



Fair go in the field: inclusive field education for international students in the social sciences

Final Report 2013

The University of Queensland

Project Leader: Dr Gai Harrison

Project Team: Dr Kerry McCluskey, Dr Wendy Green

Report authors: Dr Gai Harrison, Dr Kathleen Felton



Support for the production of this report has been provided by the Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching. The views expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the views of the Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching.



With the exception of the Commonwealth Coat of Arms, and where otherwise noted, all material presented in this document is provided under Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/>.

The details of the relevant licence conditions are available on the Creative Commons website (accessible using the links provided) as is the full legal code for the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/legalcode>.

Requests and inquiries concerning these rights should be addressed to:

Office for Learning and Teaching
Department of Education
GPO Box 9880,
Location code N255EL10
Sydney NSW 2001

<learningandteaching@deewr.gov.au>

[2013]

ISBN 978-1-74361-284-2 [PRINT]
ISBN 978-1-74361-285-9 [PDF]
ISBN 978-1-74361-286-6 [DOCX]

Acknowledgements

The project group benefitted immensely from the expertise of Ms Majella Ferguson, Internationalisation Officer, Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, The University of Queensland (UQ).

Dr Donna Couzens, a student mentor in the School of Social Work and Human Services, UQ, provided informative feedback on the first draft of the model of inclusive field education.

The contribution of Dr Rose Melville is acknowledged in making available secondary data on social work field supervisors' perspectives available to the project team for analysis.

Mr Yuchen Gao, an international student member of the reference group, was employed on the project for a short period of time to advise on the development of the needs analysis.

Acknowledgements are also due to the 14 project participants without whose perspectives and insights this project would have been unable to be undertaken, as well as the valuable perspectives provided by individual members of the reference group.

List of acronyms used

AEI	Australian Education International
AFIS	Australian Federation of International Students
EAL	English as an additional language
HEI	Higher education institution
IEA	International Education Australia
IELTS	International English Language Testing System
OLT	Australian Government Office for Teaching and Learning
UQ	The University Of Queensland
WIL	Work integrated learning

Executive Summary

A growing number of international students are electing to study professional degrees in the social and behavioural sciences in Australia. Many of these degrees, such as social work, education and psychology, require successful completion of work-based practicums. The practicum provides students with the opportunity to link theory with practice and plays a key role in ensuring graduates' job readiness via exposure to the workplace. All students potentially face challenges in making the transition to the field. However, international students often contend with additional challenges related to their lack of familiarity with the local workplace culture. Language and cultural issues may also arise for some students on practicum, which can be compounded by prejudicial attitudes in the workplace. In addition, the ascribed status of 'international student' can impact on how students are perceived and received in the field. On the basis of these observations, the issue of how to ensure international students receive a 'fair go in the field' warrants attention.

While much attention has been focused on inclusive education in the academy, minimal attention has been given to how inclusiveness translates to the field practicum. In light of this oversight, the aim of this seed project was to lay the foundation for an OLT larger grant application to enable the development of strategies and resources to make field education inclusive for international students in the social and behavioural sciences. In order to do so, it was necessary to first gain a comprehensive understanding of what is required to make field education inclusive and equitable for international students. The project team therefore completed a *needs analysis* informed by both the literature and perspectives of key stakeholders in field education, which was then used to inform a *model for inclusive education* for application across the social and behavioural sciences. Feedback on the model was sought from a reference group who advised on the development of the project. This reference group had strong representation from all stakeholders including international students, and the model was revised in accordance with members' feedback.

This report provides an overview of the project and a summary of the findings from the needs analysis. It presents a model of inclusive field education underpinned by a set of core principles: building placement capacity; normalising and affirming international student presence; engaging all stakeholders; employing a developmental approach to placement preparation; recognising individuality while acknowledging the status of 'international student'; fostering meaningful participation in communities of practice; embedding language competence into the curriculum; and involving students as knowledgeable authorities on their own learning. Notably, institutional commitment to inclusive field education is a precondition to the successful implementation of the other core principles and serves as an overarching principle in the model.

A *plan for intervention* is presented in the final part of the report, which broadly outlines what steps need to be taken to translate the model's principles into practice and test their applicability in the field. The next stage for the project team is to develop an application for a cross-institutional innovation and development project that will implement and evaluate the model through engaging all key stakeholders: international students, field supervisors, university educators, and relevant professional and regulatory bodies.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	3
List of acronyms used	4
Executive Summary.....	5
Tables and Figures	7
Tables.....	7
Figures	7
1.0 Introduction.....	8
1.1 Background to the project.....	9
1.2 Project aims	11
1.3 Project team	11
1.4 Project advisors	11
1.5 Project participants	12
2.0 Project approach	13
3.0 Needs analysis	15
3.1 Introduction.....	15
3.2 Method	15
3.3 Findings.....	17
3.4 Summary and conclusions.....	26
4.0 Model for inclusive field education.....	27
4.1 Introduction.....	27
4.2 Principles of inclusive field education	27
5.0 Evaluation of the Model	33
6.0 A Plan for Intervention – Where to From Here?.....	34
6.1 Key parameters.....	34
6.2 A phased approach.....	35
6.3 Dissemination and communication of project activities.....	35
References	37
Appendix A: Terms of Reference – Project Reference Group	42
Appendix B: Interview Guide – University Educators.....	43
Appendix C: Interview Guide – Field Supervisors.....	44
Appendix D: Interview Participants	46

Tables and Figures

Tables

Table 1: University educator participants.....46

Figures

Figure 1: The overarching and core principles of inclusive field education28

1.0 Introduction

This report outlines the development of a model for promoting inclusive field placements for international students across the social and behavioural sciences. The model, which essentially constitutes a set of core principles for inclusive field education, is informed by a needs analysis and the literature on inclusive education. The final part of the report outlines a broad-brush plan for intervention which identifies what needs to happen next in order to translate this model into practice. Ultimately, the findings from this project will be used to inform an application for a cross-institution project that will investigate the applicability of the model to the field through engaging all key stakeholders: international students, field supervisors, university educators, professional associations and regulatory bodies.

The project represents an interdisciplinary initiative undertaken at The University of Queensland over a one year period, between September 2012 - 2013. A reference group, including international students, field supervisors, university based field education staff and a representative from UQ Equity Office was formed to advise the project team on the development of the project. The reference group also provided feedback on the model of inclusive field education developed by the project team. This feedback was used to further refine the model, which is reproduced in section four of this report.

A range of terminology is used in higher education to describe work based learning. The language used tends to differ across disciplines, higher education institutions and countries. Some of the more common terms found in the literature are field placement, practicum, practice learning, internship, clinical placement, workplace learning and work integrated learning placement. For the purposes of this report, we use the terms practicum or field placement to refer to the work based learning component of professional degrees in the social and behavioural sciences. Field education is used as an umbrella term that encompasses all aspects of work based learning. The term 'field supervisor' is used to refer to workplace based staff who supervise students while they are on practicum.

There has been considerable discussion and debate concerning the use of the term 'international students', with writers pointing out the significant diversity amongst this cohort. The term 'international students' as used in this report is consistent with that outlined by Tran (2011) who refers to 'students who are pursuing a degree in a host nation but are not citizens or permanent residents of that particular country' (p. 80). As stressed by Tran (2011), this is not meant to negate the diversity of international students, but is an acknowledgement that there are certain experiences that are common to these students on the basis of their legal status. International students pay significantly higher fees than - domestic students and often have a different investment in their learning than their domestic counterparts. In addition, being classed as temporary residents, they do not enjoy the same rights and entitlements accorded to domestic students (Marginson, 2012).

For the purposes of this project, we focused on international students who come to Australia to study a professional degree affiliated with the social and behavioural sciences and who are required to complete a field practicum as part of their studies. Many of these students speak English as an additional language (EAL), with the majority of these students coming from Asian countries. The English language competence of these students has come under scrutiny in both the classroom and the workplace, although Benzie (2010) warns that this type of scrutiny can promote 'othering' and is not always warranted. Nonetheless, the challenges facing EAL students when they make the transition from the classroom to the practicum can be immense, especially given that professions such as social work, teaching and counselling are highly talk-dependent and require the sophisticated use of language skills. As educators, the challenge facing us is to ensure that these students receive a 'fair go in the field' as well as ensuring that they are placement ready.

1.1 Background to the project

Field education is a core component of students' education in professional degrees in the social and behavioural sciences such as social work, education, clinical psychology and counselling. Successful completion of the field practicum is seen as crucial to ensuring the required educational outcomes and work-force preparedness of graduates. In the contemporary economic climate, higher education institutions (HEIs) are also facing increased pressure by government, employers and students themselves to ensure that all graduates are 'work ready' (Patrick et al. 2008; Wheelahan et al. 2012). This includes international students, who often have a significant investment in acquiring work experience relevant to their discipline while studying in Australia (Gribble et al. 2012; Lawson, 2012). In light of these developments, the field practicum is taking on an increasingly important role in ensuring work readiness for both domestic and international students.

Despite recognising the importance of the learning that takes place in the field, educators have given minimal attention to what constitutes 'inclusive field education'. Proponents of inclusive practice in higher education have focused mainly on what happens in the classroom rather than what happens on practicum. In particular, minimal consideration has been given to how international students fare in the field, although the lack of equitable access to placement opportunities for these students is recognised as an issue requiring urgent attention (Patrick et al. 2008). This lack of a level playing field is compounded by increased competition for field placements as more students enter higher education in Australia. In the contemporary demand-driven system of higher education, many educators responsible for sourcing field placements report that demand for quality field placements commonly exceeds supply (Orrell, 2011; Patrick et al. 2008; Wheelahan et al. 2012).

For international students enrolled in professional degrees, a substantial part of their learning will take place outside the classroom in a workplace such as a hospital, school, business or welfare agency. The lack of attention to the learning experiences of these students is of some concern given, first, the expansion of international student numbers in Australian higher education institutions and, second, the recognition of the challenges faced by all students on practicum. These challenges include learning to fit in with the workplace culture, being closely observed on a day to day basis, and having practical work assessed by a field supervisor (Harrison & Ip, 2013). For international students, these challenges may be intensified by linguistic and cultural differences, as well as their temporary resident status (McCluskey, 2008; Nash, 2011; Patrick et al. 2008; Spooner-Lane et al. 2011).

International students have a sizable presence in Australian higher education. In 2011, they comprised 21.3% of onshore student enrolments in Australian universities, with the majority of these students coming from the Asian region (International Education Advisory Council, 2013). While many of these students have traditionally favoured science, IT or business degrees, increasing numbers of international students are enrolling in professional degrees in the social and behavioural sciences that incorporate a compulsory or optional field placement. For example, at The University of Queensland international students are well represented in the Master of Development Practice, the Master of Social Work Studies, the Master of Counselling, and the Graduate Diploma in Education. A substantial proportion of these international graduates seek employment in Australia after completing their studies (AEI, 2010). However, they are more likely than their Australian born counterparts to experience difficulties in finding work, with employers nominating practical work experience as one of the core areas that require greater emphasis in Australian education (AEI, 2010). In this regard, the field practicum plays a crucial role in enabling international students to gain practical work experience that will improve their employment outcomes.

Although many Australian universities have developed equity and diversity policies to ensure a level playing ground for students, it is not clear how these policies are applied beyond the university environment. Students who embark on practicum are supervised by professionals who abide by their own organisational policies and practices. Undoubtedly some of these supervisors are responsive to the needs of international students and are

able to affirm the value of difference for the workplace. However, on the whole, there appears to be an unspoken assumption that these students will assimilate into the workplace. As noted by Gursansky and Le Sueur (2012), students are generally expected to comply with the agency's norms and fit in with existing work practices. This is somewhat at odds with an inclusive approach to education.

