WHOM TO GROUP WITH—A BOURDIEUSIAN NARRATIVE ANALYSIS OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS IN AN AUSTRALIAN UNIVERSITY

Isadora Jung-Hsiu Lin
Queensland University of Technology

Abstract

Increasing degree-seeking international students from affluent Asian countries, who use English as an additional language (EAL), have contributed to cultural and linguistic diversity in Australian universities. However, such diversity posed challenges in pedagogy and assessment. Drawn from a larger interview study, exploring what resources helped first year EAL international students come to belong in an Australian university, this paper addresses these students' concerns of finding group members. The data is analysed through Bourdieu's concepts of field and capital to provide insight into what underlies decisions over whom to group with. This paper finds that these students are caught between seeking a sense of belonging and networking to local student peers. It is argued that these considerations are produced by both prior educational trajectories and new conditions on offer in Australia's local classrooms. The findings have empirical implications to enhance group work experience in higher education sector.

Introduction

In 2010, commencing international enrolments showed its signs of decrease in the last two decades by 2% (DEEWR, 2011). Nonetheless, international students, particularly those who use English as an additional language (EAL) and come from affluent Asian countries such as China, Singapore, Malaysia, Indonesia and Vietnam still make up diverse student populations in higher education in Australia (DEEWR, 2011). The quest for this student body to study in Australia is in part attributed to its provision of English-medium Western education (Doherty & Singh, 2007). This appeals not just to individual students, but also to some governments in Asia. Malaysia, for example, is one such government which funds its national elite students by outsourcing an educated workforce in Western countries (de Wit & Knight, 1997).

However, diversity brought about by EAL international students' cultural and linguistic background is not necessarily taken as beneficial to international education as might be expected. The intake of these students has been described as risking quality of Australian higher education (Sidhu, 2006). The quality contentions lie typically in the students' insufficient English proficiency and incompatible cultural attributes to higher education in Australia, for example, as in group discussion and participation (Strauss & Alice, 2007; Sweeney, Weaven, & Herington, 2008).

This paper discusses challenges arising from group work experience of first year EAL international students in an Australian university. It focuses on students' considerations of group formation under circumstances. In this paper, I firstly discuss what is known about group work experience in the literature on international students and first year experience. Next I present a theoretical framework of Bourdieu's concepts of field and capital, and provide background to the study. Thirdly, I analyse telling narratives of group formation, and finally conclude with reasons behind decisions over whom to group with.

Literature Review

For EAL international students, English proficiency works as a pre-requisite for enrolment and as a means to an end of their study in Australia (Doherty, Kettle, May, & Caukill, 2011). They meet minimum language requirements set by universities to be eligible applicants; in the meantime, they must learn through and about English to acquire disciplinary knowledge typically at a higher level than before. The challenge is most apparent in group work, a pedagogical, curricular, and assessment

measure that requires not just reading and writing, but speaking and listening skills (Doherty, et al., 2011). EAL international students' English skills, their oracy in particular, determine how well they can fulfill at least in part academic requirements by communicating their ideas to group members and presenting them to the whole class.

In this paper, the term group work refers to collaborative and cooperative learning activities, performed by two to six students. Group work has been recommended favourably as important and relevant to building graduates' employment capabilities, as seen in some Australian university's manuals of protocols and procedures. However, group work is highly contentious among students of both international and domestic backgrounds, particularly in aspects of group formation, job allocations, varied effort, and logistics of meetings (Burdett, 2003). Students can both benefit from and be disadvantaged by strategies of whom they group with (Pitt, 2000).

Strauss and Alice (2007) reported concerns of unfairness of group assessment. They found lecturers were caught in a dilemma whether to force domestic students to group with EAL international students, who did not necessarily have sufficient English proficiency. However, the complexities of knowledge required for students, both international and domestic, to understand and to offer spontaneous comments at tutorials are often overlooked (Doherty, et al., 2011). These complexities can impact on EAL international students more than their local counterparts, as they need to build discipline-specific vocabulary in English and to have opportunity to develop necessary proficiency for their study area (Baik & Greig, 2009). Still, with adequate and relevant academic and oracy support, these students are recognised to make on-going efforts to improve their English (for example, Sawir, 2005) and to become more experienced at group work participation (Duff, 2010; Kobayashi, 2003).

