how to enact and theorise WIL. *Sam*, an academic working in engineering, described how their development came from their interactions with an international professional body for engineering and that it was useful because,

I'm constantly engaging with leaders across the globe and always absorbing information, ideas, that way, and I do attend so many conferences and stuff like that, so I'm constantly being absorbed with great minds, and that is the greatest... And the practice, so that's the greatest development I can have... To implement [WIL], basically, you need to have an ear on the ground of what is needed and occurring and then having that connection to industry. For me, the [association] is that powerful tool, to enable that to happen... I'm constantly, through the [association], having such conversations with industry...

A key part of the everyday learning described by participants was using skills, knowledge, and professional networks from their careers prior to their current role to enact WIL in their current role. Several of the participants came from professional backgrounds that had not previously included WIL and in some cases were very different from the areas in which they now worked. For example, one academic had

previously worked in adult literacy but was now working in an academic teaching role within engineering. *Jason*, for example, when asked how he ‘learned the ropes’ in his current role replied,

I wouldn’t have considered myself a work integrated learning expert by any stroke of the imagination. I was very fortunate back when I was a schoolteacher and probably going back more than – no, not quite 20 – let’s say 15 years when I was working in the UK. I worked at an academy which is a school with a specific focus and the focus was business and enterprise and one of the facets of that was work integrated learning and that’s where I picked up that tryptic idea of we learn through work, we learn for work and there’s another one, through, for – about work.

Similarly, *Putu*, an academic within Engineering, noted that they had been hired specifically because of their diverse background and described how they used their background to assist them in enacting WIL,

...although I don’t come from WIL, I am an ethnographer and workplaces are prime for ethnographic analysis whether you’re right in there or even if you’re looking at a distance or you’re talking to participants from those places. So that’s how I did it. It’s a lot of - as ethnographers say, a lot of deepening around, listening, watching and questioning, enquiry. I think also that although I am now a WIL person but I didn’t come from a WIL background and I’m not aware of a lot of qualifications that teach you to be a WIL educator, everyone learns how to do it on the job – well most people. I do come very much from an experiential learning background.

Margaret, an academic in the School of Education, talked about how part of her everyday practice in working with her peers and to sustain WIL she shares her knowledge and resources with her colleagues new to WIL:

...I left primary teaching for adult education ... I also spent a number of years teaching professors and other academics how to become online practitioners...you can't be territorial [with what you know and say] I'm not going to share it with

anyone ...you can't have that mentality... in WIL if you're going to set up something...you have to go, okay, let's work together... so I sat down with [NAME]... I showed him how I organized the subject. I showed him what happened. He went over and had a meeting. We went together. I introduced him to the principal... Then I just let him do his own thing.

While examining the learning of academics enacting WIL can be useful to an extent, it is also limiting to discuss learning in terms of how the learning happens. The three categories noted earlier in this article – professional development, professional learning, and everyday learning – describe how people might learn at and for work, however they do not offer explanation as to what learning is. For this we turn to a newer conceptualisation of learning, that of ‘learning as coming to practice differently’ (Kemmis, 2021, p. 3).

Although the findings noted above concerning how the participants were learning are interesting, they are not particularly novel. Indeed, it is well documented within the workplace learning literature (but perhaps not so extensively explored in the HE academic learning literature) that people tend to learn at and for work through participation in that work (see for example Billett 2001, 2004; Eraut 2007, 2011). Unsurprisingly, this is what we found when using professional development, professional learning, and everyday learning as a starting point for investigating the learning of academics enacting WIL. There was little formalised professional development, more informal professional learning, mainly via networks, and then the bulk of the learning appeared to happen through everyday work. To shift thinking about learning at and for work away from this continuum of formality – informality in learning, we argue that there needs to be a shift in how we theorise learning. To that end we propose adopting the theory of practice architectures (TPA) as a lens through which to consider learning as ‘coming to practice differently’ (Kemmis, 2021, p.3).

