



Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia, Inc

Engaging Communities

Proceedings of the

31st HERDSA Annual Conference

1-4 July 2008

Rotorua, New Zealand

Vickery, J. & Hunter, J. (2008) Underwriting a quality undergraduate business education by promoting communities of learning, in *Engaging Communities, Proceedings of the 31st HERDSA Annual Conference, Rotorua, 1-4 July 2008: pp 350-360.*

Published 2008 by the
Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia, Inc
PO Box 27, Milperra, NSW 2214, Australia
www.herdsa.org.au

ISSN: 1441 001X
ISBN: 0 908557 73 6

This research paper was reviewed using a double blind peer review process that meets DEEWR requirements. Two reviewers were appointed on the basis of their independence, expertise and experience and received the full paper devoid of the authors' names and institutions in order to ensure objectivity and anonymity. Where substantial differences existed between the two reviewers, a third reviewer was appointed. Papers were evaluated on the basis of originality, quality of academic merit, relevance to the conference theme and the standard of writing/presentation. Following review, this full paper was presented at the international conference.

Copyright© 2008 HERDSA and the authors. Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of research or private study, criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright, Design and Patent Act, 2005, this publication may only be reproduced, stored or transmitted, in any form or by any means, with the prior permission in writing of the publishers, or in the case of reprographic reproduction in accordance with the terms and licenses issued by the copyright Licensing Agency. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside those terms should be sent to the publishers at the address above.

Underwriting a quality undergraduate business education by promoting communities of learning

Jo Vickery

University of New England, Armidale, Australia
jvickery@une.edu.au

James D. Hunter

University of New England, Armidale, Australia
jhunter3@une.edu.au

Reduced funding of business education at Australian universities has prompted managers to look to full-fee paying international students to try and offset funding shortfalls in their operating budgets. This paper explores the impact of increasing numbers of Non English Speaking Background (NESB) students on the quality of, and student receptiveness to, group work. We believe group work is important to an undergraduate business teaching pedagogy in preparing graduates for the challenges of modern workplaces. Student responses to a series of qualitative and quantitative focus group activities highlighted the 'big issues' they are trying to deal with when they encounter diversity while working in groups. Insights provided by these activities established the basis on which we have made some suggestions to nurture and advance a community of learning within a tertiary business education setting.

Keywords: group work, diversity, communication

Introduction

Kilpatrick, Barrett and Jones (2003, p.1) observed that educational theory and practice have moved on from the previous century's preoccupation with the individual as "lone seeker of knowledge" to one that "recognises the contribution of others to every individual's learning". It is a transformation that has promoted the notion of learning communities which aim to strike a balance between individuality and social connectedness (Feldman 2000).

When university learning is conceived of in this way it prompts a line of thought which acknowledges and responds to the interaction and dynamic interplay between a community of academics, a community of students and the wider society within which these stakeholder groups exist. We would argue that it is only when these communities are interacting with each other, sharing and creating knowledge that desired outcomes for graduates, academics and society as a whole ever likely to surface. Worryingly, however, attaining this desired state seems to have been challenged by changes to the policy-setting, funding prioritisation and delivery of higher education services within Australia (Bretag 2003; Bretag 2007; Nelson 2003).

These changes have profoundly impacted the business education offered by Australian universities. The resultant learning environment has been reshaped by a combination of:

1. reduced Commonwealth government funding of business positions in Australian universities (a reduction of \$1,100 per business student was announced in the 2007 Commonwealth Budget Papers);
2. increased budgetary pressure on the resourcing and delivery of business units (Australian Business Deans Council, 2007); and
3. the increased populating of business units with full-fee paying international students who often possess extremely limited English language/comprehension skills (Baas 2007; Comell & Macken 2003; Watty 2007).

These features have created an extremely challenging environment for business educators seeking to adequately resource their units, accommodate the different learning styles and language proficiencies of their students, whilst at the same time preserving important learning experiences that equip students with the appropriate technical, critical and interpersonal skills necessary to succeed in the modern workplace (Dickinson 2000; Jackling 2007; Yamazaki & Kayes 2004).

Context for the research

The particular focus of this paper relates to a second year management unit, undertaken by undergraduate students enrolled predominantly (though not exclusively) in business-related awards at the University of New England (UNE). The unit possessed the following characteristics.

