Chapter 1

Practice-based learning in higher education: Jostling cultures

Monica Kennedy, Stephen Billett, Silvia Gherardi and Laurie Grealish

Practice-based learning and higher education

It has become almost orthodox now that programs in higher education focussing on occupational specific outcomes need to include practice-based experiences as part of their curriculum. Whilst these kinds of arrangements have been long standing in medicine, nursing, and teaching the requirements are that workplaces or practice-based experiences are now required in all programs that have specific occupational focuses. Moreover, there is even a move for programs which do not have such specifically aligned outcomes to also include experiences in which students can come to engage in experiences outside the university setting. Such a move appears to have been prompted by requests from national governments (Department of Innovation Universities and Skills, 2008), global agencies such as Organisation for Economic and Cultural Development (OECD) (2010), professional bodies and industry representatives and university groups (Universities Australia 2008) to address concerns about the employability of university graduates. The shift is also often welcomed by students who have selected their courses to secure preferred occupations. They, like those listed before them are keen to secure a smooth transition to paid employment upon graduation. Hence, these kinds of experiences offer the promise of students coming to experience, and subsequently understand more about the particular occupation, how it is enacted and what is required for effective employment. In this way, the provision of practice-based experiences is seen as a means of assisting that occupational preparation, and also having other benefits associated with readiness for the world of work, including introductions to prospective employers. There are also some important educational contributions and rationales for including practice-based experiences within higher education programs which have particular occupations as their focus (Billett 2009). These include the provision of experiences that are authentic in terms of the kinds of activities and interactions that comprise those occupational practices and, wherever possible, the positioning of the students to engage in the kinds of thinking and acting that practitioners engage within those occupations. Certainly, in the past two decades it has been realised that the physical and social circumstances in which individuals engage in activities and interactions make important contributions to people's learning. Whether referring to the situated cognition movement (Brown, Collins & Duguid 1989), sociocultural constructivism (Scribner 1985), anthropology (Lave 1990, Ingold 2000) or the grounded cognition ideas arising from neuroscience (Barsalou 2008), there is now a strong consensus that the actual circumstances in which people engage in thinking and acting have consequences for their learning. The idea that the physical and social settings that comprise universities represent neutral learning environments from which knowledge can be learnt and then competently adapted elsewhere is being increasingly questioned and discarded. So, a shift is occurring in accepted cultural precepts

about the educational worth of particular kinds of experiences and where those experiences might be best provided.

In particular, when those circumstances where the occupation is practised as well as activities and interactions comprise those which the student is seeking to learn about, the learning outcomes are likely to be far richer than when the circumstances are remote and the activities and interactions are substitutes. For instance, universities and other kinds of educational institutions have developed workshop and workplace type facilities and experiences that are often very useful for developing specific procedural skills and provide an important incremental step towards engaging in practice settings and practice work. For instance, at hospital associated with Linköping University in Sweden they have developed teaching wards in which student doctors, nurses, physiotherapists and social workers essentially run to wards with low acuity patients. However, whilst these are important provisions for developing clinical skills and into professional working and learning, they are not intended and unlikely to provide the authentic experiences of health care work and workplaces. What all of this suggests is that workplaces provide experiences that are quite distinct from those which can usually be provided within educational settings. There are of course exceptions. For instance, the University of California, San Francisco is a health care university that sits within a hospital. In such an environment there is little separation between the hospital wards and the education facilities, for the nurses and doctors who are trained there and the staff who teach in its programs. There are also programs in the United Kingdom which are entirely work-based and students working and learning co-occur in the workplace and their projects comprise what they are assessed upon. However, these are the exceptions.

The simple point is that rather than being merely environments in which the knowledge learnt in universities can be practised, refined and honed, workplaces provide particular kinds of experiences which have the potential for students learning which is unlikely to be secured in other kinds of circumstances. This conclusion challenges a key cultural assumption under which much of education is advanced. That is that experiences in educational programs are likely to lead to adaptable or transferable knowledge. Otherwise, why would you have educational institutions and educators? There are a range of reasons for having these institutions and those teaching within them, such as the structuring of learning experiences, the making accessible much of the concepts and procedures required for demanding thinking and acting, not to mention the kinds of capacities required to count, communicate and understand the social and cultural contexts in which we live. However, there is now less confidence that the promotion of all of this knowledge can best proceed in ways that make it applicable to the world beyond the academy unless there are experiences that can supplement and augment what is provided in universities, and also provide bridges for the application of much of what is learnt through university provided provisions.