Inclusive education is a contested term and definitions vary according to context and country. However, generally speaking, the idea of inclusiveness incorporates the general principles of *access, equity, participation, valuing difference and institutional commitment to inclusive learning and teaching* (Hockings, 2010). Inclusive teaching and learning is underpinned by the values of diversity and equality; it entails planning for every student's needs and entitlements rather than expecting students to integrate into established arrangements (Equality Challenge Unit, 2010). In this sense, inclusive approaches are proactive rather than reactive and build on students' own knowledge, skills and backgrounds. However, it is unclear how this inclusive ethos translates into the field. Moreover, professional accreditation bodies may prescribe what form practice learning takes, which may not be in accord with a student-centred approach to learning in the field.

In order to successfully complete the practicum, students need to acquire local sociocultural knowledge about workplace norms and social conventions. International students often lack the social connections and cultural capital - or taken for granted knowledge - that local students have that assist them to more readily adapt to the workplace culture (Harrison & Ip, 2013). On an educational level, having the requisite cultural capital is seen to be vital to competently navigating higher education (Equality Challenge Unit, 2010). In the case of work based practicums, it may include such things as the ability to abide by unwritten rules, dress appropriately, cultivate relationships and engage in staffroom chitchat (Harrison & Ip, 2013). For students who do not readily pick up on these cultural conventions, placement may then become a stressful experience. Cultural capital can be acquired over time, but because it operates at the unconscious level its acquisition is usually not straightforward (Bourdieu, 1986). This poses particular challenges for international students who often need to become familiar with how things are done at the workplace in a short space of time. Students enrolled in degrees at Masters level may face additional pressures because of the shorter duration of their studies.

Academic staff play a crucial dual role in preparing students for field practicum and negotiating with professionals in the field to supervise students. However, there has been little investigation into how educators in the social and behavioural sciences prepare international students for workplace practicums or facilitate their field placements. In addition, their views have rarely been canvassed on how they have coped with sourcing placements for these students given limited placement capacity. Similarly, little is known about the needs of field supervisors who supervise international students.

The above discussion foregrounds a tension between making field education inclusive and ensuring students have the necessary cultural capital to succeed on practicum (Equality Challenge Unit, 2010). It also highlights two topical questions: how can educators prepare international students adequately for field placements in the social and behavioural sciences and, of equal importance, how can educators work with their counterparts in the field to ensure equitable access to field placements and an inclusive workplace for students. In essence, these two key questions have guided the project team in developing the following aims for the seed project.

1.2 Project aims

The overall aim of this seed project was to lay the foundation for a larger grant application to enable the development of comprehensive strategies and resources to make field education inclusive for international students in the social and behavioural sciences. The project consisted of two phases. The aim of the first phase was to develop a needs analysis informed by:

- a review of the extant literature on international students and field education; and
- the perspectives of academic staff responsible for field education and professional supervisors in the field.

The aim of the second phase was to use the needs analysis, in conjunction with the literature on inclusive education, to develop:

- a model for inclusive field education for application across the social and behavioural sciences, and
- a plan for future intervention.

1.3 Project team

The project team comprised:

Dr Gai Harrison	The University of Queensland
Dr Wendy Green	The University Of Queensland
Dr Kerry McCluskey	The University of Queensland

Project coordinator:

Dr Kathleen Felton

1.4 Project advisors

A key component of the project design included the formation of a reference group to advise on the development of both phases of the project and provide feedback on the model of inclusive field education developed by the project team.

The reference group consisted of individuals with specific expertise across a range of areas relevant to the experience of international students on field placement (see Appendix A for the reference group's terms of reference).

Reference group members were:

Mr Mark Cleaver	Manager, Field Education Unit, School of Social Work & Human Services, UQ	University placement coordination representative
Mr Nathan Turville/Mr Michael Bolton	Coordinators, Education Field Experience Unit, UQ	University placement coordination representative
Mr Andrew Peach	Principal, Bundamba State High School	Field placement supervisor representative
Ms Kinnie Mienie	Social Worker, The Prince Charles	Field placement supervisor

	Hospital, Brisbane.	representative
Dr Daniel Walker	Equity Office, UQ	Equity and diversity policy representative
Mr Yuchen Gao	International social work graduate, UQ	International graduate representative
Mr Peter Suo	International social work student, UQ	International student representative
Ms Priscilla Jiang	International social work student, UQ	International student representative
Ms Xiaoshu Chang	International teaching student UQ	International student representative
Ms Sylvia Ba	International teaching student UQ	International student representative
Ms Cressida Bradley	International Student Advisor, Student Services UQ	International student support representative

Other people:

The project group benefitted immensely from the expertise of Ms Majella Ferguson, Internationalisation Officer, Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, UQ, who was able to provide an overview of the international student trajectory, as well as the expectations of students prior to arrival.

Dr Donna Couzens, a student mentor in the School of Social Work and Human Services, UQ, provided informative feedback on the first draft of the model of inclusive field education.

The contribution of Dr Rose Melville is acknowledged in making secondary data on social work field supervisors' perspectives available to the project team for analysis.

Mr Yuchen Gao, a member of the reference group, was employed on the project for a short period of time to advise on the development of the needs analysis. Mr Gao also informally canvassed the views of ten international social work students on their field placement experiences to inform the project.

1.5 Project participants

In total, 14 university educator staff, including field placement coordinators, managers and program directors, participated in individual interviews as part of the research project. Their commitment and generosity is much appreciated and this project could not have been undertaken without them.

2.0 Project approach

Mindful that inclusive field education in the social and behavioural sciences is an under-theorised area and little is known about the experiences of international students on practicum, the project focused on scoping needs and laying the foundation for a comprehensive, informed intervention in a subsequent grant application. A two stage process was adopted to build this foundational base. In the first stage of the project, a needs analysis was conducted. This needs analysis was informed by a review of the existing literature on the experiences of international students in higher education, and the perspectives of university personnel working in field education in the social and behavioural sciences. In the second stage of the project, the needs analysis was used to develop a model for inclusive field education which was then evaluated by the reference group.

Initially focus groups were selected as the most appropriate method for eliciting the views of academic and professional staff working in field education. It quickly became apparent, however, that despite potential participants' genuine interest in being involved, the focus group method was not feasible with this busy cohort of workers. Hence, individual semi-structured interviews were identified as the most practical method to access the experiences and understandings of these staff members.

The interviews aimed to: (a) capture perceptions of staff regarding the issues faced by international students on practicum; and (b) investigate what strategies are used to prepare students for and support them in the field. An interview guide was developed and piloted (see Appendix B). Ethics approval was gained for this part of the project from the UQ Social and Behavioural Sciences human ethics committee.

Despite drawing on existing professional networks to recruit educators for the interviews, a purposive sampling strategy was employed as far as was possible. For instance, participants were actively recruited across the social and behavioural sciences and included a mix of program directors (academic staff), placement coordinators (professional staff) and faculty staff. Participants were purposively recruited from a range of programs in order to gauge different disciplinary perspectives and to allow the project team to compare different approaches to field education. These disciplines included education, social work, psychology, social sciences, tourism and counselling. Field education staff from tourism were included in the project due to the large number of international students enrolled in tourism degrees who were undertaking practicums. These staff members had expressed an interest in the project, and their views were sought for comparative purposes. All participants were drawn from universities in southeast Queensland and were purposively selected on the basis of their responsibility for sourcing and coordinating practicums for international students.

The original intention of the project team was to similarly elicit the perspectives of field supervisors who have supervised international students on practicum. However, the project team encountered difficulties recruiting supervisors due to competing work demands and their busy schedules. This is a telling finding in itself, in the sense that universities place additional demands on these agencies and schools in their quest to source field placements for students. As a result of these recruitment difficulties, a decision was made to analyse secondary data from a related project conducted by the project leader. This secondary data consisted of transcriptions of semi-structured interviews conducted with nine social work field supervisors on their experiences of supervising international students (see Appendix C for interview guide).

All interview data were transcribed and imported into NVivo Version 10 software program, which was used to search, sort and retrieve segments of text for qualitative data coding. Initial coding was undertaken through broadly analysing individual interviews around the key topics listed in the interview guide. This added a degree of consistency and

comparability across the interview data. When codes were modified or a new code added, prior interviews were re-examined and re-coded. The coding system was revised several times in order to ensure that all themes were able to be coded and overlap minimised.

In order to develop an overview of an issue or theme, a summary of all of the components of text coded under a specific category, for example 'pacing of learning', was compiled. Each summary provided a number of quotes from participants as evidence to support the category developed. These summaries were subsequently scrutinised for coherence and dissonance. If a participant was not represented in this sub-set, their interview was re-examined to understand how they differed.

Given that a large body of research already exists on the experiences of international students in higher education (Leask & Carroll, 2012), a decision was made to synthesise the extant literature on the student experience rather than to conduct a further study. This decision was also informed by the fact that the project's duration was for only twelve months. It was envisaged that international students would play a much greater role in a future project focused on implementing and evaluating the model of inclusive field education developed from this project. This literature review, along with the findings from the fieldwork, was used to inform the needs analysis outlined in section three.

Notably, an international social work graduate was employed on the project for a short period of time to assist the project team conduct the needs analysis and devise a model for inclusive field education. In doing so, he informally canvassed the views of ten international social work students on field placement. While working on the project, this graduate also researched and presented material on the student experience of field placement for a training seminar for locally based social work field supervisors. The lesson learnt by the project team through this exercise was the importance of seeing international students and graduates as active knowledgeable agents who have much to contribute to initiatives aimed at fostering inclusive field education.

A reference group was established to advise on and evaluate the process and outcomes of the project. This group comprised field supervisors, university based field education staff, current and past international students, a representative from UQ Equity Office, and an international student advisor. The reference group also provided feedback on the model of inclusive field education developed by the project team. This feedback, which included written submissions, was used to fine-tune the model which is presented in section four.

3.0 Needs analysis

3.1 Introduction

A needs analysis was conducted by the project team to identify what needs to occur in order to ensure that field education in the social and behavioural sciences is inclusive for international students. For our purposes, we defined need as the gap that exists between 'what is' and 'what should be' (Altschuld & Kumar, 2010, p.4). According to this definition, need equates with discrepancy, while a needs analysis constitutes an evidence-based assessment of 'both the actual and desired conditions' (Owen, 2006, p. 175). In this context, a needs analysis is solution focused and future oriented.

Conducting a needs assessment necessitates using multiple sources of information in order to elicit a range of perspectives on need (Owen, 2006). Accordingly, our needs analysis was informed by: a) a review of the extant literature on international students and field education; b) the perspectives of academic and professional staff responsible for field education; and c) the perspectives of field supervisors who have supervised international students. In addition, members of the reference group were invited to provide further feedback on a draft needs analysis before it was finalised. However, a needs analysis is always historically located, which is one of its key limitations. In other words, the findings presented below cannot take account of changing conditions in higher education, emerging practices in the workplace, or developments in field education.

A further limitation of this needs analysis is its reliance on a small sample of participants who are not necessarily representative of all stakeholders. Nonetheless, Leask and Carroll (2011) claim that a substantial body of research already exists on the issues faced by international students as well what needs to happen in order to make higher education an inclusive environment for these students. What is missing in this literature, however, are concrete strategies and interventions for making inclusive education a reality, not just in the classroom but also in the field. Accordingly, the needs analysis conducted for this project was used to develop a model of inclusive field education for application across the social and behavioural sciences.

3.2 Method

3.2.1 Literature review

As a large body of research on international students' needs and views already exists, student perspectives were not formally canvassed in this project. Information about international students' needs relevant to field placement was therefore gathered from the published literature via conducting a narrative literature review. The literature review initially focused on international students' overall experience of higher education, then drilled down to pertinent findings on their experiences of practicum. While the primary objective of the literature review was to establish what is known about international students' experiences on practicum as well as how field education staff manage this process, a secondary objective was to identify existing conceptual and theoretical frameworks on inclusive education and associated debates. It was anticipated that this latter literature would be useful for informing an inclusive model of field education.