1. Large student numbers (usually between 200 and 240 students enrolled in the unit).
2. Diversity of managerial and organisational experience (ranging from teenage internal students with no experience, through to middle-aged external students holding managerial positions or running their own businesses).
3. Increasing numbers of NESB students who enrol in the unit as a result of UNE's various pathways and alliances.

The nature and practice of management in contemporary organisational contexts demands that students be exposed to authentic learning experiences that emphasise the exploration and practical application of theory and constructs which befit real world contexts (Stein, Isaacs & Andrews 2004). Studying management should therefore equip students with the skills to interact, work in groups, formulate and implement ideas. Students need to recognise they are not simply dealing with the black and white of theories and constructs presented in their textbook, but rather the grey mire of human systems, relationships and idiosyncrasies (University of New England 2007).

A review of the literature points to diverse definitions and approaches to learning with the consistent message being the need to understand the process of learning before effective teaching can occur (Ramsden 2002; Stein, Isaacs & Andrews 2004). The literature suggests that the process of understanding learning has been evolutionary, with many strategies focusing on a movement away from surface learning activities towards

deep learning approaches that generate high quality, well-structured complex outcomes that are synonymous with scenario-based learning (Biggs 1996; Gibbs 1992).

A synthesis of the above contextual factors, amongst other things, points to the importance of incorporating group work into a business teaching pedagogy to prepare students for the challenges they will encounter in real world organisational contexts (Anderson & McMillan 1992). Group work provides:

1. academics with a means of dealing with large student numbers in a comparatively cost effective way (Burdett 2003);
2. students with opportunities to heuristically explore and critically apply management frameworks, theories and constructs presented in lectures to authentic learning situations (Gammie 1995; Stein, Isaacs & Andrews 2004);
3. students with an opportunity to develop and refine interpersonal skills in interacting, negotiating and leading others towards desired outcomes (Yamazaki & Kayes 2004); and
4. students with a forum to forge new networks with people beyond their familiar peers to mirror workplace situations (Dickinson 2000).

Importantly, these factors need to be balanced against the fact that group work can be both emotionally and intellectually challenging as it requires students to participate actively and perform cognitive and social tasks that are new and often difficult (Boswerth & Hamilton 1994). Individuals thrust into such situations need to be given the time, skill and motivation to work through the stages of forming, norming, storming and performing within the group (Mutch 1999). It is highly likely these challenges will be further accentuated for many NESB students (Kember 2007).

Research problem

Group work involving students from NESBs directly impacts on the success of communication within the group and therefore, the performance and satisfaction of the group. Dodd (cited in Engleberg & Wynn 2003) concludes that people judge others by their speech, should be made aware of their prejudices and should be encouraged to look beyond the surface. Students bringing their prejudices to the learning environment can promote negative effect on group process and cause stress and anxiety amongst group members. One way in which individuals will deal with language barriers is to simply ignore the individual. If individuals are ignored they will decrease their participation and negatively influence the quality of future group learning (Napier & Gershenfeld 2004).

Research process

We have adopted a participative action research framework as the means of guiding decisions about how to improve the efficacy of group work in learning situations where there are ever-increasing numbers of NESB students.

Action research is widely recognised as an appropriate method to explore teaching and learning issues (Chadwick 1995). It is a method that allows for breadth in practice and

depth in theoretical insight by adopting a self-reflective spiral of planning, acting, systematic observation and reflection (Altrichter et al, 2002; Altrichter & Posch 1989; Pedler 1997). The particulars of the iterative process we pursued in this study are presented as a series of action research phases in subsequent sections.

Focus groups were identified as an appropriate method of pursuing this action research methodology as this approach represented an efficient and effective means of encouraging a wide-ranging and spontaneous discussion about peoples experiences of group work (Sarantakos 1995, p. 249)

These discussions were loosely framed by a combination of simple survey instruments and semi-structured interviews designed to elicit a deeper level of understanding and explication of the issues raised by participants (Cohen & Manion 1994; Minichiello et al, 1995). Reflecting on student responses to these focus group activities represents an essential catalyst in the transition of actionable knowledge into change (Hillon & Boje 2007)). We promoted this reflective process by keeping a diary that aided us to continually work with the material in a systematic way (Nadin & Cassell 2006)

This paper reports the responses of a sample of 108 (including 28 NESB) internal second year undergraduate business students enrolled in a 2006 general management course. The focus groups were of approximately 30 minutes duration and 'piggy-backed' on a series of tutorial workshops completed by students during the course of the semester. Particulars about the type of focus group activity undertaken, and the responses these activities generated, are reported below as discrete phases in the unfolding study.

