Effectively teaching diverse student groups: a reflection on teaching and learning strategies

Kathryn Trees
Murdoch University

This paper discusses facilitating student collegiality within diverse student groups. It argues that diverse student groups of international, domestic, mature age and Gen Y students often have similar difficulties and strengths although they may occur for quite different reasons and understanding this is useful when deciding on teaching and learning strategies. It describes several teaching and learning strategies and explains the outcomes of using these with diverse student cohorts.

Keywords: *Diversity, effective communication, critical reflection, teaching strategies*

Introduction

Teaching classes with diverse student populations is increasingly the norm in Australian higher education, including universities. This

change reflects "the expanding market in cross-border study" (Sawir, 2005, 567), resulting in more international students, from diverse backgrounds studying in Australia, a focus in Australia on work oriented training and increasing numbers of students with inadequate reading literacy skills. There are "an increasing proportion of Gen Y students worldwide" who are a "diverse group" (Skene, et. al., 2007: 1). They are the Digital or Net Generation born in or after 1982 (Gardner & Eng, 2005, 405). They have their own education histories, including learning using interactive computer technology and through a system of "'bricolage'" whereby their learning preferences are "influenced by their peers and their own capacity to search out information and piece it together (Moore, Moore & Fowler in Skene, 2007, 3)". For academics, such as me, effectively teaching diverse student groups requires being critically reflective, adaptable, able to respond to varying needs and implement strategies for facilitating students learning from each other.

A reflective teacher engages in "thoughtful observation and analysis of their actions before, during and after" teaching (Snowman et. al., 2009, 15) by assessing the "ethical implications and consequences" of teaching practices on students and self-reflection involving "deep examination of personal values and beliefs embodied in the assumptions teachers make and the expectations they have for students" (Larrivee, 2000, 294). This necessitates the teacher questioning them self about what, how and why they are teaching. What do I believe needs to be achieved in the tutorial to provide students with effective learning experiences? How do I ensure as much as possible that these learning experiences have relevance for students in their everyday lives into their futures? How do I facilitate students' development as ethical global citizens? I need to "examine judgments, interpretations, assumptions, and expectations" (Larrivee, 2000, 294) of students especially those based on stereotypes – 'international students are passive rote learners, work and training oriented students are opportunistic learners' – that close off rather than open up the possibilities for conversations and shared learning and adapt content and teaching strategies appropriately.

I and other academics often voice our struggle to provide students with the best possible learning experiences for a variety of reasons including moves to standardised curriculum, "education [suited] to job-training sites" (Giroux, 2012, 186), ever changing student cohorts, pressure to research and teach; reasons not necessarily specific to this socio-political period. Importantly, most of us are time poor. At the same time, more students – those for whom English is a second language, those from low socio-economic backgrounds, mature age students either returning to education after time in the work force or raising families, and increasingly school leavers with higher visual literacy but lower reading literacy – require individual or group remedial assistance and thus more time. Students who regard themselves as clients receiving a service increasingly expect academics to respond to their inquiries immediately and accommodate their schedule, particularly if they are also working and are time poor.

Time constraints are often at odds with developing collegiality, knowing how to listen and speak with fellow students, particularly those who are 'other'. They are at odds with enabling students to be "transformative intellectuals", (Adler, 2011, 610) for whom education is about intellectual and personal growth and wider social change including supporting that in their peers. There is a useful, growing dialogue amongst academics about effective strategies, including time management and "culturally relevant pedagogy" (Adler, 2011, 609), and resources for teaching diverse groups of students.

