

University-community partnerships in language teacher education through work-integrated learning

Nhung Nguyễn

Western Sydney University, Australia

This multisite case study examines the mechanics of university-community partnerships in work-integrated learning in language teacher education. Specifically, it seeks to address the questions of the key features and challenges in organising partnerships as an educational culture of work-integrated learning in language teacher education. Williams's notion of culture including the dominant, emergent, and residual cultures was used to analyse the evidence in this study. Evidence sources include education policy documents and semi-structured interviews from two language teacher education programs in Vietnam and Australia. The interviews involved students, academics, workplace supervisors and university managers who shared their experience and/or knowledge of workplace learning in language teacher education. Key findings of this study include the relation of education-work, organisational structure and workload, and complexities in organising work-integrated learning partnerships. This study has significant implications for policy, practice and theory in engaging with industry to foster students' readiness for uncertainty in the world of work, leadership and curriculum for work-integrated learning in universities, internationalisation of higher education, and research collaboration with industry.

Introduction

Work integrated learning (WIL) for workplace experience in education is closely linked to understanding the educational culture of university-community partnerships. Organising WIL in higher education involves partnerships in which “the collaboration between a teacher education institution and the schools [or workplaces] where student teachers have their practicum” (Lillejord & Børte, 2016, p. 555) takes place. Connecting practice and theory, WIL has been used as an umbrella term in education with a variety of definitions and program models for formal learning and work experience relevant to students' studies (Jackson, 2017; Jonck, 2014; Lasen et al., 2018; Mahomed & Singh, 2011; Matoti et al., 2011; Tran & Soejatminah, 2017; Winchester-Seeto, Rowe & Mackaway, 2016; Xia Caulfield & Ferns, 2015). Targeting workplace learning, WIL contributes to enhancing students' employability and career readiness through partnerships (Jonck, 2014; Smith-Ruig, 2014; Patton, 2017), and provides students with opportunities for understanding improvisational skills in teamwork (Hains-Wesson, Pollard & Campbell, 2017). In Australian higher education, WIL is increasingly implemented in a number of university programs for students' hands-on experience, building workforce capability, and students' interdisciplinary, adaptability and interdependence skills (Hains-Wesson & Ji, 2021; Jackson et al., 2015; Pham, Saito, Bao & Chowdhury, 2018; Smith-Ruig, 2014; Smith & Worsfold, 2015; Tran & Soejatminah, 2017). In Vietnam, WIL through partnerships has focused on students' professional learning and emerged in higher education in a range of disciplines including business, tourism and teacher education as internships or practicum

(Bilsland & Nagy, 2015; Bilsland et al, 2019; Khuong, 2016; Tran et al., 2019; Welch et al., 2012).

In teacher education in Europe, Australia and Vietnam, WIL is organised as the key component to link theory and practice (Dimenäs & Norlund, 2014; Jovanovic, Fane & Andrew, 2018; Mahomed & Singh, 2011; Moore et al., 2012; Singh & Ballantyne, 2014; Tran et al., 2019). WIL partnerships create the links between on-campus and workplace learning, which necessitates developing industry-oriented WIL projects focusing on university-industry collaboration (Manathunga et al., 2012; Singh, 2013; Xia, Caulfield & Ferns, 2015).

Previous studies have emphasised the benefits of educational partnerships including knowledge sharing between educational actors, work-placements, external education provision, long-term benefits for their employability and co-constructing a curriculum (Choy & Delahaye, 2011; Klatt, Angelico & Polesel, 2017; Lillejord & Børte, 2016). There are terms for diverse models of WIL presenting philosophies and pedagogies including work-integrated learning, work-based learning, cooperative education, service-learning and community engagement (Tran & Soejatminah, 2017; Winchester-Seeto, Rowe, & Mackaway, 2016). International WIL programs integrating and utilising third-party providers as part of higher education have become more and more popular (Hains-Wesson & Appleby, 2017). However, there has been a modest amount of research that directly addresses partnerships in WIL programs in language teacher education. Organising university-community partnerships for WIL is a complicated undertaking. Specifically, key issues in organising WIL partnerships such as stakeholder commitment, time, resources and personal energy are identified as challenges (Fleming & Hickey, 2013; Winchester-Seeto, Rowe & Mackaway, 2016). Dimenäs and Norlund (2014) noted that organising WIL in teacher education “is not without its problems” (p. 1). Thus, understanding and implementing partnerships in WIL rigorously have generated academic debates. Managing WIL partnerships over time which requires regular renegotiations among stakeholders in multilayered partnerships within and between universities and the community and industry is a tension (Allen & Peach, 2011; Barends & Nel, 2017; Smith & Worsfold, 2015).

In teacher education, the relationships between stakeholders in these multilayered partnerships for helping students with their workplace learning include partners, student teachers, school mentors and academic supervisors for students’ professional learning (Dimenäs & Norlund, 2014; Du Plessis, 2010). What makes WIL partnerships problematic is that discussions about the role and nature of partnership are limited (Klatt, Angelico & Polesel, 2017), and the roles of university and workplaces (Choy & Delahaye, 2011) are not always made explicitly. Thus, concerns reside in the collaboration between schools and teacher education institutions (Lillejord & Børte, 2016). Especially, maintaining relationships with community partners to avoid breaking the partnerships due to students’ poor performance at a workplace generates pressure on university academics (Choy & Delahaye, 2011; Wenham, Valencia-Forrester & Backhaus, 2020).

This study suggests that the diversity of educational cultures in WIL is valuable, but understanding the educational culture of WIL comprising university-community partnerships necessitates undertaking more research. Williams's (1977) concepts *dominant*, *emergent* and *residual* are used as a lens in this study to analyse the operations of university-community partnerships with all aspects of WIL taking place in the field of language teacher education. Using this lens allows the researcher to locate university-community partnerships in WIL in the wider system of educational culture. More importantly, it also enables a view of educational cultures changing over time. This study argues that research into WIL contributes to knowledge from a richer view of an educational culture that can be developed from the lens of cultural theory, in addressing the constraints of frameworks that are not widely applicable and accessible.

This research study aims to contribute to the knowledge of and the agenda of partnerships between education providers, school systems and schools (Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group [TEMAG], 2014), and workplace learning in teacher education, to enhance professional standards for teachers (Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership [AITSL], 2011).