Taking a TPA approach provides a way in which to situate learning within the web of practices and practice arrangements, the practice architectures, involved in enacting WIL rather than focusing on the individual academics as learners. Such an approach de-centres the learner and shifts the focus to the practices, allowing for richer understandings of learning at and for work.

It therefore makes sense that learning happens predominantly through participation or everyday work as this is where the practices are happening – within the intersubjective spaces of the site. Rather than sectioning learning into categories, using the TPA allows us to look at the happeningness of WIL as a major project within universities and how academics are learning how to go on within the practice architectures sustaining WIL and which enable and constrain academics' work practices. In short, how academics are coming to practice differently.

In pursuit of the project of enacting WIL, the academics interviewed were participating in (and reshaping and reforming) various practices such as those first identified by Sheridan et al. (2021) -*Networking, Selling, Negotiating, Collaborating and Innovating*. Through being a part of such practices, the participants in this study were coming to (their work) practice differently in pursuit of the project of enacting WIL within their HE site. These practices are enabled and constrained by different arrangements found at the site such as resources, workload allocations, institutional WIL frameworks, and broader WIL discourses. Professional development, professional learning, and everyday learning, as defined by Olin et al. (2020), are then perhaps best considered not as separated practices in themselves, but as enactments (processes) bound up in the cultural-discursive and material-economic and socio-political arrangements of introduced WIL practices. Professional development, professional learning, and everyday learning are therefore best understood as part of the practice

arrangements of WIL within HE. Such arrangements are entangled with practices and guide how practices unfold, and at the same time, practices as enacted, may reshape aspects of those arrangements as may other contextual conditions (Kemmis 2022).

Returning to the study, material-economic arrangements relating to resources and academic workloads were key to how academics came to practice WIL. For example, many of the academics interviewed noted that they felt they were under resourced in terms of the workload allocation for WIL, with their universities not recognising how much work was really required to enact WIL. As Putu noted,

...it is a point of I guess hurt and irritation that our contribution to the University is so undervalued, is seen as less important and that the revenue we generate through our work is not directed to resourcing us appropriately.

Further, Heidi observed that,

I realise that we actually have a lot of people working in that area [WIL] and a lot of them, they don't get any workload for that because the actual building networks with industry, not just building them but maintaining them and contact them every semester again, would you like to take some of our students? ... you have to maintain that and there's no workload for that.

Under resourcing of WIL in academic workloads is not a new phenomenon (see for example Edwards et al., 2015; Johnson et al., 2019; Rook, 2017) but it is particularly prevalent in disciplines which have not traditionally encompassed WIL experiences (Dean et al. 2023). In fact, the work of Dean et al. (2023) reflects the findings of a working group at one of the universities that participated in this research and which resulted from 'agency being harnessed in a collective commitment' (Kemmis 2022, p. 100) by those academics enacting WIL who regarded existing WIL material-economic arrangements (i.e., resourcing) as less than adequate and therefore constraining the legitimacy of the WIL academic contributions. Based on the evidence from this study it appears that this

collective agency is also spilling over into less traditional areas for WIL such as international studies and learning design.

Social-political arrangements prefigure the ways in which relating among people and objects in/of practice may occur (Kemmis et al. 2014; Mahon et al. 2017). For instance, how WIL is embedded in the broader context of organisational policy priorities, the valuing (or not) of academics' work focused on WIL against other kinds of academic work such as research and publications. For example, social-political arrangements of one institution in our study also played a key role in motivating academics to engage in professional development and professional learning as it related to their teaching work. By enshrining the completion of professional learning portfolios in various policies (e.g., organisational and professional development policy, academic performance framework and guidelines, and academic probation and promotion procedures), academics that wished to be successful in this site were required to have their teaching practices (WIL or otherwise) legitimised not only by peers and mentors, but also within the institution's performance hierarchy. The policy driven approach to PD identified in our data is also in line with findings of recent research (Herbert & van der Laan 2021).