This paper is a discussion of my critical reflection on teaching *Gender, Globalisation and Cultural Politics* (*GGCP*), to undergraduate and postgraduate, international and domestic students over three years (2010 – 2012), within the context of the constraints outlined above. I began teaching the unit part way through a semester, which is often difficult for students and teacher. I came into the unit with my own expectations of how it would operate, without time to do enough of the usual preliminary work to build relationships. For me, there was a lack of engagement between international, mature age and domestic students. This prompted me to reflect on a tutorial for a unit, five years earlier in which, Singaporean students reluctant to speak to the

whole class wanted to be in groups with fellow Singaporean students, found reading comprehension difficult and lacked confidence to try out their ideas with others. The tutorial group was not cohesive; a significant number of domestic students were not patient with international students and avoided having them in their group. The students did not benefit from the cultural diversity and the range of knowledge this offered; they did not learn how to listen and speak cross-culturally; and did not develop a sense of themselves as part of global citizenry. The learning environment and teaching strategies were ineffective and I did not want that dynamic in *GGCP*. I was concerned to promote positive group dynamics and confidence so that students experienced the classroom as a safe learning space where ethnicity, cultural and socio-economic differences, future aspirations including career, enrich rather than inhibit learning.

Here, I discuss teaching strategies, such as small group learning opportunities and impromptu oral presentations I used in 2011 and 2012, to enhance the students' recognition of their knowledge and experiences and to help them develop the confidence and ability to interact and thus build collegiality. I also wanted to facilitate all students in developing an understanding of themselves as global citizens (a central unit aim). This paper is not a research project and therefore I did not collect data to monitor the outcomes of activities. However, students' verbal feedback and university teaching surveys have guided my reflections about, and changes to teaching and learning strategies and confirm my observations, assumptions and comments about their effectiveness.

The learning environment

Contemporary socio-cultural pedagogic theory argues, "teaching and learning are shaped by the social and cultural context of the learning environment and the complex and dynamic human activity systems within them at a particular point in time" (United Kingdom Council for International Student Affairs, 2012, 1). To optimise learning, students need to communicate effectively, which is facilitated when they are comfortable to speak and try out their ideas, feel accepted as one of the group, are not 'othered'. I, like most academics understand

this in relation to teaching domestic students with their diverse "socio-cultural contexts" and their "previous learning environment". As an Anglo-Celtic, female, Australian academic who has much in common with these students, I teach effectively for most of them. However, I – as with teachers Susan Adler interviewed for her research on teaching epistemology and diversity – rarely know much beyond "tourist information" (Adler, 2011, 609) about the international students' cultures and less about their previous learning environments. While over time we accrue general knowledge, it is rarely possible to acquire specific knowledge of the "socio-cultural context of the learning environment" and the previous learning on which individual international students "schema" or "meaning system" is built. Generally, we meet students in the first week of semester and work with them for fifteen weeks and if lucky work with them in successive units.

In *GGCP*, my teaching model and expectations are new for the majority of international students, who are familiar with the lecture format but not with listening in English spoken as a first language or to ideas framed within a western theoretical context. They are often not familiar with interactive tutorials in which they are required to speak about lectures they have heard an hour before and make links to the week's reading. However, many international students in *GGCP* are familiar with the issues the unit focuses on, so they can assimilate new information with their current knowledge. Importantly, the international students can provide valuable cultural knowledge for other international and domestic students and the teacher if the learning environment facilitates this. When this occurs, they play an important role in internationalising the curriculum while gaining experience speaking in class. In 2010, I had not determined the unit content or teaching strategies. Further, I was behind all semester, often reading the unit material at the same time as the students. This left little time for reflection and adapting teaching and learning strategies sufficiently to give students the best possible learning experience or have students benefit from each other's knowledge. I was able to remedy this the following year; a reminder that learning is incremental for everyone.

In her paper, "Teaching International Students: Strategies to enhance learning", Sophie Arkoudis challenges readers to accept that at least to some extent academics' views of teaching international students are based on preconceived ideas that international students are "reluct[ant] to talk in class, [have] a preference for rote learning and an apparent lack of critical thinking skills" (Arkoudis, 2011, 5). Arkoudis's observation was useful to me as a reminder to reflect critically on what is happening for students rather than making assumptions based on stereotypical ideas. It assisted me to rethink the experience with the Singaporean students some years earlier, to question what was missing from the teaching and learning environment in 2010 and remedy this. It was also necessary to extend my reflection to include other Asian students, African and European students to whom the same stereotypical ideas are applied. Importantly, the same principles apply to the domestic students.