The primary search terms initially used in the literature review included 'inclusive education', 'inclusion', 'diversity', 'equity', 'international students', 'field/clinical placement', 'practicum', and 'work integrated learning'. Notably, through our initial investigations we discovered that terms used to refer to field education and international students differed not only across countries, but also across disciplines and institutions. Accordingly, we expanded our range of search terms in recognition of this variation. For example, we

included the descriptor 'race' after discovering that much of the American literature appeared to favour this term over diversity.

Literature was located across a range of professional fields including social work, counselling, psychology, education, journalism, political science and geography. Data bases on nursing and other health professions were also searched in recognition that notable initiatives had been developed in these disciplines to assist international students on clinical placements that may have applicability in the social and behavioural sciences. The general topic areas of literature sourced included:

- Work readiness of graduates
- Equity, diversity and inclusion
- Work integrated learning
- Globalisation and internationalisation of higher education
- Field placement/practicum for international students (inclusive of education, social work, psychology and geography as well as nursing and the health sciences)
- International students and/or internationalisation
- Interventions to support international students on practicum/placement

Along with reviewing the conceptual, theoretical and empirical literature, pertinent government reports that focused on international students, internationalisation and/or work integrated learning were also sourced for the literature review.

3.2.1 Participant perspectives

Fourteen professional and academic staff from three universities in south-east Queensland participated in individual interviews conducted by the project coordinator. The sample comprised staff from social work, education, psychology, tourism, human services and social sciences. Programs represented included both undergraduate and post-graduate courses (see Appendix D). Five participants were program directors for field placement; five were placement coordinators and four were managers of field placement units.

Interview data from nine individual interviews with social work field supervisors was analysed with reference to their experiences of supervising international students and their understanding of inclusive field education. All field supervisors were similarly located in south-east Queensland. The majority of participants were female and of Anglo-Australian background, while one participant had immigrated to Australia from South Africa. Government and non-government agencies were represented, along with a range of practice contexts.

The perspectives of field supervisors were elicited via secondary analysis of data from a related project previously conducted by the project leader. The field supervisors in this study were all social workers and it is important to point out that these findings cannot be generalised beyond the sample. Nonetheless, the analysis identified a range of concerns expressed by field supervisors that could be fruitfully explored in the proposed larger study which will target a broader range of disciplines.

3.3 Findings

3.3.1 Literature Review

Introduction

This literature review summarises the main themes in both the Australian and international literature pertinent to international students, higher education, the field practicum and inclusion. There is an extensive body of research on the experiences of international students studying in another country and the literature review presented here is primarily indicative rather than systematic. The review is structured in such a way that it tracks the student trajectory from arrival in the country to entering higher education and then negotiating the field practicum. In addition to identifying potential issues and challenges faced by international students in the field, the following discussion also highlights initiatives developed to enhance the field placement experience for international students as well as areas requiring further research.

As a preface to this discussion, it is important to note that early research tended to take a deficit view of international students and treat them as a relatively homogenous group. Asian students in particular tended to be portrayed in essentialist, 'culturalist' terms (Chalmers and Volet, 1997; Ryan, 2010). The implicit assumption underpinning much of this literature was that international students needed to adjust to the host country's dominant culture and pedagogy. More contemporary research has acknowledged the heterogeneity of this student group, recognising that their abilities, attitudes and motivations are diverse (Caruana, 2010; Ryan, 2011). At the same time the inclusive education agenda has been extended to international students in recognition of their experiences of social exclusion both inside and outside the academy (AFIS, 2010; Leask & Carroll, 2012: Equality Challenge Unit, 2010). Accordingly, while it is important to acknowledge the diversity of this student cohort, it is also important to acknowledge that, as a group, international students are often ascribed 'outsider status' in higher education (Marginson, 2012).

Arrival in the country and entering higher education

While all students, domestic and international, experience a range of challenges in transitioning to the higher education context, there is broad agreement that international students experience these difficulties differently and to a greater extent (Rosenthal et al. 2007). Marginson (2011) identifies four salient factors that can interact and shape international students' experiences: their outsider status; a lack of knowledge about how systems work; communication difficulties; and cultural difference. Essentially, international students encounter the same issues and challenges that migrants contend with when they move to a new country. These issues may include culture shock (Brown, 2008; Brown & Holloway, 2008; Kelly & Moogan, 2012), language and communication difficulties (Arkoudis et al. 2012; Benzie, 2010; Sawir, 2005), social isolation or exclusion (AFIS, 2010; Baird, 2010; Rosenthal et al. 2007), loneliness (Marginson, 2011), accommodation problems and housing insecurity (Forbes-Mewett, 2011; Judd, 2012; Marginson et al., 2010). In addition, racism and security concerns have been reported by some international students (Baird, 2010; Brown & Jones, 2013; Marginson et al., 2010), while more recent attention has focused on students' financial stress (Rodan, 2009) and mental health concerns (Forbes-Mewett & Sawyer, 2011).

Clearly, the impact of these issues on individual students will be variable, with some experiences such as culture shock being transitory. Moreover, the findings from some recent large scale surveys suggest that, overall, most students are satisfied with their living and educational experiences in Australia (Lawson, 2012; Rosenthal et al. 2008). However, in order to minimise the risk associated with undertaking study in a foreign country, Forbes-Mewett (2011) stresses the importance of the provision of quality information and adequate preparation for students not only upon entering Australia, but also pre-arrival. The desirability of commencing student preparation early has been similarly highlighted by

Lawson (2012) who recognises that both pre-departure and orientation are critical stages in the international student life cycle. A student's early experiences in the country can set the scene for what follows. Students who are poorly prepared and who fail to adequately familiarise themselves with their new environment - including systems and services - are likely to struggle when they do commence their studies (Lawson, 2012).

In English-language dominant countries, communication difficulties are one of the most commonly cited problems facing international students (Marginson, 2012). Tests of English language proficiency, such as IELTS, conducted at the point of entry to a degree do not guarantee that students have the necessary language skills to successfully complete their studies (Baird, 2010; Benzie, 2010). Acquiring the requisite English proficiency for academic study is a significant challenge for many EAL students who must make the transition from language learners to language users in a short period of time (Liu, 2012). Developing proficiency in English is a long term process. Ideally, students should be given the opportunity to develop their language skills in the context of their particular discipline, although many universities still adhere to a centralised model of language assistance (Murray, 2012). Arkoudis et al (2012) also highlight the importance of adopting a staged, developmental approach to building EAL students' language skills that commences at entry and continues until students exit their studies. Given that good communication skills are vital to both work based placements and employment (Gribble et al. 2012), it is clear that such an approach is warranted to ensure that EAL students have the best chances of succeeding on practicum.

In a systematic review of predictors of international students' psychosocial adjustment to life in the USA, length of stay, English proficiency, gender and social support were the most frequently reported predictors of acculturative stress (Zhang & Goodson, 2011). Other literature emanating from Australia suggests that some of these factors are inter-related. For example, Marginson (2011) observes that students who actively expand their cross-cultural networks in Australia usually have more opportunities to improve their English. Nonetheless, Leask and Carroll (2011) point to a range of studies that suggest that international students are still perceived as outsiders on many Australian campuses and lack opportunities to engage in cross-cultural encounters.

As well as contending with the process of settling into Australia, international students must also negotiate a new academic culture. It is well recognised that international students often enter higher education with a mindset shaped by their prior educational experiences, which may in turn promote 'academic culture shock' (Brown, 2008). Those students from Asian countries are believed to experience greater challenges in adjustment than students from a Western background due to the increased linguistic and cultural distance between their home countries and that of Australia (Rosenthal et al. 2007). However, despite these challenges, the resilience and agency of international students in overcoming these challenges has similarly been noted in the literature (Malau-Aduli, 2011; Marginson, 2011; Robertson, 2011). International students have also been observed to strategically 'self monitor' and adapt their behaviour accordingly to enhance their cultural adaptation (Spong & Kamau, 2012). This ability to self-monitor becomes particularly important when students go on practicum and have to learn to fit in with the organisational culture of the workplace.

It is noteworthy that the extant research on international students predominantly focuses on adjustment issues, factors that enhance academic success, or students' satisfaction with their educational experience (Ramia et al. 2013). A limitation of much of this research is its failure to adopt a holistic view of students' lives, or adequately acknowledge their temporary migrant status and associated lack of rights in relation to practical matters such as housing, health, financial assistance and medical care (Ramia et al. 2013). The vulnerability of international students has been highlighted by Marginson (2012) who argues that their non-citizen status may impede their ability to successfully complete their studies while living in Australia. Arguably, these practical concerns will also be significant considerations for students when they make the transition from the classroom to the workplace via the field practicum.

Embarking on the field practicum

International students report that they value the opportunity to engage in work experience that is relevant to their field of study and will later assist them to find employment (International Education Advisory Council, 2013). The expectation of these students is that they will be job ready by the time they complete their studies. However, the findings of a national scoping study conducted on work integrated learning by Patrick et al. (2008) indicated that international students are frustrated that they do not have the same access to work based placements as domestic students.

Field placement is acknowledged to be a site of particular difficulty for international student learners due to a lack of familiarity with the Australian workplace culture and expectations, as well as challenges related to confidently using English across a range of contexts (Campbell et al. 2008; Harrison and Ip, 2013; Malau-Aduli, 2011; Nash, 2011; Leong et al. 2011). Employers, on the other hand, often express reluctance to host international students on the basis of these perceived shortcomings (Orrell, 2011; Patrick et al. 2008).

Once students embark on practicum, a new form of culture shock may set in again. Assisting international students 'to understand and adapt to Australian socio-cultural workplace environments' is considered to be good practice in work-integrated learning (Orrell, 2011, p. 20). However, this type of practice could also be seen to be based on an assimilatory logic rather than principles of inclusion (Harrison & Ip, 2013). The need for students to adapt to the workplace highlights a tension in extending inclusive education to the field. The onus is on the student to change rather than the host agency.

There is a diversity of models for practicum across disciplines and programs in the social and behavioural sciences. A key structural parameter, however, is the extent to which practicum is mandated by professional bodies as part of professional accreditation standards. For example, in social work, the Australian Association of Social Workers (AASW) stipulates that students need to complete 1000 hours of fieldwork in at least two different practice settings (AASW, 2012). This is usually completed over two lengthy placements and requires a substantial time commitment by students. Field supervision by qualified social workers is voluntary and university educators who are responsible for sourcing placements rely on the goodwill of agencies to host students. However, there is an acknowledged shortage of placement opportunities and concerns have been expressed about the quality of student supervision (Gursansky & Le Sueur, 2012). Sourcing quality field placements for international students is therefore compounded by the current field placement shortage.

These concerns have been similarly echoed in education. The National Association of Field Experience Administrators (NAFEA) in Victoria has noted increasing difficulties in sourcing suitable teachers to supervise pre-service teachers (NAFEA, 2011). In a submission to the Productivity Commission's study into the Schools workforce, NAFEA (2011) reported that 'it is usually more difficult to place large numbers of international pre-service teachers than it is to place local pre-service teachers' (p. 4). It was further noted in this submission that primary school teachers had communicated a reluctance to mentor international students who they perceived as having limited English proficiency.

In psychology, the practicum – usually described as an internship - is a requirement of most master level programs of study, including organisational, sports and counselling psychology. Supervisors of students undertaking an internship program must be approved by the Psychology Board of Australia and are required to complete competency based supervisor training courses, which includes input on cross-cultural supervision and diversity (Psychology Board of Australia, 2013). There would therefore appear to be more rigorous requirements for supervisors in psychology than social work or education, with attention also being focused on developing supervisors' cultural competence.