So where does that leave the role of agency in a TPA conceptualisation of professional learning? Various writers consider agency as an important concept for understanding how, and why, professionals including academics have come to practice differently (Boud & Brew 2013; Boud & Hager 2012; Olin et al. 2020; Webster-Wright 2009). Using the TPA as a theoretical lens is helpful in conceptualising agency in the context of academics coming to practice differently for the project of WIL. As Kemmis (2022) notes, agency is 'the energy that flows through practices' unified by the project (p. 136). In the case of the study discussed here, the project is enacting WIL within the different professional contexts of the academics interviewed and within the broader

context of their universities. To make WIL happen, there are various arrangements that enable and constrain the practices of WIL and prefigure the happeningness of WIL in each site. One such example was the WIL classification framework, which itself was developed by taking a professional learning approach. *Beatrice*, as convenor of the working party to develop an institutional framework for WIL related that the working group which comprised of academics from different faculties who are also WIL practitioners, adopted a professional learning approach,

...in attending the committee meeting there are always pre-readings that you need to ensure that you have read and come with any questions that you have in regards to those readings... ...We had a very clear purpose in what we were going to achieve.

Beatrice went on to describe how the professional learning approach worked through readings and discussions and how this framed the shared and agreed institutional definitions of the WIL,

When you attend the meeting, it's important to get ready to contribute. These types of meetings are actually really quite inclusive, so they welcome all feedback and any ideas that you have... If there are some things that need clarifying then just flag them and say, "Look, I'm not sure if what you're talking about here is really clear to me at this stage. I need to go do some more reading." or, perhaps it's about offering a little bit of an explanation for why you think it's not quite fitting with that alignment in that particular time...

In the project of developing the institutional WIL framework, the working group were building the architectures of WIL within the organisation. Architectures that would enable and constrain what is possible in practice and shape the learning of academics.

Agency is then the energy that moves around and through the practices of WIL, enabled and constrained by the practice arrangements of the site. In this example, the

agency that flowed from the working group then flowed on to the various enactments of WIL at the subject level across disciplines. As *Beatrice* again notes,

Anybody who is designing subjects or even at a broad level of course, can have some principles that will inform the way that they design it. And these principles are really grounded in scholarship of teaching and learning.

Academic professional learning as coming to practice differently is then also bound up in these practices and enabled and constrained by the same practice arrangements. Agency is not a property of the individual nor the site, but instead is enabled and constrained by the same practice arrangements that prefigure the practices themselves. Agency forms a part of the conditions of possibility for academics, individually and collectively, enacting WIL and coming to their practice as academics differently. The practice arrangements may make some enactments (processes) of learning - professional development, professional learning, or everyday learning – more salient than others at a particular point in time, (e.g., PD through formalised LTC modules and later as professional learning through CPD portfolios) but they are all ways that enable and constrain academics to come to practice differently with regards to WIL.

As a device for understanding the role of agency in coming to practice differently, we propose an analogy of the ocean. In this analogy, agency is the waves on the ocean coming to shore. A surfer may be surfing a wave and needs to respond to the conditions at that site and at that time. Surfers on a break also demonstrate collective agency in the project of an ‘epic’ surf by supporting and making way and avoiding ‘drop-ins’ on one another surfer’s wave. Favourable winds may enable their surf to shore while rocks in their path may constrain their progress. Certain things like a rip or strong current may pick people up and carry them away from their original project of riding the wave to the shore, or compel them to paddle a different path than the one they

had originally planned. However, as the person comes to understand the practice of surfing, then they can channel themselves more accurately and forcefully in pursuit of their project of surfing to shore.

In a similar way, the academics interviewed as part of this study were practicing in pursuit of the project of WIL in their teaching and academic practice. Certain practice arrangements enabled their progress towards that project and some constrained them however, as they practiced they came to understand the practice more fully and channel themselves towards WIL. Individually and collectively working with peers and through WIL networks, they came to know how to achieve the project of WIL. Professional development and professional learning doubtless played a part in that, but they were not the main way in which the academics learned or came to practice differently. That happened through practicing their everyday work in pursuit of WIL— through surfing the wave and practicing differently as the currents of the HE required.