Another source of unfairness is concerned with limited or non-participation in group work. Silent participation, for example, is viewed as characteristic of EAL international students' cultural attributes, and as incompatible to group work requirements (Remedios, Clarke, & Hawthorne, 2008). However, Remedios and colleagues (2008) argued that silent participation is not necessarily a product of students' cultural backgrounds, but a behaviour shared by students, both international and local. Silence can be produced by circumstances, such as task-oriented challenges and personal preferences.

Goldstein (2003) further suggested from sociological perspectives that silence participation can be a strategy to pursue useful resources that cannot be accessed otherwise. Applying Bourdieu's sociology and Valenzuela's (1999) peer social capital, Goldstein argued that Cantonese-speaking EAL migrant students in a Canadian secondary school found it impeding their chance for peer support to speak English in large-class discussion. In the then context of English-only policy in public domains of the school, active use of English might risk losing memberships of the Cantonese-speaking cohorts and result in potential loss of other support, such as discussions over an appeal for an unfair mark.

From the review, we have learned that group members can affect results of group work discussion and assessment (Pitt, 2000; Strauss and Alice, 2007), and that levels of English proficiency and cultural attributes can be a concern in group formation and practice (Goldstein, 2003; Strauss and Alice, 2007; Remedios, et al., 2008). It is also found that researchers have increasingly made efforts to explore aspects other than EAL international students' group silent participation and unfair group assessment results produced by varied levels of English proficiency and cultural attributes. However, it is not yet known that how EAL international students make decisions as to whom to group with, given their readable cultural and linguistic diversity in the context of international education. Following Goldstein (2003), the paper aims to explore through Bourdieu's concepts educational relations and their impact on these students' considerations and decisions in situ. It hopes to provide an alternative understanding of EAL international students' strategies through sociological perspectives and to challenge the taken-for-granted notions of group work experiences of this student body in higher education in Australia.

Theoretical Framework

In this paper, I propose a Bourdieusian theoretical framework based on relations between concepts of field and capital. According to Bourdieu, field is "a network, or a configuration, of objective relations between positions" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 97). It is a social space constituted by actors taking varied positions. A field functions by implicit and explicit rules and these rules are interpreted and practiced by social actors. Actors are endowed with resources, existent and potential, of relational

Isadora JH Lin
jhisadora@gmail.com

advantage in accordance with their social positions in a field. The value of resources, or capital, in Bourdieu's terms, depends on social readings and rules of the game in a field. Social actors can be like fish in water—feeling comfortable about the outside world (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992).

To illustrate a field of relations, I use an Australian university as an example. Academics are authorized representatives of the educational institution, who function as powerful others to teach and to assess students' work. In contrast to students, academics take more or less advantageous social positions in a field, based on at least in part their advanced disciplinary knowledge and institutional power. In the meanwhile, students act to seek from the authorized representatives recognition of what they might display through assessment measures. According to Luke (2008), there are sub-fields overlapping and nested adjacent to each other in a field of relations. Following this, I view both theoretically and methodologically group work/discussion as social sub-fields in an education field.

Bourdieu's concept of capital is useful in explicating relations of group work and its potential exchange of disciplinary knowledge and recognition. Capital is "accumulated labour" (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 105) that takes time to build and accrue. It has different forms, including physical means such as monetary assets, cultural goods, and educational degrees, and embodied leverage in values, tastes, manners, social bonding, linguistic and symbolic credibility (Bourdieu, 1986, 1991, 1993). Among these, I highlight social capital, "a durable network … which provides each of its member with the backing of the collective-owned capital" (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 106). Social capital is mobilizable resources, actual and potential, aggregated in social actors' familial networks, plus institutionalized memberships, such as alumni associations. To link to other forms, social capital can work as an adjunct to cultural capital, depending on circumstances (Bourdieu, 1986; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). In education field, school-related resources and information are part of cultural capital that would advantage students to have positive educational experience (Lareau & Weininger, 2003). They can be accessed through student peers on conditions of mutual recognition of social membership (Goldstein, 2003).