So, beyond the pragmatics of having the relevant experiences, the learning sciences suggests that workplaces offer particular kinds of experiences that are likely to be generative of the kinds of knowledge which are experienced and utilised within them. Whilst these issues may be of lesser concerns to educational provisions that have little or no direct applicability to applications in domains of occupational practice and particular kinds of workplaces, they are likely to be more important and crucial when the educational program is being directed towards the development of those kinds of occupational capacities. So, such

developments and requirements for contemporary practice in higher education represent some challenges to the cultural practices of university curriculum and teaching, and perhaps also for how students come to engage in workplace settings.

The provision of practice-based experiences in higher education

Of course, there is nothing particularly new about this emphasis on workplace experiences in higher education. There are strong traditions in North America associated with the co-operative education movement and internships, both of which provide extensive periods of experience in workplaces, often with the students engaged in paid employment. Then, there are the 'sandwich' courses which were favoured in the United Kingdom, and many occupations have long-standing practice-based components in their programmes of initial preparation. Indeed, it would be unthinkable to envisage medical, teacher, nurse, physiotherapy or law education without extensive periods of practicum. The cultural practices of the provision of and engagement by students in these programs are well established and entrenched. Now, however, these kinds of experiences are being built into the programs for a far broader range of university-based programs including those for journalism, hospitality, pharmacy, social work, engineering, applied psychology and education. Indeed, as most programs in higher education institutions increasingly have an orientation towards, if not a direct relationship with a specific occupation, such experiences are in growing demand.

Yet, while there is nothing particularly new about having workplace experiences as part of university programs, there are at least three new requirements arising from the demands for this broadening provision. Firstly, there are traditions of support and well-established institutional arrangements for those occupations which have long enjoyed practicum, clinical placements or practice-based experiences. Yet, many of the programs now requiring these experiences do not have such arrangements. Moreover, for some it is unlikely they will ever be developed. For instance, one pro vice chancellor complained that how would the university provide work-based experiences for up to 2000 Bachelor of Business students per year. Certainly, it is unlikely that the kind of supervised practicums which medicine, nursing, teaching and law have long enjoyed will be available to the host of programs now seeking work-based learning experiences, particularly of the example used above. Such arrangements would be highly resource intensive and impossible to sustain over time within current university resourcing and funding arrangements. Secondly, and as indicated, the numbers of students engaging in these programs means that mass responses will be required for these programs. These responses are likely to be provisions which are premised on efficiency in teaching, administration and monitoring, and will likely involve teachers and students in organising and managing much of those provisions within a university context that is not structured to support the necessary arrangements. So, there is a lack of the cultural premises within the education provisions and cultural practices within workplaces to secure the kinds of provisions enjoyed by medicine, nursing and education for instances. Thirdly, it will likely be university teachers who will have to innovate to maximise and possibly augment their students' experience in practice settings and so change will be required in the practices of those who teach in those programs, not all of whom may want to willingly engage in such transformations to how they teach and otherwise interact with their

students. So there are a range of cultural practices that need to change for the provision and integration of workplace-based experiences to progress.