Phase 1 of the research

The first issue we wanted to understand was what, in the students' eyes, constituted a positive and negative group experience. This was accomplished by asking focus group participants what they liked about group work, disliked about group work, and whether or not they felt group work was a useful part of their learning experience.

Students generally liked group work, but balanced this receptiveness with their concerns about the potential for social loafing particularly when assessment tasks are incorporated into the group activities. Importantly, however, we noted that (a) these responses did not reflect all participants, largely representing the views of the dominant personalities within the focus group, and (b) there also appeared to be a void in the data concerning the extent and means by which students believe their tutors can promote group process and outcomes. Both of these issues required further investigation and became the focal point for the research conducted during the second phase of focus group activities.

Phase 2 of the research

As a consequence, we used the second phase of the research to elicit responses from *all* participants by asking them to individually identify, from a list derived from the extant literature, the particular issues that best characterise their experiences of positive and negative group work activity. Students were also asked to identify how, in their view,

tutorial staff could work to improve these experiences for them. Table 1 presents a summary display of the survey instrument that students were asked to complete.

Table 1: Survey instrument characterising positive and negative group work experiences

Which of the following aspects of group work did you encounter during a positive experience of group work?	Which of the following aspects of group work did you encounter during a negative experience of group work?
☐ Good communication ☐ A definite leader in the group ☐ Enjoyable tasks ☐ Self-allocated groups ☐ Allocated groups ☐ Large (6-10 people) groups ☐ Small (2-5 people) groups ☐ Like meeting new people ☐ Help from the tutor when needed ☐ Group of friends ☐ Diversity (e.g., gender/age/culture/linguistic) ☐ Assessment of group tasks ☐ Other _____	☐ Poor communication ☐ Problem leader within the group ☐ Unenjoyable tasks ☐ Self-allocated groups ☐ Allocated groups ☐ Large (6-10 people) groups ☐ Small (2-5 people) groups ☐ Dislike meeting new people ☐ No help from the tutor when needed ☐ Group of friends ☐ Diversity (e.g., gender/age/culture/linguistic) ☐ Assessment of group tasks ☐ Other _____
What could tutorial staff have done to improve your group work experiences?	

The top four positive and negative factors students identified as important in shaping their group work experience are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: The ‘big issues’ that determine the success of group work

Ranked factors underpinning a positive group work experience	Ranked factors underpinning a negative group work experience
1. Good communication. 2. Help from the tutor when needed. 3. Small (2-5 people) groups. 4. Enjoyable tasks.	1. Poor communication. 2. Large (6-10 people) groups. 3. Diversity (e.g., gender/age/culture/linguistic). 4. Problem leader within the group.

In both positive and negative scenarios, students identified communication as the most critical determinant of their group work experience; however, we remained in the dark as to what students actually meant by ‘communication’. It was also interesting to note the

importance that students ascribed to structural aspects of group work (i.e., the support of groups, the size of groups, the nature of the tasks undertaken and the level of diversity within groups), suggesting that staff need to give a great deal more attention to pedagogy, workshop design and practical preparation of any students likely to be confronted by the additional challenges posed by diversity in group work activities.

Student responses to the question, ‘What could tutorial staff have done to improve your group work experience?’ clearly and unambiguously pointed to the pivotal role tutors play in assisting students negotiate the challenges posed by group processes, particularly in the role of facilitator. A sample of student responses to this question is presented in Table 3.

Table 3: How tutorial staff can influence group work

A sample of student responses
• <i>“Know how to engage with people and encourage responses”</i> • <i>“Encourage discussion from quieter members”</i> • <i>“Make all the people in the group pull their weight”</i> • <i>“Be supportive and helpful”</i>

From these responses it would appear that students see the role of the tutor as ensuring all members participate to ensure desired group outcomes. Social loafing by members of groups appears to have a large influence on the enjoyment and experience of students in group work, particularly when the task has a group assessment or outcome associated with it.