A framework for understanding the educational cultures in work-integrated learning

This study uses Williams's (1977) concepts of dominant, residual, and emergent to provide a framework for understanding the educational cultures, features and organisation of WIL partnerships in language teacher education, and for exploring the educational cultures with work and learning that can coexist in WIL partnerships. For Williams (1977), dominant interests are the force of power/knowledge that discussions of "dominant ... in these senses of the hegemonic" (p. 121). According to Bryson (2008), "hegemony of the effective dominant culture is characterised as a complex, multilayered negotiation and renegotiation of the emergent and residual cultures and of those cultures relative to the dominant culture" (p.748). In his work, Williams (1977) explored dominant interests visible through power/knowledge with the immersion of residual and emergent cultural mass that also reflects the characteristics of the 'dominant'. In research relating to Williams's work, Mahtabi and Eslamieh (2015) confirm that the dominant culture is "the most powerful, widespread, and influential culture in a society in which multiple cultures exist" (p. 167). This study explores the dominant culture in higher education operating its businesses embodied in society's ruling interests through partnerships serving the interests of the community.

Residual culture, for Williams (1977), is identified in experiences, practices, meanings, and values that have been "formed in the past, but [are] still active in the [dominant] cultural process, [that is] not only and often not at all as an element of the past, but as an effective element of the present" (p. 122). The key characteristic of residual culture resides in the way that it "may have an alternative or even oppositional relation to the dominant culture" (Williams, 1977, p. 122). Williams's (1977) concept of residual culture can be seen in old sociocultural practices of higher education continuing to the current practices in the

21st-century context. For example, residual culture in higher education includes face-to-face lectures, textbooks, online learning and blended learning (Cuesta Medina, 2018).

What emergent culture means in Williams's (1977) work is that "new meanings and values, new practices, new relationships and kinds of relationship are continually being created" (p. 123). Emergent culture is identified as an "alternative or oppositional to the dominant elements" (Williams, 1977, p. 124), which is different from being novel but confrontational to the dominating culture in the structure of any educational cultures. While emergent cultures can be different from, and actively challenge the dominant cultures, they begin from being marginal to a less marginal status in the society, and may eventually become the dominant cultures. However, not all emergent cultures become the dominant cultures (Mahtabi & Eslamieh, 2015). Examples of emerging cultures in higher education include the interests in producing and disseminating postmonolingual knowledge (Lu & Singh, 2017; Shen, 2017), and emergent multilingual research practices (Liddicoat, 2016; Singh & Lu, 2020). Such emergent cultures are an alternative to the dominant educational culture of English-only monolingualism.

Using Williams's (1977) concepts of dominant, residual, and emergent to analyse evidence of how WIL partnerships were organised, this study aimed to address the following questions:

1. How are partnerships organised in language teacher education through work-integrated learning?
2. What are the key features and challenges in organising partnerships in language teacher education through work-integrated learning?

Method

Context and participants

This paper reports on the investigation of university-community partnerships in WIL in language teacher education from two language teacher education programs. These two programs are *WIL English Language Teacher Education Program* in Vietnam herein called the English WIL, and *WIL Chinese Language Teacher Education Program* in Australia referred to as Chinese WIL.

Preliminary research into the English WIL program (Tran & Nguyen, 2014) reported on a service-learning program organised at a Pagoda Orphans' Shelter. In English WIL reported in this study, first and second-year students in the Bachelor degree in English Language Teaching (ELT) engaged in teaching English to disadvantaged young people from 16 to 21 years old at a Hospitality School, under a program called service-learning comprising forty hours teaching during a term of sixteen weeks, for their workplace learning. The Hospitality School as the partner provided students with basic teaching facilities such as classroom, chalk, board, a limited number of projectors and Internet connection. Students' participation in English WIL program was accredited as one of the two internships required for the degree.

The Chinese WIL program in language teacher education was set up to provide students with workplace learning through teaching spoken Chinese at schools, which is part of the assessment of their teacher research study for masters or PhD degrees (Singh & Ballantyne, 2014). In the Chinese WIL, postgraduate Chinese students both in masters and doctoral degrees engaged in teaching Chinese spoken language at primary schools in Sydney for ten hours per week for five school terms. Three key partners involved in this Chinese WIL program included an overseas partner in China, the Department of Education of New South Wales (NSW) and Western Sydney University. The overseas partner contributed to selecting candidates who volunteered to teach Chinese spoken language as part of their teacher research study in Chinese WIL. The Department of Education of New South Wales involved a range of schools and the University working together in giving the postgraduate students teaching/learning experiences, and opportunities to collect evidence for their teacher research. In Chinese WIL, participants learnt to know school students and teaching/learning for L1/L2 transfer, based on partial cross-sociolinguistic similarities (Singh & Nguyen, 2018), during their professional learning. In collaborating with the schools, the University also provided the postgraduate students with knowledge of language teacher research, including methods of collecting and analysing evidence from their school-based learning.

Procedures

This multisite case study (Bishop, 2010) was not to compare these two programs or their universities. Rather, the study aimed to investigate the key features and challenges in partnerships in WIL using data triangulation (Carter et al., 2014). Specifically, this study involved generating a complex data set from two research sites for more possibilities of compelling and robust evidence (Tran et al., 2018), which was preferable to a single-site case study with “all eggs in one package” (Yin, 2014, p. 64). Data sources for this study included educational policy documents and semi-structured interviews, starting from collecting education policies regarding the WIL programs shared publicly on the websites of the two universities. Documents concerning education policies relating to WIL and teacher education were collected from government websites (AITSL, 2011; Australian Government, 2016; MOET, 2017). Some of the data from documents were used for preparing and revising interview questions.

After ethical approval had been obtained, interviews were initially undertaken in Vietnam from October 2016 to December 2016. Interviewing involved 18 participants including academics, workplace supervisors, undergraduate students and university managers who engaged in English WIL. Given that participants in the English WIL program can speak at least two languages including English and Vietnamese, for in-depth data, the Vietnamese language, which is their first language, was used to interview them. For the Chinese WIL program in Australia, 16 participants including academics, school mentors as workplace supervisors, postgraduate students and university managers participated in interviews from January 2017 to May 2017. While some participants can speak Chinese, interviews were undertaken in English, which is the common language spoken by all the participants and the researcher of this study. Participation in research interviews at two sites was voluntary with the participants’ informed consent. For the privacy of the information shared by the

participants, files of audio recordings of interviews were accessed by only the researcher using password protection. To maintain participants' confidentiality and anonymity, their names were replaced with pseudonyms, and interview excerpts were presented in a way that the participants would not be identified.

In data analysis, interview data were used as the main source of evidence, supplemented by policy documents and informed by engaging with the relevant literature. Interview data analysis included transcribing, translating from Vietnamese into English, coding, categorising, identifying counterevidence, generating themes, theorising, and verifying findings (Green et al., 2007). Doing so required time-consuming intellectual work in making meaning of evidence, which led to significant findings reported in this paper.

Findings

Themes emerging in this study included education-work as mutual benefits, organisational structure imposing workload, and complexities in organising WIL partnerships in language teacher education. These three themes structure the following analysis of the tensions in engaging and collaborating with the community for connecting education and work.

Education-work as mutual benefits

Evidence from university managers' perspectives in this study indicates that WIL partnerships were set up for the mutual benefits between the university and community in linking education and work. Specifically, the WIL partnership provided partners with relevant benefits, respectively the work component for educational institutions, teaching experience for university students' professional learning, and particular work expected by school community partners.