More specifically to group work as a social sub-field, disciplinary knowledge, which can be viewed as a form of cultural capital, might be aimed for through discussions in the process of exchange for a mark. In the case of the EAL international students who learn about/through English in English-medium education, they must have proper English proficiency to achieve satisfactory outcomes of discussions. Thus, having friends who these students can use English with to improve their linguistic productions in group discussion/work is critical education-related resources (Miller, 2003). To have more understanding for this particular case of students, other species of cultural capital, *spatial and participation competences*, acquired through actors' past educational trajectories are also important (Curry, 2008). These competences can help students make sense of new rules of the game in a new education field and facilitate sensible decisions for successful educational experiences. According to Curry (2008), students demonstrate their *spatial competence* in their choices of a classroom space to allow for an easier access to teachers. In this paper, I extend the focus on access to 'teachers' to 'peers' or other powerful actors endowed with valued resources. *Participation competence* enables students to have productive engagement with teachers and curricular practices to generate positive educational outcomes. All these contribute to composite forms of capital, aggregated and accumulated for educational advantage.

The proposed Bourdieusian framework allows this paper to go beyond discussions over cultural attributes and levels of English proficiency in EAL international students' group work experience. In particular, principles of field help explain what might underlie considerations of capital accrual and exchange in students' decisions. This thus highlights processes of utilizing capital accumulated in past trajectories for potential capital accrual and exchange in grouping practices.

The study

This paper draws upon semi-structured interview data from a larger study, exploring what resources fostered EAL international students' coming to belong in an Australian university. I interviewed seventeen EAL international students, who came from nine countries, at three points across their first year of study. Email correspondences were maintained for updates on moments of change and growth during this period of time. The language used at interview was English, but Mandarin Chinese-

speaking participants chose to use their first language with the interviewer. All transcripts, 48 in total, English and translated, plus 351 email exchanges, were member-checked by participants. The study complied with ethical considerations of the researcher's university, ensuring participants' informed consent and confidentiality. The selected excerpts for this paper, as well as others, are coded and arranged by narrative structure as analytic segments, drawn from insight from Labov and Waletzky (1967/1997), being orientation, complication, evaluation, resolution, and coda. According to these authors,

- in orientation, the teller indicates what this narrative is about, who/whom involved, when and/or where;
- in complication, the teller talks about something that has gone wrong;
- in evaluation, comments on or feelings of this experience or event are provided;
- in resolution, the teller talks about how he/she resolves a complication, as described;
- and in coda, the teller offers lessons learned as a whole (Labov & Waletzky, 1967/1997).

Narrative structure helps identify participants' patterns of what went wrong, at what time, in which context, with whom involved, what comments made on particular experiences, what actions taken for what purposes, and what lessons drawn from these experiences. The narratives are further analysed through the proposed theoretical framework.

Compatriots or else: A shared dilemma

Participants' talk about finding group members emerged from the data as part of the complications experienced in the first few weeks. Whom to group with in their group work for these first year EAL participants is not as straightforward as it might seem. To better illustrate, I discuss grouping experiences described by Siti and Fatima in this section, both pseudonyms, as examples. The two students came from a larger nation-select cohort, sponsored by government funding and institutional partnerships between home and host universities. Prior to their study in an Australian university, they had completed a foundation year in their home institution. During the foundation year, the students had training on academic literacy and had become familiar with each other in the same cohort. In the first excerpt below, Siti talked about how she was grouped for a group project for a core unit in her discipline. The mark of the group project would lead up to a final grade.

 Excerpt 1 (Siti, Interview 1, English language interview)
 Orientation: I have one group assignment here
 Complication: but in this group it is all people from my own country. We don't mix with others due to the title we choose…
 Resolution 1: It's a bit easy because all of us know each other very well so we can give our full cooperation,
 Evaluation: but then the negative side maybe we don't really have a chance to work with Australians,
 Coda 1: so we don't even know how they study, how they work in a group,
 Evaluation 2: because if you work with our friends for group work, so it's not very different. Like in my country we did have a lot of group work
 Coda 2: so it's supposed to be our opportunity to work with Australian right, you know, like to get to know them better,
 Resolution 2: but…since we chose similar titles, so the lecturers give us the group.