Arkoudis identifies four challenges specific to international students, for moving beyond stereotypical thinking. These are: "learning and living in a different culture; learning in a foreign university context; learning with developing English language proficiency; and learning the academic disciplinary discourse" (Arkoudis, 2011, 5). While these challenges are self-evident, it was useful to read and reflect on them in relation to international and domestic students who experience the same challenges. Again, this is not new, rather a reminder to think about strategies that Arkoudis identified: "internationalising the curriculum; making lectures accessible; encouraging participation in small group work; ... supporting students in developing critical thinking skills; and, explaining assessment expectations" (Arkoudis, 2011, 6) and plan learning tasks accordingly.

The *Gender, Globalisation and Cultural Politics* unit

The *GGCP* unit provides students with a global perspective, focusing specifically on the gendered dimensions of economic and cultural politics. It discusses the growth of international capitalism and, especially since the early 1980s, its expansion beyond national boundaries, which has created a greater degree of integration and interdependency between nations and national economies. Students

interrogate the positive and negative impacts of global economics on cultures, poverty, health and the environment. It analyses issues such as sex trafficking, HIV/AIDS, transnational corporations and corporate social responsibility. The readings are drawn from a wide range of sources, including the United Nations website, relevant government and NGO websites and journals; problematically, only one is from a local community group. True diversification of sources for readings, at the required academic standard, is a challenge for the future.

From 2011, the unit sought to have all students understand themselves as international and global citizens. To achieve this, students learn to situate the economic, political, social systems of their home country, including Australia, within global economics, politics, and cultures. This is an important step in students understanding that all countries are interconnected, whether we recognise this in our daily lives or not. It helps clarify the need for thinking ethically about global as well as local issues. At the end of the unit, a few Australian students, who had not travelled overseas, expressed their initial difficulty with understanding Australia as just one example of a socio/economic/ political model because for them Australia was the norm. The students also analyse what responsible citizenship means, requiring an understanding of being a global citizen and the necessity to engage with issues of equity and social justice, sustainability and the reduction of prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination (ALTC National Teaching Fellowship, 2012). This analysis can be confronting, in particular for the domestic students, as they engage with their own social, including gender and non-Indigenous economic and political privilege.

In the first two years, the unit had undergraduate and postgraduate level students. The international students were ethnically, culturally and linguistically different to each other, coming from places as diverse as Ethiopia, Bhutan, Vietnam, Malaysia, Indonesia, Japan, Canada and Seychelles. The postgraduate students work for government agencies, NGOs, university and various businesses. Importantly the international students, in particular, had chosen to study in Australia rather than elsewhere. They all expressed global

worldviews, which were markedly different to the domestic students. All the international students, to varying degrees, found listening, speaking, reading and writing English difficult. The following year, the student cohort was less diverse with a mix of students from Europe, Asia and Australia, most were Gen Y students, and a smaller number of mature age domestic students.

Student dynamics and introduction to theoretical concepts through engagement with identity

My first concern in the tutorial was to establish effective group dynamics and make apparent the relationship between personal and theoretical discourses. I thus began the first tutorial in 2011 (and again in 2012), with an exercise in which students formed a group or groups based on their identities and later explained their grouping to the class. This ensured all students spoke with others immediately in conversations that explicated the nexus between theory and the everyday. All students thus spoke and listened to each other and exchanged personal information to make decisions about identity. As expected students were more or less confident about introducing themselves, so that more confident students often initiated exchanges. Questions students asked me about how to do the activity and the students' explanations of their decision making process raised a series of issues to work into the unit content and teaching strategies.

Students had conversations, formed and reformed groups. One student asked twice whether he should look at the colour of other people's skin. A domestic student asked whether the Australian students should identify their cultural heritages even if their grandparents were Australian. Once they had formed their groups, they negotiated how to explain their grouping. At the end of the sorting process, there were several groups with interesting accounts of why they were together. One student asked if it was all right not to join a group.