A partner [a Hospitality School] wants our students to teach English for hotel and restaurants to young street people. Many cohorts of university students have been sent, which means the partner is pleased with what we have been doing, and they order more. Isn't that a kind of good feedback? More and more students joined in, cohorts by cohorts ... Students have a sense of engagement. (Trí, University Manager, English WIL)

Trí (pseudonym), a university manager in English WIL stated that a partnership that engages students in teaching English to street young people opens up opportunities and alternatives for the university to link on-campus education with students' workplace learning, based on the socio-economic needs of the community partner. Given that the community had free labour for teaching, these teaching tasks provided university students with career-related professional experience. Trí emphasised that in collaborating with the Hospitality School, the university gave students an opportunity for community engagement as a part of their education. Fleming & Hickey's (2013) study shows that linking work and education involves partnerships identified as "networks, alliances, collaborations, exchange relationships and coalitions" (p. 209). In this study, the English WIL partnership went beyond the link between education-work. By engaging students with teaching English to disadvantaged learners who are street young people, the

university also provided students with opportunities to develop skills of networking and collaborating with learners in diverse educational settings.

Being set up as an education strategy through partnership, the Chinese WIL program aimed to have connections among school community organisations and those they work with including students. This multilayered Chinese WIL partnership was to secure mutual, but different benefits. From the perspective of a university manager, Isabella, the Chinese WIL partnership benefited the university from what the partners offered.

I can't have the work component unless I have the Department and schools as partners. Without the classroom teachers, there is no work-based component. I activated the partnership as my [education] strategy because my partners have something that I actually need. (Isabella, University Manager, Chinese WIL)

Isabella emphasised the significance of the multipartite partnerships involving the New South Wales Department of Education, the University and local schools. While indicating the mutual benefits that the University had in terms of education-work, she did not specify how other partners benefited from the program, for example, how the schools benefited from having students teach school students how to speak Chinese. In balancing the mutual benefits, Chinese WIL may involve partners' particular contributions that need "transparency and negotiation" (Fleming & Hickey, 2013) rather than "collaborative self-interest alone" (p. 210). Doing so necessitates taking into account what is contributed and what each party can do for the other. Evidence from Isabella brings to the fore the issue of knowing partners' expectations and requirements for mutual benefits, which is crucial in making WIL partnerships sustainable.

Organisational structure change imposing workload

Struggles in organising WIL partnerships in this study are evident in the changes in the organisational structure of one key partner in Chinese WIL, and the workload imposed on university academics and school mentors involved in two WIL programs.

Changes in organisational structure

Evidence of WIL partnership in this study reveals that structural change in organisation partners affects the organising of the Chinese WIL program. Emily, a university manager, explained how the major changes of organisational structure of the key partner, New South Wales Department of Education, affected the WIL partnership:

When the program started in mid-2008 the Department provided a program coordinator who worked to train and support student volunteers, liaised with the schools, liaised with the university and organised the bridges to understanding reference committee meetings. The university worked very much under the leadership of the Department. However, when the Department was restructured beginning in 2013, those resources disappeared, and support staff disappeared. It has been only in the last 12 months that the Department has been able to bring some—but certainly not all of those resources and part-time support staff back. (Emily, University Manager, Chinese WIL)

The change in organisational structure led to a series of changes including resource allocation, staffing allocation, and policy amendments, which created challenges in organising WIL partnerships. What Emily shared is related to the policy *Local Schools, Local Decisions* (NSW DEC, 2012) initiated in 2013, empowering NSW public schools to make their own local decisions to best meet the needs of their students. This massive restructuring led to the termination of the regional offices structured across NSW, followed by relocating and making redundant the ones involved in managing schoolteachers and students at schools from the Western Sydney Region. After 2013, such restructuring made the Chinese WIL program change dramatically, which involved the university in taking over its management and doing more work due to the lack of resources provided by the Department.

Other struggles in the Chinese WIL partnership entailed the confusion due to the changes in organisational structure and policy, which was explained by Harry, an academic involved in the Chinese WIL program, as follows:

There are academics who work within the program, who provide leadership. That's not always an easy matter; they are often confused by the political complexities. Some want the university to run the program even though it was initiated by the Department. Others want a China-centric program, even though the Department wanted it to teach school students how to learn Chinese. Academic leaders who committed the initial ideas for this venture do not know what to do, where to go, because circumstances are always changing. Because of little match between the different partners' policies and organisational changes, the program's academic leaders running the program have to struggle with it to see what the best they can do. (Harry, Academic, Chinese WIL)

Harry clarified the political complexities in changes of organisational structure with relevant policy reflected in *Local Schools, Local Decisions* (NSW DEC, 2012), and expectations from the partners. The confusion was accumulated from changing circumstances of cutting staff from central and regional programs, leading to the new management, the lack of resources, and the diverse needs of partners. The lack of match in terms of partners' policies and organisational changes among partners added to the confusion among principals, school mentors, and university academics involved in the Chinese WIL program. Without guidelines following up these policy shifts and changes, the program's academic leaders as key stakeholders implementing this Chinese WIL partnership would encounter challenges in taking charge of governing the program and allocating resources, generating workload for teachers, students, and academics alike, which might create threats to the success of this WIL partnership.

Workload

Interview data in this study show that workload imposed on stakeholders of WIL partnerships including the university academics and the schoolteachers as mentors involved in the Chinese WIL and English WIL programs, was another struggle in organising WIL partnerships. Giang and Trâm, academics in English WIL, and Andrea, a school mentor in Chinese WIL, gave their perspectives on workload in WIL:

We had to write many minutes for what we have done such as for meetings, visiting sites, training, planning discussion, reflections ... so complicated and stressful... Sometimes we have meetings with university managers on Tuesday, which we cannot have time to do any other academic tasks. (Giang, Academic, English WIL)

We do not have time to calculate specifically, for example how much time for communicating with students via Facebook, how much for going to the community sites, observing students' lesson delivery and spending time giving feedback on their lesson plans before that. It is more time-consuming than doing other academic tasks at the university, but it has limited institutional recognition in terms of workload. (Trâm, Academic, English WIL)

Although they gave me professional development, a major problem was that I wasn't given any time recognition in my workload or any financial recognition for my work in this program. It was very difficult for me to fully engage in this [WIL] program because the contradictory expectations from the Department and the School were "do your full-time paid job". (Andrea, School Mentor, Chinese WIL)

For academic Giang, the academic and administrative tasks she did in the English WIL program included preparing students for WIL, supervising and monitoring students' progress, supporting students, and reporting to university managers, which was very time-consuming. Contextually, the partnership in English WIL with communities did not involve community staff as mentors in teaching professional learning, but as workplace supervisors who monitored students' performance. Rather, Giang had to engage in both educating students on campus and supervising students' workplace learning as a mentor, which gave her an overload of stress while "little attention to the demands increased workloads placed upon university staff" (Bates, 2011, p. 112). Similarly, Trâm's experience as an academic supervisor in English WIL gave her a sense of discouragement due to the inadequate recognition of workload by the university for her academic role in the WIL partnership with communities. Evidence emerged in English WIL about the lack of responses to academics' requests for recognition in relation to workload or evaluation on work performance.