Negotiating amongst and jostling cultures

Indeed, there are others, and many within the academy, who are legitimately concerned that this strong and pervasive focus on occupational specific outcomes is not educationally desirable. Some might suggest, it is even a fashion that has perhaps gone too far and too quickly. This sentiment seems to be strongest when the content and focus of programs is dictated by agencies from outside universities and where what they propose does not always seem to be of great educational worth, and not worthy of constituting higher education. This concern also probably reflects another agenda arising from those outside of universities: i.e. to control what occurs within educational institutions. Certainly, across most countries with advanced industrial economies the focus of government, industry and community interests towards education seems increasingly about controlling what is taught, by whom, and how it is assessed and for what purposes. Of course, this exercise is no stranger to those involved in vocational education, now strongly influencing what is occurring within the schooling sector and clearly beginning to shape the expectations, processes, content and preferred outcomes of higher education. Again, this is not wholly new to higher education. There have long been requirements of medical boards, legal professions and nursing and teacher registration authorities for certain kinds of content to be taught in programs preparing those professionals. It also needs to be reminded that educators rarely if ever establish educational institutions such as universities. These institutions are inevitably established by state or religious organisations and their establishment reflects a society's particular needs and concerns. Therefore, whilst those who teach have a range of legitimate concerns, orientations and preferences for how educational programs might progress, there is necessarily a strong set of institutional and societal imperatives sitting behind the provision of higher education programs. Moreover, as societies have moved into having mass higher education an inevitable consequence will be a greater engagement with the state or religious institution to manage effectively the growing commitment of costs and other resources that will undoubtedly increase as students numbers grow. Indeed, it is not just the engagement with regulatory authorities and government that comprises the external shaping of higher education provisions. The very requirement for university students' smooth transition to employment upon graduation necessarily means that there has to be a greater interaction between those teaching in the university and those who practice the occupations and employ graduates. Yet, in all of this, it will be the talents, interests and capacities of educators who will be pivotal in determining whether the kinds of outcomes sponsors of educational institutions seek are achieved, the demands of external bodies are realised and students' needs are adequately understood and responded to in ways that are directed to their interests, and those who support their education will offer employment and opportunities to practice their skills.

So, a consequence of embracing practice-based experiences within our education programs is the coming together of practices and priorities within and outside of higher education institutions, sometimes mediated very strictly by occupational requirements and standards, as well as accrediting authorities. The bringing together of the values and practices

of divergent communities necessarily leads to the jostling of cultures. Teachers and students will seek to respond to these requirements and standards in ways which emphasise negotiations of different kinds. These ways will likely include what teachers believe should be taught and how it should be taught and the exercise of discretion to achieve those outcomes, within a wider system of constraints and opportunities associated with occupational regulation and licensing authorities. Then, there will be the negotiations between teachers and their students as the latter seek to manage their time across study life paid part-time work and the demands brought about by practice-based experiences, which are often in addition to and outside of what occurs in the university program. Then, there is the issues of negotiating the curriculum of content, meeting different requirements and reconciling the different kinds of experiences that students have within practice settings and also when aligning those experiences with their educational goals and outcomes. Consequently, what is occurring is a great deal of jostling between competing priorities across these different cultures.

Transforming institutional and teacher practices

It follows, therefore, that the provision of student experiences in workplaces necessarily brings with it a range of changes to teaching roles and student engagement within higher education institutions. It is these issues that are in part addressed in the collection of papers that comprise this edited monograph. Each of the contributions addresses these concerns in particular ways and with specific emphases and always in part. Yet, there is a common concern here to focussing on issues confronting universities' attempts to integrate practice-based learning in higher education curriculum. It is through accounts and analyses of activities that the kinds and extents of this jostling of cultures within and amongst the academy, industry, government and professional bodies and other educational providers, and not to mention students, becomes evident. The contributions, in different ways, engages theory in practices (Price, Sheeres, & Boud, 2009) through appraisals of a range of issues in the recognition and implementation of practice based learning initiatives. The contributions here variously explore the epistemologies, structures, politics, histories and rituals that both support and constrain opportunity and success in students' experiences, and illuminating the issues, practices and factors that shape the processes and outcome of educational efforts to integrate experiences in both practice and educational settings, each of which has their own distinct cultures, practice within their communities (Gherardi, 2009).

These contributions also respond and inform the contemporary focus on the confluence of working, learning and knowing, and the appropriation of the 'practice' label within higher education. The practice 'bandwagon' (Corradi, Gherardi & Verzelloni 2010) has gathered up 'practice-based learning' and 'work-based learning' inquiry and literature (Billett, 2006; Boud & Solomon, 2001; Fenwick, 2004) exploring the co-occurrence of learning and work and drawing attention to the educational opportunities and outcomes inherent in this process. The application of this interest within the higher education sector extends 'practice' beyond the domain of the vocational education and training within the education sector (Oval, 2003) and human resource development within the business and government (Bryans, 2000; Fuller & Unwin, 2004) into higher education, where its presence has curiously been restricted to ancient disciplines and new occupations. As noted, however,

programs within higher education come to increasingly focus on occupational specific outcomes, the provision of practice based experiences is shifting from being included in a limited select number of occupations to a wider range and number of programs, and it sometimes seems almost universally, as there emerge imperatives to make employment relevant programs that have no specific outcomes. Hence, it becomes a concern for nearly all discipline areas within universities.