There is a growing body of literature that focuses on cross-cultural issues in supervisor-international supervisee relationships in counselling programs which highlights the importance of the supervisory relationship, the need to ascertain students' level of acculturation, and the importance of initiating 'cultural discussions' with students while on

practicum (Mori et al. 2009; Ng, 2006; Nilsson & Anderson, 2004). Mentoring has also been identified as a strategy that can potentially assist international students negotiate the counselling practicum (Ng, 2006; Wedding et al. 2009). Most of this literature has emanated from the United States. However, the issues raised in these studies – including the importance of culturally responsive supervision and the need to be aware of the particular stressors and issues faced by international students – are likely to have relevance for other field education contexts in the social and behavioural sciences. Notably, some of this literature also highlights the positive contributions made by international counselling students. For example, Wedding et al. (2009) comment that, given an increasingly diverse population, ‘the international students of this generation may be better equipped than noninternational students to work with diverse individuals and families’ (p. 192).

Somewhat surprisingly, these issues have received little attention in social work although a large body of literature exists on cultural competence, while the need for diversity training for field supervisors is garnering more attention (Peterson Armour et al. 2004). Although not dealing specifically with international students, one notable study conducted by Arkin (1999) examined the supervisor-supervisee relationship between Israeli social workers and Ethiopian students. Arkin (1999) noted that while all supervisors commenced supervision with an optimistic outlook, this diminished over the course of the practicum, often resulting in emotional reactions including anger and frustration. Supervisors tended to either minimise or magnify difference, both responses which are ultimately unhelpful because they either put the responsibility on students to adapt to the established professional culture or result in supervisors being overprotective of students or expecting less of them. Arkin (1999) therefore highlights a need for multicultural training for field supervisors that acknowledges these complexities in the supervisory relationship. In the US context, Rai (2002) similarly contends that international students require culturally sensitive supervision by social workers who express a genuine interest in supervising this student group.

There has been little research conducted on the field experiences of international students enrolled in professional degrees affiliated with the social and behavioural sciences. Several studies conducted in education, counselling, psychology and social work have revealed that international students on practicum experience issues with cultural adjustment (Han, 2005; Taylor et al. 2000), a lack of acceptance (Kato, 1998; Han, 2005; Hartley, 2003), racism (Santoro, 1997; Spooner-Lane et al. 2011), communication difficulties including problems deciphering nuanced English or discipline-specific language (Zunz & Oil, 2009) and problems adapting to the workplace culture (Spooner-Lane et al. 2011). Other students describe feeling underprepared for their practicums (Kato, 1998; Hartley, 2003). The gatekeeping role of field supervisors has also been observed in pre-service teaching (Spooner-Lane et al. 2011), which underlines the need for educators to be cognisant of the power dynamics operating between international students and their field supervisors.

Professional degrees such as education, social work and psychology are considered to be linguistically demanding because of their reliance on ‘talk’ as the major tool of intervention. This in turn can create additional challenges for international students who are EAL speakers while on practicum. For example, Ng (2006) claims that clinical counselling requires a sophisticated level of ‘verbal English proficiency’ that is not usually required in other programs of study (p. 3). Moreover, entering the workplace requires learning ‘unique forms of text and talk’ specific to that community, which constitutes a form of language socialisation (Roberts, 2010, p. 214). Accordingly, the need to undergo further linguistic socialisation in the workplace is likely to present an additional challenge for EAL students.

Language discrimination is well recognised in the workplace (Lippi-Green, 2012) and can equally be an issue for EAL speakers on practicum. For example, Miller (2009) observed that pre-service teachers from China who use English as an additional English had their credibility questioned by their Australian students who draw attention to their accents. In this context, the speech style of native speakers is held up as the norm and the EAL students are expected to emulate these speakers. However, Benzie (2010) points out that it is unrealistic to expect EAL students to achieve the same level of command of English as a native speaker, which points to the need to sensitise field supervisors to these linguistic issues.

There are challenges involved in assessing students' performance on practicum and work integrated learning placements. It has been suggested that there is an over-reliance on the field supervisor to undertake this form of assessment, although students may be required to submit supporting evidence by way of a portfolio to demonstrate their competences (McNamara, 2013). However, McNamara (2013) calls into question the reliability of this form of assessment. There is very little literature relating to particular issues that may arise in assessing international students on practicum. One exception is a pilot study conducted by Campbell et al (2008) on international pre-service teachers on practicum. These authors question whether current practices used to assess international pre-service teachers placed in Australian schools are 'culturally fair', especially given the challenges faced by EAL students. As noted by these authors, international pre-service teachers are expected 'to complete the field experience successfully on our terms' (Campbell et al. 2008). They further highlight the stress and uncertainty experienced by supervisors in failing international students and point to the need for more research in this area.

Initiatives developed to enhance the field placement experience

Although a number of programs have been developed to assist international students negotiate their learning in the classroom, much less attention has been focused on how students in the social and behavioural sciences can be supported on practicum. There has been little empirical investigation into what determines effective field placement experiences in professional degree programs, although supervisor qualities such as mentoring ability are considered to be important factors (Carless et al., 2012). This is patently an area that warrants further investigation in order to ensure that both domestic and international students optimise their learning in the field.

It is noteworthy that many of the strategies that have been adopted to prepare or support international students on practicum are implemented in an *ad hoc* rather than a planned, systematic and sustainable manner. For example, in an exploratory study on international social work students on field placement, Zunz and Oil (2009) observed that schools adopted variable approaches to assessing students' readiness for practicum. Some schools employed individualised, needs based planning, including advising temporary withdrawal from a program in order to allow students time to develop their English language proficiency. Such an approach is clearly in accord with principles of inclusive education. However, other schools reported that they were expected to place students even if they were assessed as not being ready for practicum.

McCluskey (2012) describes the development of a program at The University of Queensland to support and prepare pre-service students from a non-English speaking background for the practicum. Attendance is voluntary and the program incorporates both practical and emotional support. Similarly in teaching, Campbell et al. (2006) outline a program aimed at promoting the skills and confidence of EAL student teachers prior to their first field practicum. Students identified topics that they wanted addressed in a series of workshops, which included understanding the classroom culture of Australian schools and addressing student behaviour management issues. In evaluating the program, Campbell et al (2006) identified the need to prepare students for practicum early in their studies and link them to other support services. Importantly, they also highlighted the importance of institutional commitment to such programs to ensure their sustainability.

While not directly applicable to the social and behavioural sciences, notable initiatives have been trialled in health programs that focus on preparing international students for clinical placements. These include the development of a model of support and supervision to build international students' resilience in clinical placements as well as enhance clinical supervisors' competence (Nash, 2011). Another promising initiative is a program offered by the Faculty of Health at The University of Newcastle that exposes international students to the clinical environment at an early stage in their studies and makes use of small group learning (Scott et al. 2010). Such programs foreground the importance of adopting a multidimensional and developmental approach to student preparation for practicum.

Although scant attention has been focused on inclusive field education in Australia, the Higher Education Academy in the UK has provided examples of how principles of inclusion may be applied to work-based learning. For example, in social work, identified strategies include: involving all relevant stakeholders in identifying barriers to inclusion; developing criteria for assessing the suitability of placements and sharing this information with placement providers; and involving students in the preparation of pre-placement information to ensure that it addresses their concerns (Morgan & Houghton, 2013). However, it is clear that more conceptual work needs to be done in terms of applying these principles to the needs of international students and translating them into practice.

In summary, this literature review has highlighted specific challenges in relation to sourcing field placements for international students, managing the expectations of field supervisors and ensuring that they are adequately supported to supervise these students. In addition it has highlighted the difficulties international students may face making the transition to the field when they are already contending with the associated demands of adapting to a new country and academic culture. For those students who are EAL speakers, the need to undergo further linguistic socialisation in the workplace is an additional stressor. While some notable initiatives have been developed to assist students negotiate the field practicum, it is equally clear that most of the onus is put on students to change and adapt to the workplace, while minimal expectations have been placed on agencies or schools to address barriers to students' participation and build an inclusive learning environment.

3.3.2 University-based field education staff

In this section, we report on the perspectives of university based academic and professional staff who are responsible for sourcing and coordinating field placements for international students. These participants reflected on their own needs as educators, as well as the needs of the students and their counterparts in the field.

A prominent concern expressed by participants was the limited capacity of placement agencies and schools to host students on practicum. Overwhelmingly, participants reported that the capacity of the field to provide placement experiences for students was limited due to schools and organisations being under pressure to do more with less.

We have to be realistic that, especially in this climate, people are busy. They're overworked and to take on a student where they might have to put in a lot more extra time, we have to acknowledge that there's some limitation to that.
(Participant 5)

Typically, supervisors based in host agencies and schools believed that international students would require significantly more time and effort than domestic students and therefore expressed a reluctance to take international students. This is encapsulated in the following comment:

We find it very difficult in particular teaching areas or combinations of teaching areas to find placements anyway. But when schools learn that they're international [students], it's like "Oh no thanks". (Participant 12)

Of some concern was the observation made by those staff directly involved in sourcing field placements that if a school or agency had one poor experience with an international student, this was likely to deter them from hosting students again in the future.

If they've had a bad experience - then we lose the host. We usually lose a few each year. (Participant 7).

Participants also reported that unfounded assumptions about international students, such as that they would inevitably return to their countries of origin after graduation, worked to restrict the availability of suitable field placements for these students.

I guess you know the myths that float around out there in the placement world about international students. Why would we train [them], why would we invest putting all of our resources in [them] when they're probably just going back home? (Participant 3).

The variability of practicum placements was identified as an issue by a number of participants across psychology, social work and teaching. Participants noted that this variability is compounded by universities' reliance on the goodwill of agencies and schools to provide placements for students. These educators made the observation that professional accreditation and government regulatory bodies are likewise grappling with the issue of practicum quality across these disciplines, and that both teaching and psychology accreditation bodies have outlined strategies to enhance placement quality.

Related to the above, educators were of the view that careful matching of students to the field and to the placement supervisor was necessary and that some professionals were better suited than others to supervising international students due to their attitude, supervision experience and cultural competence. They stressed that more needed to be done to build field supervisors' capacities to provide inclusive practicum through initiatives such as continuing professional development and reward and recognition programs.

A contrasting perspective was, however, offered by a practicum coordinator in tourism, who pointed out that some tourism operators were appreciative of the language skills and 'insider' knowledge of international students.

The students looked at Chinese blogs and websites, and gave advice to these tourism operators on where they should be advertising their products and how they should be trying to get into the Chinese market, which I think is a fabulous thing for the industry. Like, it was really targeting in on their expertise. (Participant 6).

Other issues identified with regard to the field included the organisational culture of the school or agency. For example some agencies were known to be particularly supportive and welcoming of diversity, while others were not. In some instances, a further barrier identified to placing international students was the organisational culture of the agency or school. For example, social work field educators gave examples of how field supervisors had explicitly stated that international students were not suitable to undertake practicums at their agencies. The reasons given by these supervisors seemed to coalesce around purported language and cultural competencies.

In general, the needs of international students as perceived by university staff encompassed the need for enhanced preparation of international students for field placement and the provision of ongoing support for students while on practicum. Most participants advised that they believed that preparation of international students should start as early as possible, with some suggesting that, ideally, this should commence prior to students arriving in Australia. For example:

It's one of the things we do before they even get in the door – talk to them about what they're actually wanting from this program. Because sometimes, if you don't have that discussion, they're actually on the wrong track. They might have a completely warped idea of what social work is...If we can have that conversation while they're still back in their country, we will, but often that's not possible. (Participant 2)

In addition to early preparation, most participants were of the opinion that preparation for field placement should be integrated into degree programs, rather than conducted as a 'one off' activity prior to students entering the field. This need for early and ongoing preparation is reflected in the two comments below:

My thought would be that with placement, altogether across the board, that we

need from the moment they walk in here to get them thinking about it.
(Participant 6)

Most definitely I believe that it [preparation for practicum] needs to be an ongoing thing...you know, you get a little bit in first year, you get a little bit in second year, and then by third year. (Participant 7)

Early exposure to the field via initiatives such as agency or school visits was viewed as a useful way of preparing students for practicum. Some educators advised that they encouraged students to undertake volunteering or paid work to develop their workplace and language skills in preparation for the practicum. However, it was also acknowledged that many international students are 'time poor' and already overwhelmed by the dual challenges of adapting to a new country and new learning culture, especially if they are enrolled in accelerated Master level degrees. For example:

When you've got a student who has just arrived in the country, and they've, you know, got all that resettling, it's difficult, it's a really big thing. (Participant 2).