The explanations of groupings raised questions and identified concepts central to the unit. A man and woman paired up based on having a similar colour, and being from the same broad geographic

region. One man and woman paired up because they are both indigenous, rather than pairing with others from the same country. The indigenous students also identified themselves as being in a lower socio-economic group to the other students from both countries. The domestic students sorted themselves into groups depending on their families' countries of origin, so that three students identified themselves as Mediterranean and the remainder as either Anglo or Celtic Australians. Two men grouped together because of the geographic proximity of their countries but were uneasy about this because one was indigenous and the other was not. For many of the international students politics was a key identity factor while for the domestic students it was not. Interestingly, whether they were international, domestic, mature age or Gen Y students was not an issue. The activity and the discussion facilitated students speaking and listening to each other, exchanging personal information and thereby starting to form meaningful relationships. The process produced what Adulis et. al. termed a "climate of interaction" (Higher Education Academy, 2012) that opened up possibilities for learning through the exchange of experiences, because students began speaking meaningfully to each other.

Students critically analysed their groupings and explanations for their choice of grouping, which included discussions of racial difference. This prompted one student to say she had read about scientists disputing the idea of 'different races', a way the class were describing themselves. It highlighted important concerns about everyday use of concepts and terminology including whether people use them correctly, what information they convey, the affects of using concepts and language, such as 'race' in outdated and inaccurate ways. The exercise also highlighted the heterogeneity of identity within the international and domestic groups, which the students were able to link to notions of international and global identities.

For the Anglo/ Celtic Australian students hearing about Chinese people in Asian countries other than China, including their higher socio-economic status raised issues about their own limited knowledge of non-British colonialism and imperialism. They

acknowledged that they were unaware of the social and economic effects of intra Asian colonialism and migration. One student explained that she had learnt Japan is culturally and ethnically Japanese and homogenous though she knows that the Ainu, the indigenous people of Japan are 'the original inhabitants' and occupy the lowest socio-economic class as in other colonial societies. Students' interest in what each other had to say was immediately apparent.

Doing the exercise encouraged students to raise questions about what is acceptable and not acceptable to say and do depending on gender, culture and religion. This prompted a discussion about asking if you want to know something. We agreed that in the class, as long as everyone is respectful, we would put 'political correctness' aside. This is in keeping with Kathleen Melymuka's finding that being caught up in political correctness and well-intentioned sensitivity "can stifle constructive engagement" and cause abrasive situations. She writes, "we draw conclusions, but we don't say anything and we don't learn anything. So not only is there no connection, we drive a wedge into the relationship with suspicion and fear, and it becomes difficult to work in that relationship" (Melymuka, 2006, 42). Students also raised concerns about the difficulties of talking about unequal power relations in a tutorial where those power relations already existed through gender, culture, religion and privilege; for instance between Indigenous and non Indigenous Asian men, women and men, and those who could use technology and those with limited skills. While students began tentatively, the outcome was the creation of a safe space to speak and listen to others in which they had a responsibility to actively participate.

Doing the identity exercise – in 2011 and 2012 – was a useful first step in having students interact effectively. In later classes (for both years), when students formed small groups, men initially paired up and international students formed groups with others with whom they felt most comfortable. I asked the men to stand, look at the distribution of men and women, move accordingly, and repeated this for international and domestic students. It reconnected students to the earlier discussions of heterogeneity and the opportunities to learn

through diversity. In 2011, with the more diverse group, my blatant, "at least one man and one black and white person in every group" made students laugh but more importantly reconnected them to the rule about putting aside 'political correctness' within the classroom. The humour was useful. I appreciate that whether speaking in such a way is appropriate depends on the group and a careful assessment of everyone's sensibilities. Hence, the need to reflect critically on the skills and learning outcomes the unit is trying to achieve with each new group of students and the socio-cultural context of their previous learning as identified by the Higher Education Academy.