As noted, the resurgence of interest in practice-based experiences, (i.e. those in the authentic circumstances of occupational practice) in higher education is accompanied (and fortified) by increased pressure on the sector to more directly address the needs of industry in the development of students and their qualifications (BCA, 2008; Bradley, Noonan, Nugent, & Scales, 2008; DEST, 2002; Murray, 2007) and what is sometimes termed the massification (Alexander, 2000; van Damme, 2001) of higher education globally. The increasing number of people accessing higher education, and in particular, accessing higher education to develop knowledge and skills in preparation for future careers adds impetus to a shift away from the (Lomas & Tomlinson, 2000), 'traditional liberal ideal' of higher education (Lomas, 1997: 111) and toward occupationally-specific oriented offerings in higher education, which have led to some labelling university education as becoming higher vocational education. Such a labelling is not particularly helpful nor accurate given that much of higher education always have had purposes associated with paid occupations. Indeed, beyond the long standing courses that have long been preparatory for the major professions, even the so-called liberal education was often directed at supporting particular classes of males secure 'clean' and desirable occupations in the civil service or diplomacy.

The imperatives stated above have also conspired to challenge orthodox notions of what constitutes the kinds of learning and knowledge that might in the academy and reshapes the place professional identities, politics and programs within higher education, but there is nothing new about such debates and the jostling for status and legitimacy seems perennial. Indeed, actions and initiatives within universities are often framed as one of contestation – either as serving an economic purpose or as promoting the development of mind and culture (Lomas, 1997), while the two are not mutually exclusive. This framing, however, brings with it issues regarding the relative value of educational offerings. To, some, practice-based learning conveys '...connotations of manual effort' (Lomas, 1997: 112) which signify direct and not wholly desirable economic interest, and hence, inferiority in terms of intellectual and academic value. However, these views are often premised on elite and unfounded assumptions and seek to unhelpfully distinguish between forms of occupation, work and working knowledge rather than reconcile and make them more amenable and accessible.

So, while just perspective seek to describe learning in workplace settings as 'technicist' for narrow and self-serving purposes (Billett, 2002: 40) it is noteworthy that this technicist interest is not restricted to the workplace – it is clearly evident in higher education (Fraser & Bosanquet, 2006: 279), and through their exploration of the cultures of practice-based learning approaches and issues, the contributors illustrate the possibilities of communicative and emancipatory interests in the integration of learning and work. Billett (2002: 28) calls for 'a pedagogy for the workplace' – a theory of how learning proceeds at work, and more recently a pedagogy, curriculum and epistemology (S Billett, 2011), which includes the integration of experiences within and outside of the academy. This book takes up

that challenge in particular ways by discussing and elaborating how such a pedagogy can effectively co-exist with the practices and interests of academia, and in doing so lays bare the tensions between learning in workplace practices and the cultures that contribute to the complex relationships required for successful implementation in higher education. It does so in an attempt to resolve an approach within which university students may enjoy the learning inherent in the practice of work whilst pursuing robust higher education qualifications.

In advancing these issues and elaborations, this edited volume sets out key issues for the effective integration of learning and work within higher education program's curriculum and pedagogy. It sets out some key issues through distinct and multiple analyses and in establishes the theoretical terrain through which they are to be discussed and appraised. This edited volume commences with this introductory chapter which sets out the range of issues addressed and then previews the contributions and concludes in the final chapter with a review of these contributions, and summarising them to offer an overall account of the learning practices of work and higher education and the possibilities of their integration that are advanced across the contributions.

Contributions to these arguments

In overview, the contributions advanced through this edited monograph are as follows.

Firstly, this preface has sought to establish the context, purpose and overall emphases for the book. It attempts to respond to the question: how do the cultures within and between industry, higher education and vocational education institutions impact on the way that learning and practice are conceptualized, undertaken and valued?

Contemporary pressures for meeting the needs of occupations and their practice are emphasizing interdisciplinarity, problem-based and professionally oriented approaches to higher education. As noted these imperatives are inviting changes to the existing purposes and approaches to higher education. These extend to what constitutes and development of the values underpinning curriculum design and pedagogical practice in higher education. The concept of a 'culture' lens, has been introduced as a collective device under which the myriad perspectives on practice-based learning may meet, and also be positioned as an explanatory device for institutional and personal practices.