In Chinese WIL, a part of dissatisfaction also resided in workload recognition. For mentor Andrea, the Chinese WIL partnership between the overseas Bureau of Education, the University and the Department of Education of NSW involved her as a schoolteacher but failed to acknowledge her contributions in mentoring students' professional learning. While English WIL involved academics in mentoring WIL students and workplace supervisors in just monitoring students' performance, the Chinese WIL program involved schoolteachers in mentoring students. As such, Andrea, a schoolteacher in Chinese WIL, had to balance her roles as a teacher at school and a mentor for WIL students in her full-time jobs paid by the Department of Education. The multilayered partnership in Chinese WIL with contradictory expectations from the Department of Education and the School requiring her engagement as a mentor in WIL and a schoolteacher affected her willingness and enthusiasm, due to the lack of recognition of her extra work in mentoring. This suggests that WIL partnerships involving academics and schoolteachers as key teacher educators necessitate "transparency and negotiability" (Choy & Delahaye, 2011, p. 158) in

management. The struggles in organising WIL partnerships included the lack of dialogue in exercising power from the managerial governance over those whose knowledge contributed to and secured benefits and positive outcomes for WIL programs.

Complexities in organising WIL partnerships

The complexities in organising WIL partnership in this study refer to the divergence of perspectives and the collaboration driven by finance.

Divergence of perspectives

Emerging evidence from the Chinese WIL partnership indicates the complexities in balancing the divergence of perspectives and interests articulated by the key stakeholders involved. Divergence comprises diversity, difference, and expansion, which might be a challenge for making a mutual decision among partners. In clarifying how the Chinese WIL partnership operated in language teacher education, Ashton, a university manager, explained the challenge of having multiple partners:

Another challenge is dealing with perspectives from the different partner organisations. This program depends upon the productive and constructive relationships among at least three partner organisations: University, Education Department in Australia and Education Bureau from overseas. These partners can be looked at in the top of hierarchy and are subordinated by many other people involved in the program. (Ashton, University Manager, Chinese WIL)

While multipartite partnership in Chinese WIL was meant to bring more contributions and recourses through a “convergence of different knowledge” (Wang & Wong, 2017, p. 490) in educating language teachers, making a decision might not be easily mediated. Ashton implied that involving more partners means more chance of complexities in WIL partnership. This is because the partnership involves three lead partners engaging other actors in making the partnership possible. With such a hierarchical arrangement, it would create more complexities when putting into operation the ideas articulated by the university, individual principals, and mentors who are the key actors involved in the Chinese WIL partnership. Specifically, when these key actors participate in Chinese WIL in different roles and functions, this multilayered partnership presents “complex and resource-intensive cross-institutional infrastructures for knowledge sharing, with the ambition to enhance the practice-relevance of teacher education” (Lillejord & Børte, 2016, p. 550) in communicating and negotiating their ideas. As such, tensions would arise when failing to reach diverse needs and expectations of organisation partners contributing educational ideas and WIL strategies. Thus, exploring the outcomes of this multipartite partnership regarding students’ professional learning and school students learning Chinese necessitates addressing such tensions.

Financially driven collaboration

Evidence of WIL partnerships in this study reveals collaboration driven by finance. One academic, Jilpa, specified finance as the key feature of developing international partnerships in the Chinese WIL.

Universities want to have partnerships with industry and community organisations by running this WIL partnership . . . They always talk about international liaison. Behind all the purposes, there is one important purpose for these partnerships; it means money. For example, one university in Sydney has 7,000 international students. This university has only 10% of student population from overseas students. But it wants to increase the number of full-fee-paying students. The first reason for this partnership is finance; university managers' key performance indicators require them to bring money in, and we have to make sure students "succeed", because international students pay from double to triple than the local students' fees. (Jilpa, Academic, Chinese WIL)

For Jilpa, beyond educational benefits, WIL partnerships tend to be driven by finance through international liaison which involves "external linkages between organizations such as networks, alliances, collaborations, exchange relationships and coalitions" (Fleming & Hickey, 2013, p. 209). This trend of finance-oriented collaboration aligns with a policy agenda in Australian education in which "partnerships support the provision of education and training through multiple institutions; credit transfer and qualifications recognition; student, professional and researcher exchange; joint degrees and research; and consultancies" (Australian Government, 2016, p. 23), which encourages recruiting international students.

Regarding educating teachers, while "most partnerships between teacher education institutions and schools are based on traditional, hierarchical relationships between partners" (Lillejord & Børte, 2016, p. 551), finance is targeted as the key part of the partnerships in the Chinese WIL. What Jilpa shared about recruiting international students as a financial component adds credibility to initiatives of educational partnerships which are supported by the Australian Government to "increase market share, build connections with new and emerging markets, and develop stronger international relationships" (Australian Government, 2016, p. 6). However, given developing internationalisation of higher education is misunderstood by some universities as international student recruitment through partnerships (Baik, 2013), the constraints of public funding for education and research (Marginson, 2013) would lead to the need to increase international student revenues. The policies of cutting funding in higher education also influence universities in seeking income from recruiting international students. Educational partnership in Chinese WIL emerged as a response to government agenda relating to funding cuts in higher education (Sharrock, 2013).

In this study, Jilpa emphasised that the university develops educational partnerships which bring more income from full-fee-paying international students, through partnerships generating from double to triple the local students' fees. Additionally, WIL contributes to attracting students through partnerships in a reduced funding context, because students prefer universities with WIL programs which may enhance their employability, thereby

increasing the return on their educational investment (Smith & Worsfold, 2015). With the changes in Australian Government funding policies since 2013 (Bexley, 2013), financially driven collaboration in this study brings a starting point for more research of the political frameworks (Klatt, Angelico & Polesel, 2017), including the quality of student recruitment in which WIL partnerships operate.

Discussion and conclusion

Collaboration with industry/community in higher education has become integral in providing students with workplace learning. Partnerships therefore, take a decisive and dominant role in making industry engagement possible, which gives a sense of hegemony (Williams, 1977). Evidence from this study indicates that dominant, residual, and emergent educational cultures in WIL partnerships co-exist, rather than being separated. The findings show that organising WIL partnerships involving community partners in language teacher education in a site in Australia and a site in Vietnam is a dominant practice of collaboration for mutual benefit in students' work-based learning. This practice of university-community partnership also aims to give more alternatives for the university and the partners involved and to meet each partner's agenda, which according to Williams (1977), is "emergent cultural practice is still undeniable, and together with the fact of actively residual practice is a necessary complication of the would-be dominant culture" (p. 126).