Participants also reported that, in their experience, a staged approach to learning on practicum is most beneficial. For example, some educators outlined program structures, such as the Bachelor of Education, in which students have the opportunity to undertake brief observational placement experiences, which subsequently build up over the course of the program, to students assuming responsibility for teaching classes. Educators, however, expressed some concern about the structure and associated timeframes of accelerated graduate programs in which international students are predominantly enrolled. In particular, they noted that students were expected to rapidly acquire the requisite knowledge and skills to successfully undertake practicum while developing their English language abilities, with some programs requiring students to commence placement within a few weeks of arrival in the country. Program directors worked to restructure programs for international students on an individual basis where required, but noted that their capacity to do so was restricted by the accreditation processes of regulating bodies, as well as visa requirements and financial considerations for students.

Lack of proficiency in English was identified by the majority of participants as being the major issue facing international students undertaking practicum. They saw this issue as one that impacted on nearly all areas of students' functioning and wellbeing. It was also nominated as an issue that could sway agencies not to take students on placement, especially if the student had to first attend a pre-placement interview. For example, one social work placement coordinator gave examples of the type of feedback she has received from agencies in relation to EAL students:

They [international students] are too hard, they take too much time, we can't trust them with clients, they can't speak the language - the issue seems to be...primarily around language and also about written ability depending on the agency.
(Participant 10)

Participants suggested that international students required ongoing structured support while on placement. Along with language support, a variety of other types of support were identified, including support groups, peer mentoring and increased use of field liaison visits.

One participant, who had formerly been an international student, stressed the diversity of international students and the importance of not losing sight of their individual learning needs. In her current role as an educator, she expressed ambivalence around the concept of inclusivity and identifying international students as a distinct group. Instead, she emphasised the importance of developing a learning culture within organisations where all students are invited to join a 'community of practitioners' and are provided with opportunities for participation.

A good placement as we say, that's sort of almost like being invited into the profession. Like you get a sense that the students feel that there is this community of practitioners helping to educate [them]...So I think that sort of organisation or learning culture – that needs to be inclusive – I guess the other one is actual participation [and] having access to professional activities. (Participant 3).

The outcomes of placement were also highlighted as an issue by some participants, including the complexities with regard to assessing international students' performance. Practicum coordinators noted that they played a critical role in assisting field supervisors to resolve any difficulties on placement, including issues around assessment.

With regard to their own needs, university staff indicated that they required further continuing professional development in how to better support international students. They also indicated that they required enhanced structural organisational support and resourcing from their respective employers, particularly in terms of recognition of the increasing support needs of international students, as well the need to better support the field to host international students.

3.3.3 Field supervisors

Notably, all field supervisors interviewed had agreed to host an international student at their respective agencies and expressed a willingness to talk about their experiences. However, their views are not necessarily representative of field supervisors from agencies or schools that express reluctance to host international students, which was highlighted as a factor contributing to the difficulties faced by university staff in sourcing quality placements for these students.

Most field supervisors were able to identify the contributions that international students made to their agencies, such as offering a different perspective on an issue informed by the student's own cultural lens. Alternatively, some supervisors expressed admiration for those students who were EAL speakers, acknowledging how hard it was to learn a second language. However, conversation generally focused on concerns and challenges that arose during the practicum and how they sought to address these issues with students. Generally, these issues related to students' English language proficiency and limited sociocultural understanding of the agency or school context.

Specifically, field supervisors discussed international students' lack of confidence and/or difficulties in using the English language in the practice context. These issues related to students' ability to understand jargon in the workplace, colloquialisms and a diverse range of accents. It was further pointed out that international students sometimes lacked the sophisticated repertoire of communication skills required in potentially stressful situations and contexts, such as child protection. As a result, some supervisors were reluctant to expose international students to situations in which clients may be hostile and therefore 'protected' them from potentially distressing encounters. Other supervisors tailored experiences as much as they could to suit international students' learning needs, while one supervisor stated that she exposed students to the full range of experiences with the belief that they would not learn otherwise.

A common observation was that students were often underprepared for placement. Specifically, supervisors commented that students often did not have a clear understanding of how to interact within the workplace environment. In addition, they expected that students would take the initiative for their learning and ask for guidance when required. Other observations were that students often did not have a working knowledge of the Australian service delivery environment in which their agency was located. Most believed, however, that given more time, international students could gain the requisite knowledge.

Two supervisors spoke at length about the difficulties and stress associated with 'failing' international students on practicum, especially given these students' significant personal and financial investment in their education. In addition, they highlighted the additional

effort and time they put into trying to assist these students. These supervisors reflected on possible reasons why these students were not able to perform at the expected level, at various times speculating whether it was a 'language problem', a lack of understanding of the nature of the work, or the personal disposition of the student.

Field supervisors also discussed the organisational culture of their organisations and how students were viewed within the organisation as a whole. Most participants positively commented on the support given to both them as supervisors and the students by their co-workers, making the placement a shared undertaking. However, a small number of supervisors discussed needing to manage the expectations of their colleagues, some of who expressed apprehension about taking an international student.

3.4 Summary and conclusions

The findings from this needs analysis suggest that there is a sizable gap between 'what is' and 'what should be' in terms of ensuring that international students receive a fair go in the field. At the same time, it has identified some promising initiatives implemented at the local level to enhance international students' learning experiences while on practicum. Despite a wide variety of programs and field placement environments, it is possible to discern a number of key needs that are common across this diversity. These are summarised below.

- Any intervention aimed at providing inclusive field education for international students needs to be multidimensional and cognisant of the needs of all key stakeholders, including professional registration and accreditation bodies.
- Initiatives developed to support international students need to be context-based and developmental to take account of the typical phases of the student trajectory, ideally commencing at pre-arrival and continuing throughout the student's studies.
- Any interventions offered within the university to support international students need to be structural, sustainable and integrated into professional programs rather than offered as 'add-ons' or provided on an *ad hoc* basis.
- Field placement agencies and schools need to be supported to develop greater capacity to host international students.
- English language proficiency and communicative competence need to be embedded into the curriculum in both the classroom and the field.
- The common needs of international students on the basis of their non-citizen status need to be acknowledged, without losing sight of the needs of individual students.
- International students should be consulted and actively involved in any initiatives aimed at promoting inclusive field education.
- A community of practice framework should be used to enhance understanding of how international students are socialised into and learn in the workplace.

These issues are further expanded upon in section four, which presents a model of inclusive field education based on a set of core principles.

4.0 Model for inclusive field education

4.1 Introduction

The model for inclusive field education developed by the project team comprises a set of core principles that have broad applicability across the social and behavioural sciences. Facilitating equitable access to field placements and building placement capacity is considered to be a key principle of inclusive field education. In order to translate this principle into practice, ***institutional commitment to inclusive field education*** is crucial. In other words, a commitment to inclusive field education is an overarching principle that needs to be endorsed at the institutional level before it is possible to successfully implement any other core principles of inclusive field education. This is represented diagrammatically in figure one below, which identifies eight core principles of inclusive field education that are underpinned by an institutional commitment to inclusion.

A more in depth discussion of each principle follows. However, it should be noted that the way in which these principles will be translated into practice will vary according to context, need and local conditions. Given the diversity of models of field education employed in higher education across different social science disciplines, it is clearly not feasible or desirable to employ a 'one size fits all' model of inclusive field education. Accordingly, how these principles are enacted in practice will of necessity be context-specific.

4.2 Principles of inclusive field education

4.2.1 Institutional commitment to inclusive field education


Institutional commitment to inclusion is a prerequisite to the enactment of any of the other core principles of inclusive field education. It serves as an overarching core principle that recognises the importance of embedding inclusion at the institutional level in such a way that it permeates all aspects of higher education institutional life. In order to do this it is first necessary to develop and promote a shared understanding of inclusive field education.

The preceding needs analysis highlighted how interventions aimed at making field education inclusive need to be structural, sustainable and integrated into professional programs. This necessitates active leadership and the recognition that both resources and dedicated staff time are needed to build and maintain placement capacity in the field. In addition, institutional commitment to all of the following core principles is necessary to make inclusive field education a reality for international students.

4.2.2 Ensure equitable access to field education/build placement capacity

In essence, field education involves a collaborative partnership between the university and the field based placement agency. Notably, many HEIs rely on the goodwill of placement agencies to host students on field practicums. These host agencies carry considerable responsibility for ensuring a quality learning experience for students and overseeing their general wellbeing. HEIs need to be proactive in maintaining good working relationships with both management and supervisory staff in these organisations in order to ensure the continuation of this goodwill. In addition, they need to work with placement agencies and foster university-industry partnerships to build placement capacity.

Figure 1: The overarching and core principles of inclusive field education



While a level playing field does not automatically guarantee a quality learning experience in the field, it is a prerequisite for the realisation of the other core principles of inclusive field education identified in figure one. HEIs need to take the initiative in addressing barriers such as workplace discrimination that prevent international students from accessing and participating in meaningful learning in the field. As reported in the preceding needs analysis, university based staff responsible for sourcing field placements report considerable resistance on the part of some organisations to taking international students. In order to facilitate equitable access to workplace learning placements, it is necessary to identify and address the concerns of field based staff about hosting international students. Some of these concerns relate to the expectation that international students will require more intensive supervision than domestic students or that their language skills will not be adequate for the job. Addressing these issues may necessitate the provision of additional assistance to students and their supervisors while on placement.

At other times, however, this resistance may be indicative of prejudicial attitudes that will require a more targeted response to raising consciousness of workplace discrimination and institutional barriers to promoting inclusive workplaces for international students. Despite the existence of diversity and equity policies in most workplaces, on occasion there is a disconnect between these policies and what happens to international students in practice. In these instances, it may be necessary to devise strategies to address the deficit view of international students that has taken hold in some workplaces and contributes to their reluctance to host these students.

4.2.3 Normalise and affirm international student presence

International students are well represented in higher education in Australia, constituting approximately 21% of current student enrolments. However, it is not clear that these demographics are fully appreciated by agencies, businesses and schools that host students on field placements. Rather than seeing international students as the exception, placement providers need to be made aware that internationalisation is core business of many HEIs in Australia and that this trend is likely to continue. Webb (2005, p. 114) refers to the need to normalise the internationalisation of the curriculum, which should logically extend to field education. In view of this, it is incumbent upon university staff responsible for implementing the internationalisation agenda to develop a vision for how this agenda can be extended to the field.

One way of affirming the presence of international students is to raise the awareness of placement agencies of the contributions that these students can make to the workplace. Some workplaces do recognise the positive contributions made by international students, so it may be possible to elicit the support of these agencies in such awareness raising campaigns. International students and graduates themselves can also play a part in such awareness raising activities by showcasing their work and achievements while on practicum.

4.2.4 Adopt a coordinated, multipronged approach to field education that is inclusive of all stakeholders

There are multiple stakeholders involved in field education: university based staff who source and facilitate field placements; field based professional staff who supervise students; professional accreditation bodies; and the students themselves. Each stakeholder plays a crucial role in the student's learning experience on field placement. University based field education staff are responsible for placing students and monitoring their placements. The field supervisor plays a critical role in supporting the learning of students on placement and overseeing their day to day work. Professional accreditation bodies, on the other hand, have a more indirect role in the student's experience by specifying what form field education should take and what learning should take place in the field. It is important to recognise the different agendas of these stakeholders, as well as possible tensions in these relationships.