In setting out the requirements for and interactions comprising practice-based learning, it is helpful to be informed by a review of what is currently known or understood. As this monograph combines experiences of practice-based learning in the academy with theories of practice-based learning it is helpful to explore premises, issues and possibilities in the integration of practice and learning in higher education. In Billett's chapter that follows this introductory chapter, a review of the literature on practice-based learning, with a particular emphasis on the issues faced in its implementation in various sectors, a preview of the issues raised and discussed in the following chapters is provided. He aligns this review with the book's purpose and structure, describing the ways in which practice and theory inform each other in paired chapters. He concludes with a summary of the main themes which are highlighted under the 'culture' lens – values, rituals, language, artifacts, structures, standards, and tools – and present a brief introduction to their relationship to the book's chapters.

In her chapter - Knowledge claims and values in higher education - Kennedy holds that the epistemological distinctions that underpin disciplinary and sectoral differences in pedagogy and research constrain opportunities for successful practice-based learning in higher education. She offers a review of the literature on epistemological beliefs and values in education and uses the analysis to illustrate the historically-derived differentiations amongst sectors and institutions in their practices and pedagogies and the cultures that protect and maintain those practices. This analysis is used to discuss issues to be faced in bringing the kinds of changes required to be made by and through higher education institutions. In particular, she argues that competing priorities and protected niches in post-school education have produced differentiated sites for learning which maintain diverse cultures but which must now contend with contemporary pressures for more accessible, vocationally oriented and industry-aligned education. The practice-turn in learning (and the learning turn in practice) add weight to the pressure for change in pedagogical privilege in higher education.

Practices in sites are, however, seeped in culture, value laden and traditions are resistant to change... “relatively enduring”. Shifting values about how practice and learning interact will require a significant, generative shift in theory and practice in higher education. Recognition of the value of the learning in work and opportunities for softening boundaries between formal and informal sites of learning is required if practice is brought to the fore in productive ways. This awareness about the validity and value of practice-based knowledge in the academy is developing incrementally, but something of the diversity and quality of the advances being made in a range of sites and these developments are identified, theorized and illustrated in the contributions to this book. In this way, the chapter brings together conceptions of knowledge and sites of knowledge production in a model which assists in the analysis of contemporary currencies of knowledge and their production in the education sector.

These first three chapters set out the context, premises for and purposes for the book. Campbell and Zegwaard provide the first of the next group of chapters. In their chapter, they draw on examples in higher education practice to explore the development of ethics through practice-based learning. Their investigation focuses on a work integrated learning approach to the development of professional ethics. In their discussion, the authors discuss the interplay between power and agency in the development of critical moral agency within the emerging professional. They conclude that an approach that combines practice-based learning with an explicit critical ethics curriculum supports the development of moral agency in emerging professionals. In this way, they refer to particular kinds of interventions that are required for the practice-based experiences to achieve the kinds of educational goals that warrant the moniker of higher education.

In their chapter, Hungerford and Kench provide a critical discourse analysis of the jostling cultures within and across the provision of health care in the 21st century, focusing on the increasing importance of the discourse ‘clinical governance’ in the dynamic context of the practice and practice development of health professionals in alliance with the academy. The chapter explores how the current trend towards standardizing practice in the health services and academic contexts has shaped the practice-based learning of students of the health professions. The discussion is based on findings of a critical discourse analysis of the

standards that frame contemporary health services; and claims these standards are dominated by the science and biomedical paradigms, and infused by the ideology of economic rationalism. Constructed as 'best practice' with benefits that are self-evident, they argue that standardization has served to subordinate humanist and other social justice discourses in the health services and health education including a traditional focus on care, compassion, and personal transformation through learning. Their analysis suggests that the language of business now dominates, with health professionals, health students and also academics positioned to comply – or risk fiscal and associated disadvantage. The authors propose that academics should take the lead and develop an innovative pedagogy for practice-based learning that promotes critical questioning of the structures that support contemporary health services and academic institutions; and in so doing, promote the personal and professional growth of students. Again, here university educators are positioned as those who are best positioned to balance the various demands generated by different cultural interests that are directed at higher education, whilst exercising duty of care to students.