According to Siti, working with compatriots in the same group had its privilege—they had known each other's talent and skills so well that they could work to their fullest. In the meanwhile, by her report, such grouping practice had its drawback—losing an opportunity to do group work with domestic students. For this paper, whether or not she *'was supposed to'* work with the domestic students is beside the point. Here the focus is how Siti viewed this practice as part of aspired, on-campus, educational experience in Australia. This is demonstrated in two codas—she believed grouping with compatriots was not optimal use of the opportunity she had in Australia as an international student.

As shown, grouping with compatriots eases the group experience, given similar EAL backgrounds and comparable capital portfolios. Participants feel comfortable about this grouping practice; nonetheless, there is also a strong sense of looking for more to extend and to challenge in future practices. Although there is no telling from the data whether the choice of the same title was strategic on the part

of Siti and her cohort, the decision was not entirely hers. Rather, it was an outcome of the lecturer's pedagogical interventions. Whom to group with depends on conditions on offer in this new field of education.

In contrast to Siti's relative comfort with compatriots as group members, Fatimah had a different story to tell. In Excerpt 2 below, she talked about how she went from sitting with compatriots to other students in the same tutorial over two semesters.

> Excerpt 2 (Fatimah, Interviews 1-2, English language interview)
>
> Orientation 1: …we tend to sit in our own groups sometimes ... Usually this table ((is)) for this kind of students; this table for ((that kind of)) students. So whenever we go to the class, there is the seat for us.
>
> Evaluation 1: …I don't think we really mix that much except for group discussion or when you are scrambled in class….
>
> Sometimes it's good but sometimes it's better to mix with other people because you are in a new country and it's best to meet new people … But sometimes it's good to be in our own group because we understand us and they ((my compatriot cohort)) accept us for where we are now.
>
> Resolution 1: And then right now I tend to mix up with Australians, other students. I don't usually sit with my cohort anymore ... Because I think in order to, like, talk to other Australians maybe it's quite good to practice first in tutorials, because in a small group I tend to have more courage to speak.
>
> Evaluation 1: So when I'm sitting with my ((compatriot)) cohort I don't have the opportunity to talk to Australians. So if I sit with Australians maybe sometimes we have pair work so I have more opportunity to talk with them…it's a good practice to talk English ...
>
> Resolution 2: I'll be sitting ((at a table)) with the less people groups ... just the first days because the table is already full so I can't join that table anymore. So I tend to sit at…other places. And then when the next weeks to come…I don't really sit there ((with my compatriot cohort)) anymore.
>
> Int: Did that change your relationships with your friends?
>
> Complication: No, not really, but at first it feels quite weird because I keep sitting somewhere else…
>
> Resolution 2: I said that at first 'because the table is already full so I didn't see that there's a place there.'
>
> But then when the weeks to come I said 'Just it's okay to mix with other students because our lecturer always said try to mix with other students also'.
>
> Coda 2: [Course coordinator] always say 'Try to mix with other students, try to be friends with them, try to talk to them'… because different people have different things ... '

Fatimah changed from mixing only with her cohort to sitting elsewhere, thereby creating chances to accrue new cultural capital through meeting new friends. She, in Siti's cohort, was well aware of the potential of seating arrangements leading to grouping or pairing partners. This awareness is an example of classroom participation competence (Curry, 2008), a species of cultural capital which enables students to choose advantageous places to sit in the classroom. Fatimah was very explicit about her strategy in seating choices and was also conscious about possible outcomes, as well as consequences. By '*mixing with other students'*, Fatimah could broaden social networks and accrue linguistic and other capital. This was a strategy suggested by an expert other, but gradually became part of Fatimah's dispositions, as shown in the taken-for-grantedness —'*it's best to meet new people'*.

However, it took time for Fatimah to realize the strategy of *'mixing with other students'*. At the early stage, being close to compatriots was an unconscious practice— interacting with those of similar EAL backgrounds as a matter of course. This resulted in a sense of comfort and belonging on this term. Later an accidental breaking led to subsequent conscious decisions, which then enabled Fatimah to extend her social networks by connecting to social groups other than her cohort.