In summary, in this analysis and discussion we have sought to contribute an empirical example to support the theorisations put forward by Kemmis (2021) of learning as coming to practice differently. We have demonstrated through our empirical case study the explanatory power of TPA when considering the learning of academics enacting work-integrated learning. In doing so we are further contributing to the emerging literature locating professional learning in TPA.

Reflections and conclusions

The introduction of work-integrated learning (WIL) into the Australian HE landscape has required academics to shift their teaching practices and their overall practices as an academic. Adopting the theory of practice architectures to frame this study of academics enacting WIL at two Australian universities has provided a way in which to de-centre

the learner and to instead explore professional learning through the lens of practices. Learning then is not merely a process or outcome of activities for individuals but is instead best conceptualised as ‘coming to practice differently’ in pursuit of the project of WIL. This has implications for institutional policies such as academic workload allocation for professional learning as well as rewarding and recognising professional learning as part of probation and promotion criteria. Moreover, there are implications for how professional learning is enacted and how organisational resources are directed to support professional learning. As PD, PL happen amid practices of work, therefore, simply providing generic resources is not sufficient. Future research may further explore understandings of academics as dual professionals in both their discipline and teaching and learning as well as furthering research using TPA and agency in HE research.

The changing practices required to enact WIL lead academics finding new ways to know how to go on in their jobs. In our research, professional development, professional learning, and everyday learning were initially taken up to facilitate this but we found that these concepts do not represent a complete picture of learning for academics enacting WIL. Professional development, professional learning, and everyday learning, while important, form a part of numerous other practice arrangements that enable and constrain the professional learning of academics enacting WIL. An important part of this is individual and collective agency, the ‘energy that flows through practices’ (Kemmis 2022, p. 136). Continuing the metaphor of surfing that we introduced in this article, individual and collective agency are like the flow of the ocean. They enable academics to move towards the WIL project - hopefully without drowning.

Disclosure statement

The authors report there are no competing interests or funding sources to declare.

References

- Anonymous 2012, 'ULT Course for Learning and Teaching (Internal document)', De-identified Organisational Internal Document.
- 2016, 'CPD Learning and teaching framework (Organisational document)', De-identified Organisational Internal Document.
- 2018, 'Academic Performance Framework and Guidelines', De-identified Organisational Internal Document.
- 2020, 'Academic Probation Procedure', De-identified Organisational Internal Document.
- Billett, S 2001, *Learning in the workplace: Strategies for effective practice*, Allen & Unwin, Crows Nest.
- 2004, 'Co-participation at work: Learning through work and throughout working lives', *Studies in the Education of Adults*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 190-205.
- Birnbaum, R 2000, 'Management Fads in Higher Education: Where They Come from, What They Do, Why They Fail. The Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series'.
- Boud, D & Brew, A 2013, 'Reconceptualising academic work as professional practice: implications for academic development', *The international journal for academic development*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 208-21.
- Boud, D & Hager, P 2012, 'Re-thinking continuing professional development through changing metaphors and location in professional practices', *Studies in Continuing Education*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 17-30.
- Croucher, G & Lacy, WB 2020, 'Perspectives of Australian higher education leadership: convergent or divergent views and implications for the future?', *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 516-29.
- Dean, BA, Mundy, T, Price, OM, Kennedy, M, Wheeler, G, Sheridan, L & Iskra, L 2023, 'Resourcing work-integrated learning: Academics' perceptions of the challenges experienced embedding WIL in curriculum', *International journal of work-integrated learning*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 141-156.
- Enders, J., De Boer, H., File, J., Jongbloed, B., & Westerheijden, D. 2011, Reform of higher education in Europe. In *Reform of higher education in Europe*, pp. 1-10. Brill.
- Eraut, M 2007, 'Learning from other people in the workplace', *Oxford Review of Education*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 403-22.
- 2011, 'Informal learning in the workplace: evidence on the real value of work-based learning (WBL)', *Development and Learning in Organizations: An International Journal*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 8-12.