Instead of the university and school collaboration for students' practicum in teacher education, WIL in this study relied on emergent partners, which is "in relation to a full sense of the dominant." (Williams, 1977, p. 123). Here, evidence of WIL partnerships offering education-work connection as mutual benefits indicates the dominant culture of education with alternatives as emergent cultures, which also indicates the partnerships as a residual culture moving from university-led internships (Ranabahu et al., 2020) to the more interactive and mutual partnerships. Specifically, WIL partnerships involved multiple partners including the university, the Department of Education, the overseas partner in Chinese WIL, and the community of vulnerable groups in English WIL. The dominant and residual culture of partnership in Chinese WIL resides in the work-based component constituted by a multipartite partnership, that may require "a complex, multilayered negotiation and renegotiation of the emergent [the practice of partnerships]" (Bryson, 2008, p. 748) over the time. The emergent feature in two WIL programs was reflected in educating teacher-researchers teaching Chinese spoken language to Australian school students, and in preparing teachers of English for non-school settings.

However, WIL partnerships face changes over time, which "depends crucially on finding new forms or adaptations of form" (Williams, 1977, p. 126). Adapting to the changes of organisational structure means accepting dominant and emergent culture. In English WIL, academics struggled with a heavier workload in supervising students at workplaces. The forms of adaptation to the changes took place as if they were "never only a matter of immediate practice" (Williams, 1977, p. 126). Doing so unintentionally creates tensions of the hierarchical structure of WIL partnerships in terms of power/knowledge relations

among partnership leaders and the ones directly involved in student supervision, which indicates dominant culture as hegemony.

The finding of financially driven collaboration in this study indicates the dependency in recruiting international students from China as part of the partnerships in Chinese WIL. The finance-based collaboration emerging in current international partnerships may become the dominant educational culture (Williams, 1977) facing government funding cuts (Marginson, 2013). Especially, higher education possibly faces uncertainties (Deutschmann & Wanke, 2020) which might also lead to changes in partnership operation caused by disasters or a pandemic such as the Covid-19 pandemic. The dependency due to uncertainty in educational partnerships may include the reduction of student numbers at institutions amid Covid-19 throughout the world including the US, Europe and Australia, making universities switch to online classes to avoid permanent closure, as noted in *Times Higher Education* (Bothwell, 2020).

The findings of this study show tensions in organising multilayered WIL partnerships in language teacher education. The tensions of emergent features of WIL partnerships evident in the changes of organisational structure in the Chinese WIL show the unstable status that any partnerships may face in contemporary educational cultures (Williams, 1977). As such, organising WIL that involves human resource management, curriculum, and pedagogy in WIL partnerships necessitates an adjustment in higher education. Specifically, addressing the universal challenge including the impact of the coronavirus pandemic in higher education is worthwhile. Such changes may lead to emergent education programs including online short courses as micro-credentials (Ghasia et al., 2019) that might become a prominent feature in education. One of the limitations of this study included the involvement of only some stakeholders in WIL partnerships. Further research involving other types of participants including learners at communities and schools, to explore how WIL partnerships might help the communities, could be undertaken using both qualitative and quantitative research methods. This research has implications for engaging students' work readiness in the workplaces, leadership and curriculum for work-integrated learning in universities, internationalisation of higher education, and research collaboration with industry in these times of uncertainty.

Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank Professor Michael Singh for his feedback in the early stages of this work. Comments and feedback by anonymous reviewers of this paper are acknowledged with gratitude.

References

- Allen, J. & Peach, D. (2011). Assessing for work integrated learning experiences: A pre-service teacher perspective. *Asia Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, 12(1), 1-17.
<http://hdl.handle.net/10536/DRO/DU:30063187>

- Australian Government (2016). *National strategy for international education 2025*.
<https://apo.org.au/node/234211>
- Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) (2011). *Australian professional standards for teachers*. https://www.aitsl.edu.au/docs/default-source/apst-resources/australian_professional_standard_for_teachers_final.pdf
- Baik, C. (2013). Internationalising the student experience. In S. Marginson (Ed.), *Tertiary education policy in Australia* (pp. 131-138). Melbourne: University of Melbourne.
https://melbourne-cshe.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/1489174/Tert_Edu_Policy_Aus.pdf
- Barends, Z. & Nel, C. (2017). Work-integrated learning within the reading literacy component of foundation phase teacher preparation programmes. *South African Journal of Childhood Education*, 7(1), article 435. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajce.v7i1.435>
- Bates, M. (2011). Work-integrated learning workloads. *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning*, 12(2), 111-124.
<https://www.proquest.com/openview/cc423851b74b0153efd0bab43d301643/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=4379534>
- Bexley, E. (2013). On the fragmentation and decline of academic work. In S. Marginson (Ed.), *Tertiary education policy in Australia* (pp. 97-104). Melbourne: University of Melbourne. https://melbourne-cshe.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/1489174/Tert_Edu_Policy_Aus.pdf
- Bilsland, C., & Nagy, H. (2015). Work-integrated learning in Vietnam: Perspectives of intern work supervisors. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, 16(3), 185-198.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1113544.pdf>
- Bilsland, C., Carter, L. & Wood, L. N. (2019). Work integrated learning internships in transnational education: Alumni perspectives from Vietnam. *Education+ Training*, 61(3), 359-373. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-07-2017-0094>
- Bishop, P. (2010). Multisite case study. In A. Mills, G. Durepos & E. Wiebe (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of case study research* (pp. 588-590). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412957397.n219>
- Bothwell, E. (2020). Coronavirus could be 'make or break' for universities' finances. *Times Higher Education*, 19 March.
<https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/coronavirus-could-be-make-or-break-universities-finances#survey-answer>
- Bryson, J. (2008). Dominant, emergent, and residual culture: The dynamics of organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 21(6), 743-757.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/09534810810915754>
- Carter, N., Bryant-Lukosius, D., DiCenso, A., Blythe, J. & Neville, A. J. (2014). The use of triangulation in qualitative research. *Oncology Nursing Forum*, 41(5), 545-547.
https://docksci.com/the-use-of-triangulation-in-qualitative-research_5a984becd64ab293801702ff.html
- Choy, S. & Delahaye, B. (2011). Partnerships between universities and workplaces: Some challenges for work-integrated learning. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 33(2), 157-172.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0158037X.2010.546079>
- Cuesta Medina, L. (2018). Blended learning: Deficits and prospects in higher education. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 34(1), 42-56.
<https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.3100>