Excerpts 1-2 suggest a shared dilemma as to whether or not to stay within those of similar backgrounds in order to belong. Both Siti and Fatimah were aware of the relative ease and sense of belonging with their compatriots. However, these established social relations posed other risks of limiting friendship to her existing compatriot cohort. It was further shown that an expert other's explanation, the lecturer's advice, legitimated her actions to build new friendships for potentials of capital accrual in new fields. Resorting to an expert other further resolved possible tensions within existing friendships. Stepping out of compatriot cohorts in a multicultural classroom in Fatimah's case was not free of challenges. Disregarding this tension might result in a risk of losing peer social capital (Goldstein, 2003). This risk can in turn impede the opportunity to accrue cultural capital relevant to lives as students.

Feeling comfortable or seeking capital

The case of Sandra M. (pseudonym), Chinese speaker from Taiwan, is parallel to that of seeking a sense of belonging discussed earlier. She preferred to sit with those with *'black hair'* at the start of a new semester. The context of the following excerpt was a combined postgraduate lecture and tutorial of a Master's course in Education. This was a first tutorial, with six students present, including Sandra M., another Chinese-speaking student, and four local students.

> Excerpt 3 (Sandra M., Interview 1, Translated)
>
> Orientation: S: I usually sit beside Asian students. I look for students with black hair, not necessarily Chinese, but at least Asians, like Japanese, Koreans, so that I would have a sense of security. Not knowing why, we tend to sit together and they ((Australian students)) sit together too. At that time, I would like to group with another female student from China,
>
> Complication 1: but the lecturer didn't seem to like to see us in the same group. We were concerned about using too much Chinese at discussion.
>
> Resolution: It turned out that the other Chinese-speaking girl paired with one Australian local teacher, and I with another; as such, we formed different groups.
>
> Int: Did the lecturer make the decision?
>
> S: Yes, my lecturer asked, 'Why don't you come here?' I agreed, so I went. The last group was two female students, both local teachers,
>
> Complication 2: who seemed unwilling to group with us—they, sitting adjacent to each other, initiated to pair up. Thus they avoided the lecturer's intervention. This made me uncomfortable.
>
> Evaluation 1: Now I am not worrying about not having teaching experience. My classmates, except the Chinese girl and myself, were all local teachers, who seemed to know about teaching. [...]
>
> Evaluation 2: Then, I felt some students like my group member in [unit name], the Australian teacher, are nice…He is a teacher, but doesn't seem to act like teachers. He was friendly when teaching me something; I was like his student, as much as his classmate. I don't know much of the rest cohort; they were not very friendly
>
> Coda: I feel people here are not as friendly as I imagined. I remember my classmates at EAP said they had experiences of being ignored when talking to local Aussies.

By choosing to sit beside those with similar backgrounds, Sandra M. sought a sense of belonging in her first lectures and tutorials. She displayed her classroom participation competence (Curry, 2008) not by placing herself where she could be advantaged in terms of creating opportunity for talk in English, but by settling down with the '*black hair*'. Nonetheless, this was a dilemma for Sandra M. because she then needed the lecturer's intervention to find a pair who might not use Chinese in discussion. Her coda shows that she agreed at that time with how her EAL peers felt about *'being ignored'* by *'local Aussies'*.

The term '*black hair*' indicates that Sandra M. was aware of the visible differences of her ethnicity and of the possible 'reading' of the symbolic value inherent in such differences. The symbolic value here includes having cultural capital that is relevant and beneficial to her group assignment. In the meantime, Sandra M. was concerned about her not being a teacher as a disadvantage for a Master of Education. For her, feeling uncomfortable about this field could arise at least from (i) her sense of visible differences, (ii) her novice status in the presence of a certified local teacher, and (iii) her limited teaching experience. The point here is that the lecturer's intervention eased, to some extent, Sandra M.'s uneasiness of the process of finding group members, and thus feeling more of fitting in a new field of education in Australia. At the same time, with the opportunity to pair with the local teacher, Sandra M. had potential to extend her social networks and to use English more exclusively in the discussion, which could foster her accrual of English proficiency, friendship, and knowledge of education relevant to her group assignment. The intervention foregrounded her subsequent interactions with other local students and thereby changed views.

From the vantage point of six months later, in her second interview Sandra M. compared her interactions with others in two units. In the following narrative she explained a subtle change regarding her views about the friendliness of 'Australian' students in the same unit.