In order to ensure that field education is inclusive, it is necessary to engage all stakeholders in the process. Moreover, it is important to involve all stakeholders in planning and reviewing initiatives aimed at promoting inclusive field education, such as building placement capacity. Without ensuring a coordinated approach, it is unlikely that any initiatives undertaken will be sustainable.

In the past, most initiatives aimed at enhancing students' learning on field placement have tended to primarily focus on student preparation. The covert if not overt aim of many of these preparation programs is to assist students integrate or 'fit in' with the placement agency, which is somewhat at odds with the ethos of inclusive education. It is equally important to raise the awareness of agency based supervisory staff of the particular needs of international students without problematising these students as a group. In addition to preparing and supporting agency based supervisors, professional bodies need to be alerted to the issues faced by international students on field placements. In this way, it may be possible for all key stakeholders to reflect on what they could do differently to ensure an inclusive practicum experience for students.

4.2.5 Employ a developmental approach to preparing students for field practicum that targets critical stages of the student trajectory

The recognition that there are critical stages in the student's learning trajectory underpins this principle. In order to better prepare students for the field practicum and enhance their work readiness, a developmental approach needs to be adopted that begins prior to the student leaving home, continues throughout the student's studies, and encompasses planning for the student's exit from the degree.

This preparation needs to commence at the point of pre-departure. Students may not be familiar with the idea of field education or alternatively have preconceived ideas about what the field placement entails. At this point it is important to provide clear information about the field component of study and dispel any myths that students may hold about practicum. In this regard, international students who have completed field placements can be useful sources of information because of their 'insider perspective' on life in the field. In addition, they are likely to be able to offer practical hints on how to better prepare for the practicum, including what sorts of clothes to bring or what prior preparation students should do before leaving the country. These are pertinent concerns for students who arrive in the country with no or minimal knowledge of the local workplace culture.

Other critical stages in the student learning trajectory are the first semester of study and the first field placement. Students enrolled in professional degrees and programs that incorporate work integrated learning are likely to require more intensive targeted input and support at the front end of their educational experience. For professional degrees with two or more field placements, it is commonly the first entry into the field that elicits the most anxiety for students. The difficulties experienced by international students in breaking into informal workplace cultures, their lack of general 'knowhow' about how to act in the workplace, and the extra time taken by many students to integrate and apply information have been noted by field education staff and students alike. Accordingly, preparation for first field placement must commence early in the student's studies. Along with the provision of information, agency visits and offering students the opportunity to shadow workers are other strategies that can be employed to enhance readiness for field placement.

Preparation for the field needs to focus not just on the practical aspects of managing practicum but also promoting students' general wellbeing and assisting them to develop coping skills in the workplace. Field placements can be stressful and, given that international students already contend with multiple pressures and demands as new migrants, a holistic approach needs to be taken to placement preparation.

In order to ensure students' work readiness, prior to graduation the focus of preparation needs to move to making the transition to the workforce. This preparation could include, for example, practical input on writing job applications, addressing selection criteria and managing job interviews, as well as providing opportunities for students to network with employers. Assisting international students make these workplace connections is important given that many of them are likely to seek employment in Australia after graduation.

4.2.6 Recognise students' ascribed status as international students while acknowledging their individuality

The heterogeneity of international students is an important consideration in planning strategies for enhancing inclusive teaching and learning in the field. Using 'international student' as an analytic category hosts its own dangers in terms of overlooking the complexity of student identity. The status of international student cannot be considered in isolation from each student's multiple and intersecting identities. Social divisions do not play out independently of each other in day to day life and it may be the case that a student's gender, age, race, ethnicity, language ability, (dis)ability and/or social location all come to

the fore at different times. Moreover, it is the intersection of these identity markers that contribute to how students are perceived and received in the field, which in turn shapes their qualitatively different experiences on field placement.

From a student perspective, it is important to recognise individuality rather than difference (Hockings, 2010). At times, however, it is important to acknowledge the implications of the ascribed status of 'international student'. Students who hold this status are not accorded the same rights and entitlements as domestic students by virtue of being deemed non-citizens. (Robertson, 2011). In this regard, ensuring an inclusive learning experience for international students may require educators to advocate for the recognition of these students' rights (Marginson, 2012). In addition, international students pay significantly higher fees than domestic students and, on this basis, have made a greater investment in their education. Notably, some students have questioned where their student fees are going when they are based primarily in the field and do not attend classes (Harrison and Melville, 2012). In this regard, greater transparency around the expenditure of student fees may be necessary to instil greater confidence in the motives of HEIs.

4.2.7 Promote students' meaningful participation in communities of practice

The community of practice framework offers a useful way of thinking about how international students learn in the workplace as well as how they are socialised into such a community. It also provides a lens for examining how students gain entry into the workplace and move from peripheral to core membership of a community of practice. Notably, learning is only meaningful when students are given permission to participate in the community of practice and are granted legitimacy as potential members (Arkoudis et al. 2012). For some international students, their attempts to gain entry and be accepted into a community of practice may be thwarted by established members of the community such as other workers.

In addition to focusing on the student trajectory, it is equally important to understand how established members of the community, such as workplace based supervisors, see their role in relation to newcomers (students). Although universities are now internationalised and staff are encouraged to adopt a global outlook, as mentioned earlier, it is not clear how the internationalisation agenda translates to the field practicum. It would appear that some supervisors adopt a local rather than a global perspective on field education, such as when they express resistance to taking international students because they are not planning to stay in Australia. Accordingly, in order to promote students' meaningful participation in the workplace, it may be necessary to focus on assisting these workers develop a more global outlook on field education. Ryan (2011) suggests that inclusive communities of practice can be built via a transcultural approach that explicitly acknowledges the mutual learning that occurs between staff and international students. This approach could equally have applicability for the field. An alternative approach proposed by McCluskey et al (2008) involves the use of workplace based mentors who have developed a sense of 'worldliness' to mentor students in their trajectory from legitimate peripheral participants into and across the community of practice. Such initiatives will also necessitate HEIs making the resources available for the professional development of workplace staff.

4.2.8 Embed language and communicative competence into the curriculum in both the classroom and the field

A sizeable number of international students use English as an additional or second language. The language proficiency of international students who use English as an additional language has been raised as a significant concern by educators and students alike in both the classroom and the field. Some students have reported experiences of 'subtle unstated discrimination' on the basis of their perceived fluency in English when seeking work placements (Sawir, 2008). Upon arriving in Australia many of these students discover that

their English is seen in a deficit light. These students require opportunities to build on their English language skills within their particular disciplinary context (Arkoudis et al., 2012).

Professional degrees in the social and behavioural sciences such as social work, teaching and psychology are linguistically demanding and require the sophisticated use of language. These occupations are highly 'talk dependent' and the forms of assessment employed in these professional programs reflect the importance placed on communicative competence. English language proficiency is an influential factor in educational and employment outcomes. International graduates who have limited English proficiency have diminished prospects for finding work in their professional field (Arkoudis et al., 2012). In recognition of the crucial importance of English language proficiency, HEIs need to tailor language assistance to ensure that students have the communication and language skills necessary for work-based placements. This in turn will assist in improving graduates' workplace readiness.

Equally important, however, is the need to sensitise field supervisors to the challenges faced by students who speak English as an additional language, and to highlight the ways in which they may use English differently to a native speaker. The myth of a standard language still holds sway in Australia despite the fact that linguists recognise the presence of multiple varieties of English. These different varieties of English reflect local patterns of usage but are commonly seen as deficient rather than different (Lippi-Green, 2012).

4.2.9 Involve international students in consultation, planning and monitoring of initiatives

In line with student-centred learning, it is important to consult with students about their learning needs and actively involve them in planning and reviewing initiatives aimed at promoting inclusive field education. International students need to be viewed as active agents who are knowledgeable authorities on their own learning. In particular, those students who have completed field placements are a rich source of knowledge regarding the qualitative experience of field education.

On a local level, practical strategies that could be employed could include inviting international students and/or graduates onto reference groups to plan and oversee local initiatives. These students/graduates could also act as consultants in translating the principles of inclusive field education into practice. It is also important to recognise that international students have on occasion assumed the role of activist citizens (Robertson, 2011). In this regard, international student groups such as the National Liaison Committee for International Students (NCLIS) are other potential partners whose support could be elicited in the pursuit of inclusive field education.

4.2.10 Summary and future directions

The preceding discussion has identified eight core principles of inclusive field education that are underpinned by the overarching principle of institutional commitment to inclusion. Given the variety of models of field education used in higher education, how these principles are translated into practice will depend on the institutional, disciplinary and local context in which they are enacted. In recognition of the need to test and, if necessary, refine these principles, it will be necessary to conduct further research into their applicability to the different field education models used in the social and behavioural sciences. Such an investigation should involve all relevant stakeholders, including students, university based field education staff, placement supervisors, regulatory bodies and professional associations.

5.0 Evaluation of the Model

A meeting of the reference group was convened in August 2013 to seek feedback on the principles developed for the model of inclusive field education. All members were sent a copy of the draft needs analysis and the principles prior to the meeting. Those members who were not able to attend the meeting were invited to submit written feedback.

The reference group was presented with a list of questions to consider in relation to the applicability and utility of the model. These questions are reproduced below.

- Do these principles make immediate sense or do they need further explanation?
- How do these principles fit with your knowledge and experience? Do they have application in your context?
- Are there any obvious gaps not covered by the nine core principles? If so, what are they?
- If we were to undertake further research through a larger grant, do you have any suggestions for how we could test/research the application of these principles in your context?
- Any other comments/observations?

Members of the reference group endorsed the principles in general, but also raised several issues that they believed required further elaboration or explanation. These issues are summarised below along with how they were addressed in the revised model.

- Some reference group members highlighted the dilemma of identifying international students as a separate group and drawing attention to 'difference' when contemporary understandings of inclusive education stress its application to all students. In order to address this concern, principle six was expanded on to reiterate the importance of seeing students as individuals while recognising how the ascribed status of 'international student' can shape their lives and learning experiences.
- One member, an international student, questioned whether the principles gave sufficient attention to 'the psychological and emotional status of international students on field placement' and focused too much on practical concerns. This student reported that practicum can provoke anxiety and even depression in some students because they are worried about their language and lack of understanding of the culture and organisational context. The project team recognises that this is an important point. In Australia, increasing numbers of international students are presenting to student support services with mental health related concerns. Accordingly, principle five, which focuses on critical stages of the student trajectory, was developed further to encompass both practical preparation and support for students' emotional wellbeing.
- The importance of involving all stakeholders in initiatives such as building placement capacity and fostering communities of practice was stressed. This point was built into principle four which highlights the need for a multi-pronged coordinated approach to inclusive field education.

Other members of the reference group provided suggestions for further research, which are identified in the plan for intervention outlined in the following section.

6.0 A Plan for Intervention – Where to From Here?

6.1 Key parameters

Findings from this seed project suggest that substantial intervention is required in order to ensure that international students who undertake field practicums receive a 'fair go in the field'. Along with the need for further research on different stakeholders' perspectives on how inclusiveness translates to the field, there is also a need to investigate how the core principles identified in the model of inclusive field education translate into practice in discipline specific contexts. The findings suggest that building placement capacity is an overriding priority given the concerns raised by university field education staff about the difficulties they encounter placing international students. As reported by Patrick et al (2008) in an ALTC funded study that has clear synergies with this project, demand for field placements often exceeds supply. This is an issue that affects both domestic and international students alike. However, international students may also have to contend with a reluctance on the part of some agencies to host them, especially if they are EAL speakers or lack the cultural capital that will allow them to make a smooth transition to the field.