Grealish continues analysis of the role of standards in the regulation of entry to the professions, exploring in particular the design of curriculum and assessment of students within professional learning programs in higher education. She describes standards as boundary objects, spanning the social worlds of government, industry, professional bodies, higher education and vocational education. These objects act to translate industry expertise into curriculum and operate to produce effective graduates for professional roles. In this way, Grealish makes visible the work of translation in universities and workplaces and describes the implications of these standardising technologies in connecting the interests of industry and higher education in the provision of practice-based learning. In the chapter, the author explores constructions of competence and standards, highlighting their continuous (re)enactment in the workplace.

The following chapter builds upon the previous chapter's discussion of standards in practice-based learning, developing theoretical discussion on the structuring role of the artefacts that are designed and implemented to coordinate and standardize practice in the higher education curriculum. Walkington and Williams discuss the interaction of artefacts with each other and their use in constraining variety and in surveillance through practice experiences. The chapter develops the proposition that artefacts are both valuable in support of accountability, risk reduction and staff guidance while also destructive in the restrictions they place on agency and opportunities for serendipitous learning. This chapter unpacks the role of audit as a central controlling method for governance at a distance (Rose 1999) and reveals the issues of power inherent the preparation of a workforce for a productive Australia in a global marketplace.

The next chapter seeks to articulate the relationship between a social phenomenon and change in educational practice through a study of the Brazilian higher education sector. In this chapter, Bispo offers a theoretical analysis of e-learning as an organizing practice, providing insight into the daily and situated social life that enables virtual learning. Five elements of the virtual learning environment (VLE) are developed in this account using a practice-based studies approach to e-learning. These comprise: i) learning the e-learning "times"; b) the necessity of planning; c) the learning of VLE logic and functioning; d) the learning of communication and interaction through VLE for professors and students; and e)

the development of a competence of teaching through VLE for the professors and the learning for the students. The key claim is that the virtual nature of e-learning higher education offers a new space for creativity and facilitation of student learning, with an understanding of e-learning logic by human social actors. Teachers work to continuously negotiate context of teaching, juggling the different requirements of multiple cultures in the situated practice of e-learning.

Vitteritti's chapter - Learning in practice in the higher education - proposes to extend Lave and Wenger's Legitimate Peripheral Participation (LPP) concept to higher education. It does this by reviewing the concept of LPP by placing the role of novices and technical materiality at the heart of practice-based learning. A narrated description of the events observed in the laboratory are used to indicate the ways in which novices learn through practice and with others (both human and non-human), emphasizing the idea that in higher education. In particular, the case made here proposes that the transition from experiences and learning in the lecture theatre to the laboratory practice-based learning is situated, socio-material and participated. The pedagogy of practice, activated in the scientific laboratory context fosters the co-existence of learning practices and academic interests, producing tension amongst codified knowledge and unstable expertise in evolution, the procedural standards and artisan skills incorporated by both novices and experts. It claims that only by integrating these two types of knowledge and the associated cultures within which they are produced a robust university training and qualification be achieved.

The chapter by Smith, Shaw and Tredennick entitled - Practice-based learning in community contexts: A collaborative exploration of pedagogical principles - addresses the challenge of multidiscipline learning in the higher education context. It offers a detailed application of practice-based learning strategies. In their chapter the authors offer an analysis of a practice-based learning laboratory reveals collaboration, interdisciplinarity, complexity and uncertainty, and reflection as pedagogical principles underpinning development of values and practice in a range of disciplines. The chapter takes a community engaged learning strategy that utilised participatory action research (PAR) to illustrate the principles as they are shown to emerge in the activity of students, academics and community partners. The chapter describes how that these partners engage to identify and refine what is required to support students as they negotiate complexity and uncertainty inherent in problems facing communities, as they collaborate with others from different disciplines and professional contexts and leverage difference as they challenge their own values and practices.

In their chapter, Smigiel, Stephenson and Macleod, offer an institutional case study, describe the tensions that arise in the implementation of practice-based learning strategies in the modern university. The authors outline the strategic and operational difficulties encountered in the institution as professional and academic staff struggle to find a priority for practice-based learning approaches. They argue that re-culturing of the university is necessary such that these approaches are valued and rewarded, but that this re-culturation is difficult given traditional university workloads and priorities.