- Fereday, J & Muir-Cochrane, E 2006, 'Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development', *International journal of qualitative methods*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 80-92.
- Herbert, K & van der Laan, L 2021, 'Towards a typology of learning and teaching professional development practice uptake by university academics in Australia', *Professional development in education*, pp. 1-16.
- Kemmis, S 2021, 'A practice theory perspective on learning: Beyond a 'standard' view', *Studies in Continuing Education*, vol. 43, no. 3, pp. 280-95.
- Kemmis, S 2022, *Transforming practices: Changing the world with the theory of practice architectures*, Springer, Singapore.
- Kemmis, S, Wilkinson, J & Edwards-Groves, C 2016, 'Roads Not Travelled, Roads Ahead: How the Theory of Practice Architectures Is Travelling', in K Mahon, S Francisco & S Kemmis (eds), *Exploring education and professional practice : Through the lens of practice architectures* Springer Singapore Pte. Limited., Singapore, pp. 239-56.
- Lave, J 2019, *Learning and everyday life*, Cambridge University Press.
- Leibowitz, B 2014, 'Reflections on academic development: what is in a name?', *The international journal for academic development*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 357-60.
- Lizier, AL, Price, O & Francisco, S 2023, 'Coming to practice differently in the workplace: a practice architectures exploration of workplace learning in times of change', *Studies in Continuing Education*, vol. TBA.
- Mahon, K, Kemmis, S, Francisco, S & Lloyd, A 2017, 'Introduction: Practice theory and the theory of practice architectures', in *Exploring education and professional practice*, Springer, pp. 1-30.
- Manley, K, Martin, A, Jackson, C & Wright, T 2018, 'A realist synthesis of effective continuing professional development (CPD): A case study of healthcare practitioners' CPD', *Nurse Education Today*, vol. 69, pp. 134-41.
- Miles, MB & Huberman, AM 1994, *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*, Sage.
- Njenga, M 2022, 'Teacher Participation in Continuing Professional Development: A Theoretical Framework', *Journal of Adult and Continuing Education*, p. 14779714221123603.
- Olin, A, Francisco, S, Salo, P, Pörn, M & Karlberg-Granlund, G 2020, 'Collaborative professional learning for changing educational practices', in *Pedagogy, Education, and Praxis in Critical Times*, Springer, pp. 141-62.
- Penprase, B 2018, 'The fourth industrial revolution and higher education', in N Gleason (ed.), *Higher education in the era of the fourth industrial revolution*, Palgrave Macmillan, Singapore, pp. 207-29.
- Schatzki, TR 2002, *The site of the social: a philosophical account of the constitution of social life and change*, Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Sheridan, L, Price, O, Sheridan, L, Plumb, M, Cunial, R, McDonnell, T & Pocius, R 2021, 'Uncovering WIL practices to enable WIL's expansion in higher education', *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 54-68.

- Sheridan, L, Sheridan, L, Price, OM, Pocius, R, McDonnell, T & Cunial, R 2021, 'Work Integrated Learning (WIL) mainstreamed: The identity of the practitioner', *Educational Research*, vol. 63, no. 3, pp. 319-36.
- Smith, T, Salo, P & Grootenboer, P 2010, 'Stying alive in academia: Collective praxis at work', *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 55-66.
- Stetsenko, A 2019, 'Radical-Transformative Agency: Continuities and Contrasts With Relational Agency and Implications for Education', *Frontiers in Education*, vol. 4.
- Vázquez-Calatayud, M, Errasti-Ibarrondo, B & Choperena, A 2021, 'Nurses' continuing professional development: A systematic literature review', *Nurse Education in Practice*, vol. 50, p. 102963.
- Webster-Wright, A 2009, 'Reframing Professional Development through Understanding Authentic Professional Learning', *Review of educational research*, vol. 79, no. 2, pp. 702-39.