- Deutschmann, M. & Wanke, M. (2020). Risk university: Uncertainty of the late modernity coming too early. *Society Register*, 4(3), 145-160.
<https://doi.org/10.14746/sr.2020.4.3.08>
- Dimenäs, J. & Norlund, A. (2014). Maintenance or change - an analytical tool for studies of the work-integrated learning in teacher education. *Nordic Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, 4(2), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.3384/njvet.2242-458X.14v4i2a3>
- Du Plessis, E. C. (2010). Students' experiences of work-integrated learning in teacher education. *Progressio: South African Journal for Open and Distance Learning Practice*, 32(1), 206-214.
https://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/22982/2010_Student%27s%20experiences%20of%20WIL%20in%20teacher%20education_Progressio_du%20Plessis%20EC.pdf
- Fleming, J. & Hickey, C. (2013). Exploring cooperative education partnerships: A case study in sport tertiary education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, 14(3), 209-221. https://www.ijwil.org/files/APJCE_14_3_209_221.pdf
- Ghasia, M. A., Machumu, H. J. & DeSmet, E. (2019). Micro-credentials in higher education institutions: An exploratory study of its place in Tanzania. *International Journal of Education and Development using ICT*, 15(1), 209-230.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1214271.pdf>
- Green, J., Willis, K., Hughes, E., Small, R., Welch, N., Gibbs, L. & Daly, J. (2007). Generating best evidence from qualitative research: The role of data analysis. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, 31(6), 545-550. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1753-6405.2007.00141.x>
- Hains-Wesson, R. & Appleby, M. (2017). A perspective on third-party providers and study tour programs: A mixed method study. *Issues in Educational Research*, 27(3), 435-452.
<http://www.iier.org.au/iier27/hains-wesson-2.pdf>
- Hains-Wesson, R. & Ji, K. (2021). An interdisciplinary, short-term mobility, work-integrated learning experiment: Education for change. *Issues in Educational Research*, 31(3), 800-815. <http://www.iier.org.au/iier31/hains-wesson.pdf>
- Hains-Wesson, R., Pollard, V. & Campbell, A. (2017). A three-stage process of improvisation for teamwork: Action research. *Issues in Educational Research*, 27(1), 82-98.
<http://www.iier.org.au/iier27/hains-wesson.pdf>
- Jackson, D. (2017). Developing pre-professional identity in undergraduates through work-integrated learning. *Higher Education*, 74(5), 833-853.
<https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s10734-016-0080-2.pdf>
- Jackson, D., Ferns, S., Rowbottom, D. & McLaren, D. (2015). *Working together to achieve better work-integrated learning outcomes: Improving productivity through better employer involvement*. <http://acen.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Working-together-to-achieve-better-WIL-outcomes.pdf>
- Jonck, P. (2014). The mitigating effect of work-integrated learning on graduate employment in South Africa. *Africa Education Review*, 11(3), 277-291.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/18146627.2014.934988>
- Jovanovic, J., Fane, J. & Andrew, Y. (2018). Giving institutional voice to work-integrated learning in academic workloads. *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning*, 19(2), 93-109. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1182118.pdf>

- Khuong, C. T. H. (2016). Work-integrated learning process in tourism training programs in Vietnam: Voices of education and industry. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, 17(2), 149-161. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1114031.pdf>
- Klatt, G. Angelico, T. & Polesel, J. (2017). Emerging partnership practices in VET provision in the senior years of schooling in Australia. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 45(2), 217-236. <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s13384-017-0244-9.pdf>
- Lasen, M., Evans, S., Tsey, K., Campbell, C. & Kinchin, I. (2018). Quality of WIL assessment design in higher education: A systematic literature review. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 37(4), 788-804. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2018.1450359>
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2016). Multilingualism research in Anglophone contexts as a discursive construction of multilingual practice. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 11(1), 9-24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2015.1086361>
- Lillejord, S. & Børte, K. (2016). Partnership in teacher education - A research mapping. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(5), 550-563. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2016.1252911>
- Lu, S. & Singh, M. (2017). Debating the capabilities of “Chinese students” for thinking critically in Anglophone universities. *Education Sciences*, 7(1), article 22. <https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/7/1/22>
- Mahomed, C. C. & Singh, P. (2011) Work-integrated learning skills: A comparison of teachers’ perceptions about the PGCE with those of student teachers in the Nelson Mandela Metropole. *Africa Education Review*, 8(3), 504-528. <https://doi.org/10.1080/18146627.2011.618700>
- Mahtabi, R. O. & Eslamieh, R. (2015). Dominant, residual, and emergent: Opposing forces hovering over John Dos Passos’ U.S.A. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 4(6), 166-171. <http://www.journals.aiac.org.au/index.php/IJALEL/article/view/1792>
- Manathunga, C., Pitt, R., Cox, L., Boreham, P., Mellick, G. & Lant, P. (2012). Evaluating industry-based doctoral research programs: Perspectives and outcomes of Australian Cooperative Research Centre graduates. *Studies in Higher Education*, 37(7), 843-858. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2011.554607>
- Marginson, S. (2013). Australia and world university rankings. In S. Marginson (Ed.), *Tertiary education policy in Australia* (pp. 139-150). University of Melbourne, Australia. https://melbourne-cshe.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/1489174/Tert_Edu_Policy_Aus.pdf
- Matoti, S. N., Junqueira, K. E. & Odora, R. J. (2011). A comparative study of pre-service teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs before and after work-integrated learning. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 25(6), 1140-1154. <https://journals.co.za/doi/pdf/10.10520/EJC37733>
- Ministry of Education and Training (MOET) (2017). *Quyết định 2161/QĐ-BGDĐT: Kế hoạch phát triển bền vững giáo dục và đào tạo 2025-2030 [Decision 2161/QĐ-BGDĐT 2017: Agenda for sustainable development in education and training to 2025 and orienting to 2030]*. <https://vanbanphapluat.co/quyet-dinh-2161-qd-bgdtt-2017-ke-hoach-phat-trien-ben-vung-giao-duc-dao-tao-2025-2030>