This final chapter offers a commentary on the themes across the contributions to the book, highlighting the central issues and theories and illustrating the complex interrelationships between them, using the metaphor of culture. Gherardi's conclusion

suggests avenues for further investigation based on the issues examined in the book and offers some insights on the future of practice-based learning in the academy.

In these ways, the various contributions offer conceptions, insights and illustrations of practices through which practice-based experiences are considered, utilised and integrated within higher education programs.

References

- Alexander, F. K. (2000). The Changing Face of Accountability: Monitoring and Assessing Institutional Performance in Higher Education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(4), 411-431.
- Barsalou, L. W. (2008). Grounded Cognition. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 59, 617-645.
- BCA. (2008). *Submission to the Review of the Australian Higher Education System*: Business Council of Australia.
- Billett, S. (2002). Toward a workplace pedagogy: guidance, participation, and engagement. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 53(1), 27-43.
- Billett, S. (2006). Work, Subjectivity and Learning. In S. Billett, T. Fenwick & M. Somerville (Eds.), *Work, Subjectivity and Learning - Understanding Learning through Working Life* (Vol. 6, pp. 1-20). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Billett, S. (2009). Realising the educational worth of integrating work experiences in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 34 (7), 827-843.
- Billett, S. (2011). *Curriculum and pedagogic bases for effectively integrating practice-based experiences*. Sydney: Australian Learning and Teaching Council.
- Boud, D., & Solomon, N. (Eds.). (2001). *Work-Based Learning: A New Higher Education?* Sydney: Taylor and Francis, Open University Press.
- Bradley, D., Noonan, P., Nugent, H., & Scales, B. (2008). *Review of Australian Higher Education - Final Report*. Canberra: Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations.
- Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated Cognition and the Culture of Learning. *Educational Researcher*, 18(1), 32-34.
- Bryans, P. R. S. (2000). Beyond training: reconceptualising learning at work. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 12(6), 228-235.
- Department of Innovation Universities and Skills. (2008). *Higher Education at Work: High Skills: High Value*. Sheffield: Department of Innovation, Universities and Skills.
- DEST. (2002). *Striving for quality: Learning, teaching and scholarship*. Canberra: Department of Education, Science and Training.
- Fenwick, T. (2004). Rethinking Processes of Adult Learning. Retrieved 19 November 2004, from www.ualberta.ca/~tfenwick/ext/pubs/print/adultlearning.htm
- Fraser, S., & Bosanquet, A. (2006). The curriculum? that's just a unit outline, isn't it? *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(3), 269-284.
- Fuller, A., & Unwin, L. (2004). Expansive learning environments: integrating organizational and personal development. In H. Rainbird, A. Fuller & A. Munro (Eds.), *Workplace learning in context*. London: Routledge.
- Gherardi, S. (2009). Community of Practice or Practices of a Community? In S. Armstrong & C. Fukami (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Management Learning, Education, and Development*, (pp. 514-530). London: Sage.
- Ingold, T. (2000). *The perception of the environment: Essays on livelihood, dwelling and skill*. London: Routledge.

- Lave, J. (1990). The culture of acquisition and the practice of understanding. In J. W. Stigler, R. A. Shweder & G. Herdt (Eds.), *Cultural psychology* (pp. 259-286). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lomas, L. (1997). The decline of liberal education and the emergence of a new model of education and training. *Education + Training*, 39(3), 111-115.
- Lomas, L., & Tomlinson, K. (2000). Standards: The varying perceptions of senior staff in higher education institutions. *Quality assurance in education*, 8(3), 131-138.
- Murray, D. (2007). *Graduate Employability Skills: Business, Industry and Higher Education* Collaboration Council.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2010). Learning for jobs. Paris: OECD.
- OVAL. (2003). *Changing pedagogy: Contemporary vocational learning* (No. Oval Research working Paper 03-12). Sydney: University of Technology, Sydney.
- Price, O., Sheeres, H., & Boud, D. (2009). Re-making Jobs: Enacting and Learning Work Practices. *Vocations and Learning*, 2, 217-234.
- Scribner, S. (1985). Knowledge at work. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 16, 199-206.
- Universities Australia. (2008). A National Internship Scheme: Enhancing the skills and work-readiness of Australian university graduates Canberra: Universities Australia.
- van Damme, D. (2001). Quality Issues in the Internationalisation of Higher Education. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 41(4), 415-441.