We identified two further issues requiring clarification as a result of our reflections about student responses to the survey instrument, namely (a) what students meant when they referred to the issue of communication, and (b) what students expected from tutorial staff in terms of facilitating group process and outcomes.

Phase 3 of the research

The third phase of the research focused specifically on enriching and extending our understanding of what students meant by communication and facilitation. These issues were broached and explored during the course of feeding back and discussing the results derived from the survey instrument students had completed previously.

When questioned about what they meant by communication, students talked about issues that related to four principal areas, namely (a) the impediments posed by language barriers, (b) the lack of accountability within the group (for example, social loafing), (c) problems arising from inappropriate leadership within the group, and (d) the impact of group size on effective communication within the group. Table 4 presents the issues that students identified as being important to the communication process.

The second issue explored during the course of this phase of focus groups related to clarifying what students expected from a tutor in terms of facilitating group process and group outcomes. Discussions around this issue suggested that students did not want the tutor to supervise task outcomes, they wanted the tutor to provide them with the skills necessary for positive group outcomes and being available to assist them resolve issues that were beyond their capabilities.

Table 4: What students meant by ‘communication’

Main areas	Issues reported by students
1. Language barriers	- Both English and NESB students identified verbal communication as a problem in respect of engaging with, and comprehending what, each other meant. - Many NESB students did not engage in group discussions because of an inability to comprehend the nature of discussions and to input their ideas. Some reported that when they had tried to engage, English-Speaking students either did not understand or ignored their views. - Many English-Speaking students saw the lack of engagement by NESB students as indicative of social loafing.
2. Lack of accountability	- Many English-Speaking students felt they had ended up doing all the work when placed into groups. - A common view amongst English-Speaking and NESB students suggested that larger groups promoted opportunities for some individuals to free ride. - End of unit peer evaluations were not considered to be a good mechanism to ensure that all students engaged in group work as it was too far removed from the immediate task. - Problems that arise from individuals possessing different motivations in terms of the outcomes of group process (e.g., an HD student's expectations alongside a P student's expectations).
3. Leadership problems	- The existence of a group leader who dominated discussion and ignored others points of view. This eventually led to disengagement from discussion and the breakdown of the group. - The existence of more than one leader within the group which led to power conflicts and unnecessary time wasting.
4. Size of the group	- Both English-Speaking and NESB students believed smaller groups promoted individual accountability and a more enjoyable experience. - Many students reported a bad experience in a large group. - Large groups were perceived to be unwieldy, difficult control and likely to promote coalitions and sub-groups based on different agendas and views.

While the four issues identified in Table 4 are informative to academics designing and delivering a teaching pedagogy that might resonate with English and NESB students, a question still existed in our minds about the level of awareness amongst students about why they are being exposed to group work as part of their business curriculum.

Phase 4 of the research

The fourth phase of focus groups was principally used to explore the level of students' awareness about, and understanding of, UNE's *Graduate Attributes*. These attributes promote communication, global awareness, information literacy, lifelong learning, problem-solving, ethical behaviour and teamwork as critical competencies for UNE's graduates when negotiating the challenges posed by modern workplaces.

The focus groups were once again conceived of as forums designed to promote general discussion with students about the University's *Graduate Attributes* – what were they, what purpose did they serve, and how could the University best prepare its undergraduate business students for the challenges posed by modern workplaces?

It was extremely disconcerting to us that only one student reported having heard of the *Graduate Attributes*, but was unable to elaborate as to what they were or why they were there. This is despite the discussion that appears in all unit materials. However, once explained, many students understood that the acquisition of such attributes would give them a sound basis to engage with real workplace situations.

We were also surprised to observe that, in answering these questions, it was clearly the first time any of the students had made the connection between the value of group work, the reason courses include group work, and the outcomes sought by the University's *Graduate Attributes*. A light-bulb moment best captured by one student exclaiming “Ohhh!!! I get it now. This is why we do so much group work!”

Conclusions and implications

In 2005 the Australian Business Deans Council commissioned a study into the economic value of a university business education to the Australian economy and society. The study, conducted by the economic consultants Access Economics, found that university students who graduated with a business degree will generate net benefits well above those with non-business tertiary qualifications.

If, however, attention is not clearly focused on continually improving the learning community within which tertiary business education is conducted, those estimated net economic benefits believed to flow from Australia's business graduates is likely to be seriously jeopardised.