- Moore, R., Pitard, J. & Greenfield, R. (2012). New concepts and challenges for teacher education for TVET: Work integrated learning through the career change program. *International Journal of Education*, 6(2), 107-113.
<https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/ije/article/view/5296>
- NSW Department of Education and Communities (2012), *Local schools, local decisions: Report on the consultation*. https://schoolsequella.det.nsw.edu.au/file/3d9c0df5-e220-4e12-bc09-71a340d7126f/1/Local%20Decisions%20Report%20on%20Consultation_.pdf
- Patton, N. (2017). Driving change: Students shaping and reshaping work-integrated learning spaces. In T. Bowen & M. T. B. Drysdale (Eds.), *Work-integrated learning in the 21st century: Global perspectives on the future* (pp. 163-176). Bingley, England: Emerald Publishing Limited.
<https://books.emeraldinsight.com/resources/pdfs/chapters/9781787148604-TYPE23-NR2.pdf>
- Pham, T., Bao, D., Saito, E. & Chowdhury, R. (2018). Employability of international students: Strategies to enhance their experience on work-integrated learning programs. *Journal of Teaching and Learning for Graduate Employability*, 9(1), 62-83.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1235782.pdf>
- Ranabahu, N., Almeida, S. & Kyriazis, E. (2020). University-led internships for innovative thinking: A theoretical framework. *Education + Training*, 62(3), 235-254.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-02-2019-0031> [also
<https://ro.uow.edu.au/buspapers/1677/>]
- Sharrock, G. (2013). Degrees of debt: The Base Funding Review, Graduate Winners and undergraduate fees. In S. Marginson (Ed.), *Tertiary education policy in Australia* (pp. 73-84). Melbourne: University of Melbourne. https://melbourne-cshe.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/1489174/Tert_Edu_Policy_Aus.pdf
- Shen, H. (2017). A *Dui Hua* (对话) standpoint to multilingual educational theorizing. *Education Sciences*, 7(1), article 24. <https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/7/1/24>
- Singh, M. (2013). Designing research to improve students' learning: 'Industry/university' collaborations for educating teacher-researchers. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 40(5), 549-566. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-013-0117-9>
- Singh, M. & Ballantyne, C. (2014). Making Chinese learnable for beginning second language learners? In N. Murray & A. Scarino (Eds.), *Dynamic ecologies* (pp. 199-214). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7972-3_13
- Singh, M. & Lu, S. (2020). *Postmonolingual critical thinking: Internationalising higher education through students' languages and knowledge*. Abingdon: Routledge.
<https://www.routledge.com/Postmonolingual-Critical-Thinking-Internationalising-Higher-Education-Through/Singh-Lu/p/book/9780367409968>
- Singh, M. & Nguyen, T. H. N. (2018). *Localising Chinese: Educating teachers through service-learning*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-54282-3_7
- Smith, C. & Worsfold, K. (2015). Unpacking the learning-work nexus: 'Priming' as lever for high-quality learning outcomes in work-integrated learning curricula. *Studies in Higher Education*, 40(1), 22-42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2013.806456>
- Smith-Ruig, T. (2014). Exploring the links between mentoring and work-integrated learning. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 33(4), 769-782.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2013.863837>

- Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (TEMAG) (2014). *Action now: Classroom ready teachers*. Department of Education. Canberra: Australian Government.
https://docs.education.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/action_now_classroom_ready_teachers_print.pdf
- Tran, D. & Nguyen, T. (2014). A model of service-learning internship at Hoa Sen university: Teaching English for disadvantaged children. In S. Chan & J. Sun (Chairs), *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Service-Learning*, 20-21 November. The Hongkong Polytechnic University (pp. 152-157).
<http://ira.lib.polyu.edu.hk/handle/10397/64555>
- Tran, L. T. & Soejatminah, S. (2017). Integration of work experience and learning for international students: From harmony to inequality. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 21(3), 261-277. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315316687012>
- Tran, L. H. N., Phuong, H. Y. & Tran, L. K. H. (2019). The contribution of part-time work experience to pre-service teachers' development of graduate employability. In G. I. E. Strohschen & K. Lewis (Eds), *Competency-based and social-situational approaches for facilitating learning in higher education* (pp. 20-47). IGI Global.
<https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-8488-9>
- Tran, N. H., Hallinger, P. & Truong, T. (2018). The heart of school improvement: A multi-site case study of leadership for teacher learning in Vietnam. *School Leadership & Management*, 38(1), 80-101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2017.1371690>
- Wang, X. & Wong, J. L. N. (2017). How do primary school teachers develop knowledge by crossing boundaries in the school–university partnership? A case study in China. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 45(5), 487-504.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2016.1261392>
- Welch, B., Vo-Tran, H., Pittayachawan, S. & Reynolds, S. (2012). Crossing borders: Evaluating a work integrated learning project involving Australian and Vietnamese students. *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, 43(2), 120-134.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00048623.2012.10722265>
- Wenham, K. E., Valencia-Forrester, F. & Backhaus, B. (2020). Make or break: The role and support needs of academic advisors in work-integrated learning courses. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 39(5), 1026-1039.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1705254>
- Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and literature*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
<https://global.oup.com/academic/product/marxism-and-literature-9780198760610>
- Winchester-Seeto, T., Rowe, A. & Mackaway, J. (2016). Sharing the load: Understanding the roles of academics and host supervisors in work-integrated learning. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, 17(2), 101-118.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1114027.pdf>
- Xia, J., Caulfield, C. & Ferns, S. (2015). Work-integrated learning: Linking research and teaching for a win-win situation. *Studies in Higher Education*, 40(9), 1560-1572.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2014.882302>
- Yin, R. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods*. (5th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE. [6th ed.] <https://au.sagepub.com/en-gb/oce/case-study-research-and-applications/book250150>

Appendix: Interview questions for two WIL programs

English work-integrated learning program

Types of participants	Interview questions
Academics	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Could you please tell me about your role, in this service-learning program through teaching English to young learners? 2. Can you share some of your impressive experiences when involved in this program? 3. What are your views about what knowledge and skills were targeted in preparing teachers through this program? 4. In your opinion, what were the students' learning outcomes? 5. How do you think this program would help students with their future employment? 6. Could you please tell me about assessing students' workplace learning outcomes? 7. How are universities, students and communities connected? 8. Would this program be worth doing in teacher education of other disciplines? If so, what amendments would you like to suggest? <p><i>Vietnamese</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Anh / chị vui lòng chia sẻ vai trò của mình trong chương trình Học Tập Phục vụ Cộng đồng thông qua việc dạy tiếng Anh cho trẻ em? 2. Xin anh / chị chia sẻ vài kỷ niệm ấn tượng khi tham gia thực hiện chương trình này. 3. Theo anh/chị, chương trình này chú trọng vào kiến thức và kỹ năng nào của sinh viên để trở thành giáo viên? 4. Theo anh /chị, sinh viên đạt được những kiến thức gì trong chương trình này? 5. Theo anh/chị, chương trình này giúp ích gì cho nghề nghiệp tương lai của sinh viên? 6. Anh / chị vui lòng chia sẻ thêm về cách đánh giá kiến thức sinh viên đạt được khi tham gia chương trình này. 7. Trường đại học, sinh viên và cộng đồng kết nối với nhau như thế nào thông qua chương trình này? 8. Theo anh/ chị, chương trình có thể áp dụng đào tạo giáo viên các môn học khác được không? Anh / chị có gợi ý thay đổi gì?
Undergrad. students	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Could you please say something about you, your role, and the reasons for your participation in the service-learning program through teaching English to young learners? 2. What do you think are your achievements in terms of knowledge and skills from this service-learning program? What were your expected, unexpected outcomes of this program? 3. What types of training were provided by the university or by the communities prior to and during this program? 4. How were you supported by academics and community supervisors in