> Excerpt 4 (Sandra M., Interview 2, Translated)
>
> Int: Tell me what you think about your Australian classmates now. Are they still not so friendly as they were in Interview 1?
>
> Orientation 1: S: I had more interactions with my Australian classmates in the unit I mentioned earlier [same unit in Excerpt 3] than other units in this semester. I felt this is because we had only six students in the class, a very small group ...
>
> Evaluation 1: And I found them very friendly. In fact, only three of them are Australians. We usually had some chat, and they seemed to be interested in my culture. They asked me and the other Chinese

speaking student about my culture … during break time … they were keen to know about China and Chinese culture. I felt very good about this.

Complication: But I did not have much interaction with Australian classmates in other units. Not much life experience to share with them. There was no foreseeable reciprocity between them and myself. Nothing would prompt them to approach me.

Evaluation 2: I can't really say that they are not friendly. We are here for class, so making friends may not be a priority, perhaps! Anyway, communication is difficult … because there is nothing in common in our lives. I can understand why they act like this.

Int: How would you describe what you mean so far?

S: …Perhaps it is like the Chinese saying 'You walk on your sunny path, and I go on my single-planked bridge.' (妳走妳的陽關道；我過我的獨木橋。) That kind of feeling. So I do not feel anything in particular about this.

Coda: Anyway, I have good interactions with my Australian classmates in one unit. That is good enough for me to feel comfortable about having them around. I am happy to meet them there.

According to Sandra M., some interactions were welcoming, so that she was happy about them, while other experiences were just more pedestrian. She enjoyed the happy interactions she had in one unit; at the same time, she understood reasons for lack of such interactions with certain groups of students— *'Not much life experience to share with them. There was no foreseeable reciprocity between them and myself'*. She also realized that *'making friends was not a priority'* and *'communication was difficult'* when it came to befriending with students met at university. She learnt that she and her domestic counterparts were taking different routes in terms of building friendships.

Over time, Sandra M. readjusted her initial expectations of social interaction with the domestic students. This readjustment was made by how she reflected on pleasant experiences in one unit, despite earlier challenges in grouping, alongside other more or less limited interactions. She then came to realize there were mechanisms operating in her limited interactions with a particular group of students. Despite visible and audible differences, she was also aware that she did not have sufficient capital to enable exchange for social capital, and that there were different levels of interest in intercultural experience.

Excerpt 4 is significant, as it is a resolution to Sandra M.'s feeling unwelcome, as discussed in Excerpt 3. This resolution stems from the realization that there needs to be something wanted in the reciprocal deals of friendship building. This realization lessens emotional reactions to dissatisfactions about friendships and prompts realignments of previous expectations.

The narratives selected for this paper illustrate different considerations of group formation and experiences of interactions with group members. The analyses indicate that strategies of finding group members reflect how participants are caught in the dilemma of grouping with those they feel they belong to as EAL international students, or with those they can feel less comfortable with, but might foster an extended social network to the more advanced English-speaking peers for example. It has been shown how participants' evaluations of group formation subsequently inform their social networking decisions. As in the case of Fatimah, she is explicit about her intention to accrue capital through purposeful seating choices and participation in group or pair work. However, Sandra M. for another case, steps back and takes up the more marginal and perhaps more comfortable field positions on offer, rather than making a conscious effort to build new social networks. A third and final point is that participants make adjustments over time as to expectations of and strategies of making friends with the local peers. However, decisions are not necessarily made once and for all. The same participant may respond differently at different times in various sub-fields. This shows that re-adjustments to views on befriending might arise in response to changed conditions and circumstances, and a growing feel for the game.

Conclusion

This paper reports on findings of a Bourdieusian narrative analysis of group work experiences in an Australian university. It focuses on EAL international students' considerations of whom to group with. These considerations are analysed and interpreted through Bourdieu's concepts of field and capital. In this Bourdieusian framework, group work is viewed both theoretically and methodigically as a social sub-field, where members display their capital for an exchange. The paper suggests that the students are caught by whether to find someone who they could relate to as EAL international students or

whether to extend themselves to those of local backgrounds. It is also found that students' considerations are realized at least in part in *spatial and participation competences* (Curry, 2008), as in where to sit in a classroom and what seating choices might lead to. The paper shows that the practice of group/pair work is not just a pedagogical activity, but a chance for friendship and capital building. Nonetheless, outcomes of these strategies depend on conditions on offer.