The needs analysis has revealed that to be effective, any intervention aimed at ensuring that international students are adequately prepared for practicum will need to take a developmental approach across the student life cycle. This preparation needs to commence pre-departure, beginning with information provision at the recruitment stage while students are still in their home country. After arrival in Australia, further preparation needs to occur prior to the first practicum and continue during the practicum, culminating in post-placement consolidation of knowledge and input on making the transition to the workforce. International students who have successfully completed field placement could potentially contribute to this preparation through sharing their own experiences with new students. Alternatively, they could act as consultants in developing student-focused resources for incoming students.

Another critical finding from this project is the need for a coordinated, multi-pronged approach to inclusive field education which includes the full range of stakeholders. Apart from the students themselves, these stakeholders include recruitment agencies and faculty administrative staff who are in the position to shape expectations regarding field education before students arrive, course coordinators/program convenors on campus, field education units on campus, field supervisors and their organisational environments, and accreditation bodies.

Finally, the needs analysis indicates that any intervention developed to promote inclusive field education should be informed by a number of core principles. That is, it should foster a strong institutional commitment to inclusion and promote equitable access; normalise and affirm international students' presence; take a multi-pronged, developmental, and individualised approach; foster participation in communities of practice (CoPs); provide opportunities for developing language and communicative competence; and involve international students as knowledgeable authorities on their own learning.

While the needs analysis lends weight to the conclusions regarding the importance of these core principles, it is important to acknowledge the limitations of the seed project in designing an intervention. First, the project drew on a small pool of participants, who were drawn from one geographic region, south-east Queensland. Second, the project focused mainly on the challenges associated with field education for international students. While the views of stakeholders were sought on 'what works well' with international students on practicum, there is a need to further investigate effective or promising practices across a broader terrain. In conjunction with what is known from the literature, this is vital information which should inform future interventions. Third, it is not yet possible to know what approaches would be considered the most effective for the different stakeholders in

field education as well as what is 'doable'. For example, professional and accreditation bodies often stipulate conditions and standards for field practicum, so they would need to be consulted in order to ascertain the parameters of any interventions undertaken to build inclusive field placements.

6.2 A phased approach

In recognition of these factors, a two phase intervention is proposed. In phase one, we will seek more extensive feedback across selected Australian universities regarding the nine principles, current good practices and the possibilities and limitations of embedded versus co-curricular intervention. This will be followed by the trialling, evaluation, refinement and dissemination of resources in phase two.

Phase One:

The following three questions will guide the first phase of the project.

1. Are the core principles developed from this Seed Project applicable more widely across regions, types of universities, and disciplines in Australia?
2. What examples are there of good practice occurring in particular disciplines, sites and stakeholder groups that might be adopted or adapted in other contexts?
3. What are the pros and cons of embedded and co-curricular approaches, as perceived by stakeholder groups within different disciplines?

These questions will be explored through a survey and interviews conducted with representatives from all stakeholder groups in selected regions around Australia. The findings from phase one will then be used to refine the intervention in the second phase of the project.

Phase Two:

The aims of this second phase are to: first, raise awareness of the need for interventions which will make field education inclusive for international students in the social and behavioural science disciplines; and second, to build the capacity of all stakeholder groups to address the challenges international students currently face in field placements. Informed by further research in phase one, this intervention will be multi-pronged and multi-staged. It will develop, trial, evaluate and disseminate information, guidelines, and teaching and learning resources that target each of the stakeholder groups identified above as appropriate. When developing these resources, consideration will also be given to the four critical stages of the international student life cycle as it relates to field education: pre-arrival in Australia, and pre-, during and post-field placement. The project team will also actively seek the involvement of international students and/or graduates in conducting both phases of the project, inviting them to act as consultants to the team.

6.3 Dissemination and communication of project activities

Dissemination activities to date have included both information provision and interactive forums to build awareness of the project and engage potential users in the uptake of the model. These activities are outlined below.

- The project leader facilitated a workshop entitled *Supervising International Students: Issues, Complexities and Learnings*, which was based on the needs analysis from the project. Participants included university based field education staff from The University of Queensland, Queensland Institute of Technology and Griffith

University, as well as Brisbane based social work field educators.

- The project leader worked with a member of the reference group, Mr Mark Cleaver, to provide input on the issues faced by international students on practicum for an interactive panel discussion on field education at the Australian Association of Social Workers (AASW) 2013 National Symposium in Melbourne.
- One article has been published in an international peer reviewed journal: Harrison, G. & Ip, R. (2013). Extending the terrain of inclusive education in the classroom to the field: International students on placement. *Social Work Education*, 32(2), 230-243.
- A further conceptual paper on inclusive field education has been drafted for submission to a peer-reviewed journal. The project team are currently developing two other papers based on the findings from the needs analysis and the model.

In addition to the above activities, presentations on different stages of the project have been made to members of the reference group, who in turn have communicated these project activities to their respective work-based teams and colleagues. Dissemination activities will continue throughout 2014, focusing specifically on disseminating the model via professional and institutional networks as well as other relevant communities of practice.

References

- Arkoudis, S., Baik, C., and Richardson, S. (2012). *English language standards in higher education: From entry to exit*. Camberwell: Acer Press.
- Altschuld, J.W., and Kumar, D.D. (2010). *Needs assessment: An overview*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Arkin, N. (1999). Culturally sensitive student supervision: Difficulties and challenges. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 18(2), 1-16.
- Australian Association of Social Workers (2012). *Australian social work education and accreditation standards*. Canberra: Australian Association of Social Workers.
- Australian Education International. (2010). *International graduate outcomes and employer perceptions*. Canberra: Australian Government.
- Australian Federation of International Students (AFIS) (2010). *International students advocacy paper: Social inclusion and international students*. Retrieved from: http://www.proceedings.com.au/isana/docs/2010/paper_noor.pdf
- Baird, B. (2010). *Stronger, simpler, smarter ESOS: Supporting international students: Final Report*. Canberra: Australian Government.
- Benzie, H. (2010). Graduating as a 'native speaker': International students and English language proficiency in higher education'. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 29(4), 447-459.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In Richardson, J.G. (Ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood Press.
- Brown, L. (2008). The incidence of study-related stress in international students in the initial stage of the international sojourn. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 12(1), 5-28.
- Brown, L., & Holloway, I. (2008). The initial stage of the international sojourn: Excitement or culture shock? *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 36(1), 33-49.
- Brown, L., & Jones, I. (2013). Encounters with racism and the international student experience. *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(7), 1004-1019.
- Campbell, M., O'Gorman, L., Tangen, D., Spooner-Lane, R., & Alford, J. (2008). Issues in assessing international pre-service teachers during the field experience: A pilot study. In *Proceedings Australian Association for Research in Education (AARE) 2008*, Brisbane.
- Campbell, M., Tangen, D., & Spooner-Lane, R. (2006). A program for preparing ethnic minority student teachers for practicum. *International Journal of Practical Experiences in Professional Education*, 9(2), 1-10.
- Carless, S. A., Robertson, K., Willy, J., Hart, M., & Chea, S. (2012). Successful postgraduate placement experiences: What is the influence of job and supervisor characteristics? *Australian Psychologist*, 47, 156-164.
- Caruana, V. (2010). The challenges and opportunities of diversity in university settings. *Assessment, Teaching and Learning Journal*, 11, 50-67.
- Chalmers, D., & Volet, S. (1997). Common misconceptions about students from South-East Asia studying in Australia. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 16(1), 87-98.
- Equality Challenge Unit (2010). *Internationalisation and Equality and Diversity in Higher Education* Briefing March 2011. Retrieved from <http://www.ecu.ac.uk/publications>
- Forbes-Mewett, H. (2011). International education preparation: Minimising risk and furthering security. *International Journal of Contemporary Sociology*, 48(1), 61-93.

- Forbes-Mewett, H., & Sawyer, A. (2011). *Mental health issues amongst international students in Australia: Perspectives from professionals at the coal-face*. The Australian Sociological Association Conference Local Lives/Global Networks, The University of Newcastle, November 29 -December 2. Retrieved from <http://www.campusreview.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/Mental-Health-Issues-among-International-Students-in-Australia.pdf>
- Gribble, C., Blackmore, J., Farrell, L., Devlon, M., Arber, R., & Rahimi, M. (2012). Work barriers block international students. *Campus Review*, 29 May, 13.
- Gursansky, D., & Le Sueur, E. (2012). Conceptualising field education in the twenty-first century: Contradictions, challenges and opportunities. *Social Work Education*, 31(7), 914-931.
- Han, J. (2005). 'World English speaking' student-teachers' entry into the education profession: The practicum as a stimulus to metamorphosis. Paper presented at the 2005 International Education Research Conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Sydney.
- Harrison, G., & Ip, R. (2013). Extending the terrain of inclusive education in the classroom to the field: International students on placement. *Social Work Education: The International Journal*, 32(2), 230-243.
- Harrison, G., & Melville, R. (2012) How inclusive is field education? International students on placement. Paper presented at the Australian Association of Social Work and Welfare Educators (AASWWE) Symposium. 'Cultural diversity: Social work and human Services education working with difference'. University of South Australia, Adelaide, 27-28 September.
- Hartley, B. (2003). Just return for dedicated investment: Internationalisation, Japanese language teacher education, and student expectations' in A. Liddicoat, S. Eisenclas & S. Trevaskes (Eds.) *Australian Perspectives on Internationalising Education*, (pp. 53-64). Melbourne: Language Australia.
- Hockings, C. (2010). *Inclusive learning and teaching in higher education: A synthesis of research*. EvidenceNet. Retrieved from www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/documents/inclusion/wp/inclusive_teaching_and_learning_in_he.doc
- International Education Advisory Council (2013) *Australia - educating globally: Advice from the International Education Advisory Council*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia. Retrieved from www.aei.gov.au
- Jeong, S.Y., Hickey, N., Levett-Jones, T., Pitt, V., Hoffman, K., Norton, C.A., & Ohr, S.E. (2011). Understanding and enhancing the learning experiences of culturally and linguistically diverse nursing students in an Australian bachelor of nursing program. *Nurse Education Today*, 31, 238-244.
- Judd, S. (2012). Housing and international student experience. Paper presented at the Australian International Education Conference: International Education in the Asian Century. Melbourne, Australia: Retrieved from www.aiec.idp.com/pdf/2102_judd_Fri_1235_220_paper.pdf
- Kato, K. (1998). Classroom communication by Japanese native speaker and English native speaker teachers. Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education conference. Adelaide, South Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.aare.edu.au/98pap/kat98361.htm>
- Kelly, P., & Moogan, Y. (2012). Culture shock and higher education performance: Implications for teaching. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 66(1), 24-46.