	<p>your workplace learning?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. In your opinion, how are universities, students and communities connected? 6. What knowledge do you think you may have contributed to teaching English to young learners in communities? 7. What were the opportunities and challenges for you in workplace learning through this program? 8. How do you think this program could be improved? <p><i>Vietnamese</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bạn có thể chia sẻ một chút về mình, vai trò và lí do bạn tham gia vào chương trình Học Tập Phục Vụ cộng đồng thông qua dạy tiếng Anh cho trẻ em. 2. Theo bạn, bạn học được kiến thức và kỹ năng gì. Kết quả nào như mong đợi và không như mong đợi? 3. Bạn được trường và cộng đồng tập huấn gì trước và trong khi tham gia chương trình này? 4. Khi tham gia học tập kinh nghiệm môi trường làm việc trong chương trình này, bạn được giảng viên và nhân viên cộng đồng hỗ trợ như thế nào? 5. Trường đại học, sinh viên và cộng đồng gắn kết với nhau thế nào? 6. Theo bạn, bạn đã có đóng góp gì cho chương trình dạy tiếng Anh cho trẻ em? 7. Tham gia chương trình này, bạn có những cơ hội và thách thức gì? 8. Theo bạn, chương trình này có thể cải thiện như thế nào?
Workplace supervisors	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Could you please say something about your role and contributions in this English teaching service-learning program? 2. What knowledge and skills do you think students obtained through this program? 3. How did the university collaborate with the community in this program? 4. How were you involved in assessing students' professional learning outcomes? 5. What challenges do you think exist in this program? 6. Would this program be worth doing in teacher education of other disciplines? How do you think this program could be improved? <p><i>Vietnamese</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Anh /chị có thể chia sẻ một chút về vai trò và sự đóng góp của mình trong chương trình Học Tập Phục Vụ cộng đồng thông qua dạy tiếng Anh cho trẻ em ? 2. Theo anh/ chị, sinh viên đạt được những kiến thức và kĩ năng gì khi tham gia chương trình này? 3. Trường đại học đã hợp tác với cộng đồng thế nào? 4. Anh /chị được mời tham gia đánh giá quá trình sinh viên học tập kinh nghiệm làm việc thế nào? 5. Theo anh / chị, chương trình này có những thách thức gì? 9. Theo anh/ chị, chương trình có thể áp dụng đào tạo giáo viên các môn học khác được không? Anh / chị có gợi ý thay đổi gì?
University managers	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Could you please tell me about your role in the English teaching service-learning program?

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Could you please tell me what key educational values this program targeted? 3. How important were partnerships in this program? 4. How did the university collaborate with partner organizations in students' workplace learning? 5. How did the university support students regarding finance, orientation, guidelines, facilities, personnel and time? 6. What were the achievements and challenges of this program? 7. What are your views about this program being worth doing in teacher education of other disciplines? If so, what are your recommendations? <p><i>Vietnamese</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Anh /chị có thể chia sẻ một chút về vai trò của mình trong chương trình Học Tập Phục Vụ cộng đồng thông qua dạy tiếng Anh cho trẻ em? 2. Xin anh / chị cho biết về những giá trị giáo dục quan trọng trong chương trình này. 3. Vấn đề đối tác quan trọng như thế nào trong chương trình này? 4. Trường đại học đã hợp tác với đối tác trong vấn đề kinh nghiệm học tập nơi làm việc của sinh viên 5. Trường đã hỗ trợ sinh viên về mặt tài chính, định hướng, hướng dẫn cụ thể, cơ sở vật chất, nhân sự và thời gian như thế nào? 6. Chương trình này đã đạt được gì và có những thách thức gì? 7. Theo anh/ chị, chương trình có thể áp dụng đào tạo giáo viên các môn học khác được không? Anh / chị có gợi ý thay đổi gì?
--	---

Chinese work-integrated learning program

Types of participants	Interview questions
Academics	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Could you please say something about you and your role, in this work-integrated learning program through teaching Chinese at local schools? 2. Can you share some of your impressive experiences when involved in this program? 3. Please tell me what knowledge and skills were targeted in preparing teachers through this program? 4. What were the students' learning outcomes? 5. How do you think this program would help students with their future employment? 6. Could you please tell me about assessing students' workplace learning outcomes? 7. In your opinion, how are universities, students, and communities connected? 8. Would this program be worth doing in teacher education of other disciplines? If so, what amendments would you like to suggest?
Post-graduate students	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Could you please say something about yourself, your role, and the reasons for your participation in this work-integrated learning program through teaching Chinese at local schools?

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. What do you think are your achievements in terms of knowledge and skills from work-integrated learning, specifically in this program? What you're your expected, unexpected outcomes of this program? 3. What training was provided by the university and the local schools prior to and during this program in terms of teacher-research and Chinese language teaching? 4. How were you supported by academics and school mentors in your professional learning? 5. In your opinion, how are universities, students and communities connected to one another? 6. What knowledge do you think you may have contributed to teaching Chinese at schools through your research? 7. What are the opportunities and challenges for you in terms of learning how to teach the Chinese language and learning how to do teacher-research in this program? 8. How do you think this program could be improved?
<p>School mentors</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Could you please say something about you and your role, in this work-integrated learning program through teaching Chinese at local schools? 2. What were your contributions? Can you share some of your impressive experiences when involved in this program? 3. Please tell me what knowledge and skills the students were supposed to gain through this program? 4. How do you think this program would help students with their future employment? 5. In your opinion, how are universities, students and communities connected? 6. How were you involved in assessing students' professional learning outcomes? 7. What do you think were the significant challenges in this program? 8. Would this program be worth doing in teacher education of other disciplines? How do you think this program could be improved?
<p>University managers</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Could you please tell me about your role in the Research-Oriented School Engaged Teacher-researcher Education (ROSETE) program? 2. How do you think education partnerships contribute to this work-integrated learning program through teaching Chinese at local schools? 3. Could you please tell me what key educational values this program targeted? 4. How did the university support students in with regard to finance, orientation, guidelines, facilities, personnel and time? 5. How were partner organisations involved in students' workplace learning? 6. What were the achievements and challenges of this program? 7. Would this program be worth doing in teacher education of other disciplines? If so, what amendments would you like to suggest?

Dr Nhung Nguyễn is doing research at Western Sydney University, Australia. Her research focuses on language teacher education, work-integrated learning, policy and practice in higher education, English language teaching, pedagogy, curriculum, post-monolingual education, and multilingualism.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2541-3042>

Email: nhung.instructor@gmail.com

Please cite as: Nguyễn, N. (2022). University-community partnerships in language teacher education through work-integrated learning. *Issues in Educational Research*, 32(1), 292-314. <http://www.iier.org.au/iier32/nguyen.pdf>