This paper is not to argue for or against seating strategies of EAL international students in their grouping considerations. Rather, the point is to provide an alternative understanding that some EAL international students might need more time or effort to step out of their compatriot group than others and that reciprocity in capital exchange can impact on grouping and subsequent group work experince. In higher education sector, educators need to be mindful for complexities that might be produced in educational relations among group members. It might be important to consider whether particular pedagogical interventions ease or deepen these complexities.

References

Baik, C., & Greig, J. (2009). Improving the academic outcomes of undergraduate ESL students: The case for discipline-based academic skills programs. *Higher Education Research & Development, 28*(4), 401-416.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 105-116). New York: Greenwood.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* (G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Sociology in question* (R. Nice, Trans.). London: Sage.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*: University of Chicago Press.

Burdett, J. (2003). Making groups work: University students' perceptions. *International Education Journal, 4*(3), 177-191.

Curry, M. J. (2008). A "head start and a credit": Analysing cultural capital in the basic writing/ESOL classroom. In J. Albright & A. Luke (Eds.), *Pierre Bourdieu and literacy education* (pp. 279-298). New York: Routledge.

de Wit, H., & Knight, J. (1997). Asia Pacific countries in comparision to those in Europe and North America: Concluding remarks. In J. Knight & H. de Wit (Eds.), *Internationalisation of higher education in Asia Pacific countries* (pp. 173-180). Amsterdam: EAIE.

DEEWR. (2011). *Student 2010 Full Year: Selected Higher Education Statistics*. Retrieved from http://www.deewr.gov.au/HigherEducation/Publications/HEStatistics/Publications/Pages/Students.aspx.

Doherty, C., Kettle, M., May, L., & Caukill. (2011). Talking the talk: Oracy demands in first year university assessment tasks. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 18*(1), 27-39.

Doherty, C., & Singh, P. (2007). Mobile students, flexible identities and liquid modernity: Disrupting western teachers' assumptions of 'the Asian learner'. In D. Palfreyman & D. McBride (Eds.), *Learning and teaching across cultures in higher education* (pp. 114-132). Basingstroke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Duff, P. (2010). Language socialization into academic discourse communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 30*, 169-192.

Goldstein, T. (2003). Contemporary bilingual life at a Canadian high school: Choices, risks, tensions, and dilemmas. *Sociology of Education, 76*(3), 247.

Kobayashi, M. (2003). The role of peer support in ESL students' accomplishment of oral academic tasks. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 59*(3), 337-368.

Labov, W., & Waletzky, J. (1967/1997). Narrative Analysis: Oral versions of personal experience. *Journal of Narrative and Life History, 7*, 3-38.

Lareau, A., & Weininger, E. B. (2003). Cultural capital in educational research: A critical assessment. *Theory and Society, 32*(5-6), 567-606.

Luke, A. (2008). Using Bourdieu to make policy: Mobilizing community capital and literacy. In J.

Albright & A. Luke (Eds.), *Pierre Bourdieu and literacy education* (pp. 347-362). New York: Routledge.

Miller, J. (2003). *Audible difference: ESL and social identity in school*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Pitt, M. J. (2000). The application of game theory to group project assessment. *Teaching in Higher Education, 5*(2), 233-241.

Remedios, L., Clarke, D., & Hawthorne, L. (2008). The silent participant in small group collaborative learning contexts. *Active Learning in Higher Education 9*, 201-216.

Sawir, E. (2005). Language difficulties of international students in Australia: The effects of prior learning experience. *International Education Journal, 6*(5), 567-580.

Sidhu, R. K. (2006). *Universities and globalisation: To market, to market*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Strauss, P., & Alice, U. (2007). Group assessments: Dilemmas facing lecturers in multicultural tertiary classrooms. *Higher Education Research & Development, 26*(2), 147-161.

Sweeney, A., Weaven, S., & Herington, C. (2008). Multicultural influences on group learning: a qualitative higher education study. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 33*(2), 119-132.