- Lawson, L. (2012). *Student voices: Enhancing the experience of international students in Australia*, Canberra: Australian Education International. Retrieved from <https://aei.gov.au/research/Publications/Documents/Student%20voices%20-%20FINAL.pdf>
- Leask, B., & Carroll, J. (2011). Moving beyond 'wishing and hoping': internationalisation and student experiences of inclusion and engagement. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 30(5), 647-659.
- Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent: Language, ideology and discrimination in the United States* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Liu, C. (2012). From language learners to language users: A study of Chinese students in the UK, *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 23(2), 123-143.
- Malau-Aduli, B. (2011). Exploring the experiences and coping strategies of international medical students. *BMC Medical Education*, 11:40. doi:10.1186/1472-6920-11-40
- Marginson, S. (2011). International student well-being: What does the research tell us? *National Summit on the Mental Health of Tertiary Students*. The University of Melbourne, 4-5 August. Retrieved from http://www.cshe.unimelb.edu.au/nationalsummit/Simon_Marginson_paper.pdf
- Marginson, S. (2012). Including the other: Regulation of the human rights of mobile students in nation-bound world. *Higher Education Policy*, 63, 497-512.
- Marginson, S., Nyland, C., Sawir, E., & Forbes-Mewett, H. (2010). *International Student Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCluskey, K. (2008). Working at the edge: Accounts of beginning and novice NESB teachers. Unpublished PhD thesis. Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia.
- McCluskey, K. (2012). The absolute necessity for a working model to support pre-service teachers of a non-English speaking background. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 38(5), 571-584.
- McNamara, J. (2013) The challenge of assessing professional competence in work integrated learning. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(2), 183-197.
- Miller, J. (2009). Teaching with an accent: Linguistically diverse preservice teachers in Australian classrooms. In J. Miller, A. Kostogriz & M. Gearon (Eds.), *Culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms: New dilemmas for teachers* (pp. 36-55). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Morgan, H., & Houghton, A. M. (2013). *Inclusive curriculum design in higher education: Social Policy and Social Work*. The Higher Education Academy. Retrieved from http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/resources/detail/inclusion/Disability/Inclusive_curriculum_design_in_higher_education
- Mori, Y., Inman, A.G., & Caskie, G.I.L. (2009). Supervising international students: Relationship between acculturation, supervisor multicultural competence, cultural discussions, and supervision satisfaction. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 3(1), 10-18.
- Murray, N. (2012). Ten 'good practice principles'...ten key questions: Considerations in addressing the English language needs of higher education students. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 31(2), 233-246.
- Nash, R. (2011). *Promoting resilience and effective workplace functioning in international students in health courses: Final Report 2011*: Australian Learning and Teaching Council. Retrieved from www.olt.gov.au/project-resilience-international-students-health-gut-2009
- National Association of Field Experience Administrators - Victoria. (2011). *Submission to the*

- Productivity Commission Study into the Schools Workforce from the National Association of Field Experience Administrators - Victoria*. Retrieved from [www.pc.gov.au/ data/assets/pdf file/0012/111009/sub001.pdf](http://www.pc.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0012/111009/sub001.pdf)
- Ng, K. M. (2006). Counselor educators' perceptions of and experiences with international students. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling*, 28(1), 1-19.
- Nilsson, J. E., & Anderson, M. Z. (2004). Supervising international students: The role of acculturation, role ambiguity, and multicultural discussions. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 35(3), 306-312.
- Orrell, J. (2011). *Good practice report: Work-integrated learning*. Australian Learning and Teaching Council. Retrieved from [www.olt.gov.au/system/files/resources/GPR Work Integrated Learning Orrell 2011.pdf](http://www.olt.gov.au/system/files/resources/GPR_Work_Integrated_Learning_Orrell_2011.pdf)
- Owen, J. M. (2006). *Program Evaluation: Forms and Approaches*. 3rd edn. Allen and Unwin, Sydney.
- Patrick, C. J., Peach, D., Pocknee, C., Webb, F., Fletcher, M., & Pretto, G. (2008). *The WIL (work integrated learning) report : A national scoping study [Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) Final report]*. Brisbane: QUT. Retrieved from <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/44065/1/WIL-Report-grants-project-jan09.pdf>
- Peterson Armour, M., Bain, B., & Rubio, R. (2004). An evaluation study of diversity training for field instructors: A collaborative approach to enhancing cultural competence. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 40(1), 27-38.
- Psychology Board of Australia (2013). *Guidelines for supervisors and supervisor training providers*. Retrieved from <http://www.psychologyboard.gov.au/Registration/Supervision.aspx>
- Rai, G. S. (2002). Meeting the educational needs of international students: a perspective from US schools. *International Social Work*, 45(1), 21-33.
- Ramia, G., Marginson, S., & Sawar, E. (2013). *Regulating International Students' Wellbeing*. Policy Press, Bristol.
- Roberts, C. (2010). Language socialization in the workplace. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 211-227.
- Robertson, S. (2011). Cash cows, backdoor migrants, or activist citizens? International students, citizenship, and rights in Australia. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 34(12), 2192-2211.
- Rodan, P. (2009). The international student as student, migrant and victim: Changing perceptions in a vexed area of public policy. *Australian Universities Review*, 51(2), 27-31.
- Rosenthal, D. A., Russell, J., & Thomson, G. (2007). Social connectedness among international students at an Australian university. *Social Indicators Research*, 84, 71-82.
- Rosenthal, D. A., Russell, J., & Thomson, G. (2008). The health and wellbeing of international students in an Australian university. *Higher Education*, 55, 51-67.
- Ryan, J. (2010). 'The Chinese learner': Misconceptions and realities. In J. Carroll and G. Slethaug (Eds.), *International Education and the Chinese Learner* (pp. 37-56). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Ryan, J. (2011). Teaching and learning for international students: Towards a transcultural approach. *Teaching and Learning: Theory and Practice*, 17(6), 631-648.
- Santoro, N. (1997). The construction of teacher identity: An analysis of school practicum discourse. *Asia Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 25(1), 91-100.

- Sawir, E. (2005). Language difficulties of international students in Australia: The effects of prior learning experience. *International Education Journal*, 6(5), 567-580.
- Sawir, E. (2008). International students and the English language: How can we move forward? *Campus Review*, 28 January. Retrieved from <http://www.campusreview.com.au>
- Scott, J., Gresham, R., & Dennis, J. (2010). *An orientation program for first year international students in the faculty of health at The University of Newcastle*. Paper presented at the Nuts and Bolts Workshop FYHE Conference. Retrieved from http://fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers10/content/pdf/4E.pdf
- Spong, A., & Kamau, C. (2012). Cross-cultural impression management: A cultural knowledge audit model. *Journal of International Education in Business*, 5(1), 22-36.
- Spooner-Lane, R., Tangen, D., & Campbell, M. A. (2011). The complexities of supporting Asian international pre-service teachers as they undertake practicum. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(1), 79-94.
- Taylor, S., Craft, C., Murray, D., & Rowley, D. (2000). International students in Bachelor of Social Work programs across Australia: A case for special education consideration? *Australian Social Work*, 53(2), 29-36.
- Tran, L. T. (2011). Committed, face-value, hybrid or mutual adaptation? The experiences of international students in Australian higher education. *Educational Review*, 63(1), 79-94.
- Webb, G. (2005). Internationalisation of curriculum: An institutional approach. In J. Carroll & J. Ryan (Eds.), *Teaching International Students: Improving Learning for All*, (pp. 109-118). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Wedding, D., McCartney, J., & Currey, D. (2009). Lessons relevant to psychologists who serve as mentors for international students. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 40(2), 189-193.
- Wheelahan, L., Leahy, M., Fredman, N., Moodie, G., Arkoudis, S., and Bexley, E. (2012). *Missing links: The fragmented relationship between tertiary education and jobs*. Adelaide: NCVER.
- Zhang, J., & Goodson, P. (2011). Predictors of international students' psychosocial adjustment to life in the United States: A systematic review. *International Journal of International Relations*, 35, 139-162.
- Zunz, S. J., & Oil, K. R. (2009). A preliminary look at international students in MSW field placements at nonurban U.S. Campuses. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 45(1), 131-137.

Appendix A: Terms of Reference – Project Reference Group

Reference Group Terms of Reference 3 October 2012

Purpose:

The purpose of the Reference Group is to provide expert advice on key aspects of the research project, “Fair go in the field: Making field education in the social sciences inclusive for international students”. This advice will be provided to the research team and used to inform the process and outcomes of the project.

Functions and authority:

The Reference Group will meet to provide advice on three occasions across Stage 1 of the research project. Its function and authority will be advisory only and decision making authority will be retained by the research project investigators.

Specific advice sought from the Reference Group will include, but not be limited to:

- Identification of key issues for consideration in focus group/interviews;
- Any issues/advice around process of interviews/focus groups;
- Feedback on analysis of data from interviews/focus groups;
- Feedback on model of inclusive field placements for international students.

Frequency of meetings/other participation:

It is envisaged that in Stage 1 of the research project, the Reference Group will meet on three occasions. It is anticipated that there may be some informal communication/advice sought via email/phone outside of the context of these formal meetings.

Proposed membership of reference group:

- International student representatives
- Student support service staff involved in international student support
- University placement coordination representatives across disciplines
- Field placement supervisor representatives across disciplines
- Representative for internationalisation within the university context
- Representative for international student language acquisition

Appendix B: Interview Guide – University Educators

Interview Guide – University Coordination/Placement Staff

Please note: Participants will be briefly asked for demographic information in relation to:

- Approximate numbers of international students placed over the last 3 years; and
 - An indication of the country of origin of these students.
 - Ethnic background and gender of staff member
-

1. Considerable attention has been given in recent years to the idea of inclusive education. What do you think this would look like in the context of field placement/practicum/internship for international students?
2. How do you/your unit assess if international students are ready for placement/practicum/internship?
3. How are students matched to agencies/schools?
4. What sorts of responses have you encountered from the field when sourcing placements/practicums/internships for international students?
5. What sorts of issues/challenges have you managed with respect to international students while on placement/practicum/internship?
6. Is there anything you think could be done better by the university to prepare international students for placement/practicum/internships?
7. Is there anything you think could be done better to support international students while on placement/practicum/internship?
8. Is there anything you think could be done to better support the field to facilitate/host student placements/internships for international students?
9. Can you identify any training/support needs that you may have as placement coordinators, or is there any training that you have already done that was helpful?
10. Is there anything else that you think the research team needs to be aware of?

Appendix C: Interview Guide – Field Supervisors

Interview Guide – Supervisors

Please note: a brief demographic questionnaire will be provided to participants prior to the interview requesting information about:

- How many students supervised overall in the last 3 years
- How many international students supervised in the last 3 years
- Country of origin of students supervised
- Ethnic background of supervisor
- Professional background of supervisor
- Number of years' experience in field
- Professional experience in the field in a country other than Australia
- Number of years' experience in supervising students
- Any cross cultural supervision

-
1. Considerable attention has been given in recent years to the idea of inclusive education. What do you think this would look like in the context of field placement/practicum/internship for international students?
 2. Is there anything in your background/professional interests/skill set that motivates and/or assists you in supervising international students on placement/practicum/internship?
 3. What expectations did you have about international students on placement before hosting your first student?
 4. Were there any unique skills, knowledge and abilities international students brought with them to the placement/practicum/internship?
 5. Have you experienced any challenges in supervising international students? What did you do to manage these?
 6. Does your organization/school do anything additional to assist international students on placement/practicum/internship? Is there anything (more) that you think they could do?
 7. Overall, what has been your experience of supervising international students on placement/internship?
 8. Are there any tips that you think other supervisors who are planning to supervise an international student need to know?

9. Ultimately, we are interested in how we might support supervisors of international students to develop inclusive learning environments on placement/practicum through training and resources. Can you identify any training/support needs that you may have as placement supervisors, or is there any training that you have already done that was helpful?

10. Is there anything else you think the research team needs to know about your experience?

Appendix D: Interview Participants

Table 1 below outlines the discipline areas and roles of university educators who participated in interviews as part of the research project.

Table 1: University educator participants

Participant	University	Role	Program areas
1	University 1	Practicum coordinator	Education
2	University2	Program coordinator	Social Work and Human Services
3	University2	Program coordinator	Social Work and Human Services
4	University1	Program coordinator	Social Science Studies
5	University1	Practicum coordinator	Social Work and Human Services
6	University1	Practicum coordinator	Tourism
7	University1	Practicum coordinator	Tourism
8	University1	Program director	Tourism
9	University1	Program director	Counselling
10	University3	Practicum coordinator	Social Work and Social Sciences
11	University	Practicum unit manager	Education
12	University2	Practicum unit manager	Education
13	University1	Practicum coordinator	Psychology
14	University1	Practicum unit manager	Social Work and Human Services