A business education that provides students with the opportunities to participate in group work activities that allow them to heuristically explore technical material while at the same time develop the understanding, sensitivity and critical interpersonal skills needed

in modern workplaces is a business education that will continue to provide value to a society.

It is clear from the research reported above that students' views about current and future group work are shaped to a significant degree by prior experiences of (a) workshop design (size of groups, tasks undertaken and degree of diversity within the group); (b) language proficiency; (c) leadership style and skill; and (d) perceived and actual loafing within the group.

All of these issues, apart from those relating to workshop design, would appear to prevent students from achieving deep learning outcomes because they do not possess the understanding and interpersonal skills required to facilitate group process. It is a situation that runs contrary to the University's desire to equip their students with the skills promoted by its *Graduate Attributes* and, by definition, the requirements of modern workplaces.

We believe these observations would best be addressed by focusing on three main areas: namely by (a) introducing undergraduate students to positive group work experiences earlier in their university education; (b) ensuring the University develops staff to effectively design and facilitate group work activities; and (c) providing students with the skills necessary to promote positive outcomes from group work involving diversity.

Providing students with early and positive group work experiences

Students' prior experience of group work has been reported to strongly influence their receptiveness to, and performance in, group activities. Consequently, student experiences of group work in first year will influence their perception of, expectations about, and willingness to engage with group work in second and third year curriculum. Offering students an authentic learning experience through group work in first year would enable them to understand and develop a willingness to deal with group process issues, instead of avoiding them, and would better equip students with the self awareness and self monitoring skills required to maximise the benefits that accrue from group work activities in later years.

Developing staff skills in the design and facilitation of group work activities

Students have flagged the important role staff play in designing and facilitating group activities. Specifically, the design roles related to keeping group sizes small and ensuring that tasks are interesting and engaging, while facilitation roles relate to providing students with the skills to negotiate group processes, coaching them in the utilisation of those skills in practice and being available to assist them overcome problems that are beyond their existing experience and capabilities.

We would argue that only when staff members are aware of the importance of these roles is the possibility of promoting deep learning outcomes, and the acquisition of desired attributes, a reality. Talking about deep learning outcomes is necessary but not sufficient as the implementation phase needs to go beyond the mere modification of curricula to equipping lecturers and tutors with the skills, sensitivity and resources to effectively facilitate deep learning outcomes across increasingly diverse student cohorts.

Developing student skills to succeed with group work activities

At present it would appear students are simply thrown into group work activities without having developed the interpersonal skills and strategies needed to successfully negotiate and benefit from these situations.

Students continually spoke of their concerns about the lack of accountability within group work activities: a situation in which they believed social loafers would prosper and benefit, while those who actually performed the work would gain no tangible benefit for their efforts. These sentiments were reinforced by negative stereotyping prejudices about students from different countries, communication difficulties due to language barriers, and disquiet about the quality of emergent leadership within groups – typically those individuals with the biggest or loudest personalities rather than those with the best insights and interest in focusing group members towards desired outcomes.

We believe a case could be made for undergraduate students generally lacking the maturity and experience to rapidly accumulate the skills needed to negotiate the challenges posed in the pressure cooker of a one semester course. Consequently, more time needs to be devoted to developing cultural sensitivity and awareness, interpersonal communication skills, and a manifest of proactive strategies to empower students with the means of positively engaging, and productively coping, with group activities.

A lack of attention to these three issues effectively impedes the interaction and dynamic interplay between communities of students, communities of academics and the society within which they exist. Any move to rectify such oversight would likely improve the quality of an undergraduate business education and its appropriateness to the modern workplace.

References

- Access Economics (2005). *Economic value of university business education*. Australian Business Deans Council, Brisbane.
- Altrichter, H., Kemmis, S., McTaggart, R. & Zuber-Skerritt, O. (2002). The concept of action research. *The Learning Organization*, 9 (3), 125-131.
- Altrichter, H. & Posch, P. (1989). Does the 'grounded theory' approach offer a guiding paradigm for teacher research? *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 19 (1), 21-31.
- Anderson, B. & McMillan, M. (1992). Learning experiences for profession reality and responsibility. In J. Mulligan and C. Griffin (Eds.), *Empowerment through experiential learning* (pp. 222-232). London: Kogan Page.
- Australian Business Deans Council (30 May 2007). Business funding shortfall to threaten quality of business education and further impact skills shortage. <http://www.abdc.edu.au/3.33.0.0.1.0.htm>. Last accessed 15 January 2008.
- Baas, M. (2007). The language of migration: The education industry versus the migration industry. *People and Place*, 15 (2), 49-60.
- Biggs, J. (1996). Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment. *Higher Education*, 32, 347-364.
- Boswerth, K. & Hamilton, S.J. (Eds.) (1994). *Collaborative Learning: Underlying processes and effective techniques*. New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Bretag, T. (2003). Reconceptualising the internationalisation of higher education. Paper presented to the Conference of the National Union of Students Education. Adelaide, South Australia, July.
- Bretag, T. (2007). The emperor's new clothes: Yes, there is a link between English language competence and academic standards. *People and Place*, 15 (1), 13-21.

- Burdett, J. (2003). Making groups work: University students' perceptions. *International Education Journal*, 4 (3), 177-191.
- Chadwick, P. (1995). Academic quality in TQM: Issues in teaching and learning. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 3 (2), 19-23.
- Cohen, L. & Manion, L. (1994). *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge.
- Comell, A. & Macken, J. (2003). Foreign students pay fees: Australian universities pay the price. *Weekend Australian Financial Review*. 1-2 March, 26.
- Dickinson, M. (2000). Giving undergraduates managerial experience. *Education and Training*, 42 (3), 159-169.
- Engleberg, I.N. & Wynn, D.R. (2003). *Working in Groups: Communication Principles and Strategies*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Feldman, D.H. (2000). Forward. In V. John-Steiner (Ed.) *Creative collaboration* (pp. ix-xiii). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gammie, B. (1995). Undergraduate management education: An analysis of rationale and methodology. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 9 (4), 34-40.
- Gibbs, G. (1992). *Improving the Quality of Student Learning*. Bristol: Technical & Educational Services.
- Hillon, M.E. & Boje, D.M. (2007). The social ecology of action research. *Management Research News*, 30 (5), 359-367.
- Jackling, B. (2007). The lure of permanent residency and the aspirations and expectations of international students studying accounting in Australia. *People and Place*, 15 (3), 31-41.
- Kember, D. (2007). *Reconsidering open and distance learning in the developing world: Meeting students' learning needs*. New York: Routledge.
- Kilpatrick, S.I., Barrett, M.S. & Jones, T.A. (2003). Defining learning communities. Paper presented to the International Education Research Conference. Auckland, New Zealand, December.
- Minichiello, V., Aroni, R., Timewell, E. & Alexander, L. (1995). *In-depth interviewing: Principles, techniques, analysis*. Melbourne: Addison Wesley Longman Australia.
- Mutch, A. (1999). Employability or learning? Groupwork in higher education. *Education and Training*, 40 (2), 50-56.
- Nadin, S. & Cassell, C. (2006). The use of a research diary as a tool for reflective practice. *Qualitative Research in Accounting and Management*, 3 (3), 208-217.
- Napier, R.W. & Gershenfeld, M.K. (2004). *Groups: Theory and experience*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Nelson, B. (2003). *Our universities: Backing Australia's future*. Department of Education Science and Training, Australian Government Printing Services, Melbourne.
- Pedler, M. (Ed.) (1997). *Action learning in practice*. Aldershot: Gower.
- Ramsden, P. (2002). *Learning to lead in higher education*. London: Routledge.
- Sarantakos, S. (1995). *Social research*. Melbourne: McMillan Education Australia Pty Ltd.
- Stein, S.J., Isaacs, G. & Andrews, T. (2004). Incorporating authentic learning experiences within a university course. *Studies in Higher Education*, 29 (2), 240-257.
- University of New England (updated 7 May 2007, accessed 23 August 2007). Attributes of a UNE graduate. *Teaching and Learning Centre*. <http://www.une.edu.au/gamanual/what.htm>.
- Watty, K. (2007). Quality in accounting education and low English standards among overseas students: Is there a link? *People and Place*, 15 (1), 22-29.
- Yamazaki, Y. & Kayes, D.C. (2004). An experiential approach to cross-cultural learning: A review and integration of competencies for successful expatriate adaption. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 3 (4), 362-379.