The exercise worked equally well when the student cohort was less diverse with students still focusing on ethnicity, often through ancestral history and interestingly music. It also identified similar teaching and learning content and strategies to those identified with the more diverse group.

Difficulties understanding and communicating

In 2010 and 2011, I found from conversations with the students that the majority of international students had difficulty engaging with the reading, lectures and tutorials because, they find listening, speaking and writing English difficult. I assume that their initial reluctance to speak in tutorial was because of their lack of English proficiency and therefore difficulty in understanding the lectures. While, from later conversations with students, I find this is true, their reluctance might also be because of cultural and gender rules, education, life experiences and other issues that we have not been able to explore. Difficulty with understanding lectures because of language was particularly the case for the first four weeks which introduce, define terms and the theoretical perspectives, and tend to contain language that is technical, and have less every day examples. In 2012, I simplified the lectures, gave more everyday examples from a variety of cultural perspectives and did more close reading of texts in tutorials. The readings, which supplement and extend the lectures, add another layer of anxiety for those students who cannot read English proficiently and for those who focus on visual media rather than written texts. However, I think they are vital. Some

international students can also experience lectures and readings as too western centred, as was the case in the first weeks dealing with theoretical perspectives on globalisation and gender. Mid semester in 2011, students explained that they were thus anxious about having to articulate ideas and did not know what questions to ask in the tutorials. This is consistent with Mills (1997) and others who found that international students lacked the proficiency in comprehending and speaking English to keep pace with domestic students. I asked three confident students how they experienced the tutorials. They explained that they felt an added burden to speak up not only because of the international students but also for the domestic students, who for whatever reason may not have much to contribute some weeks.

Several domestic students – each year – certainly had difficulties communicating and comprehending the readings and lectures, likewise the four first theoretical lectures. However, in 2011 and 2012 groups interacted well from the beginning of semester so talked to others openly about their difficulties. Further, by doing the reading and asking questions most domestic students could work through their difficulties. They have the advantage of English being their first language and familiarity with their learning environment. These issues were exacerbated for all students at the beginning of each year because students often found it difficult to understand what others were saying and became embarrassed to keep asking them to repeat. Two domestic students drew my attention to this problem when they were working in small groups. A student beckoned me to join their discussion so I could see the difficulties they had communicating and their reluctance to keep asking others to repeat themselves. I was able to raise the issue with the class, acknowledge my difficulty understanding some people. I owned that I found it difficult to ask people to repeat themselves too often and that it can take me some time to concentrate on listening rather than what I might say next. Knowing that the tutor faces similar problems can, I think, be useful to students.

Listening is not always simple. An inability to know how to listen appropriately often exacerbates difficulty with communication. "To listen well, students must understand the difference between hearing

and listening while recognizing and controlling the many listening barriers within the classroom" (Bond, 2012, 61). In her work on listening and emotional support, Jones explains that:

> Listening is a multidimensional construct that consists of complex (a) cognitive processes, such as attending to, understanding, receiving, and interpreting messages; (b) affective processes, such as being motivated and stimulated to attend to another person's messages; and (c) behavioral processes, such as responding with verbal and nonverbal feedback (e.g., backchanneling, paraphrasing) (Jones, 2011, 86).

In addition, active listening consists of verbal strategies (asking clarifying questions), whereas passive listening is nonverbal in nature (providing back channelling cues) (Jones, 2011, 86). I assume most people usually take listening and hearing for granted, and are often passive listeners; however, effective cross-cultural communication is a complex process that requires active participation. Most rarely, practice or teach this skill, which Beall et al. argue, "fosters motivation and improvement in both learning and listening among the students and the instructor" (Beall et al., 2008, 63). When students learn to actively listen, they engage with the content and each other in ways that dispel notions of students – particularly some international students – as rote learners unable to think and speak their own ideas. Through this peer interacting and learning – hearing first hand about the effects of HIV, or knowing what mining in WA is like – the students learn from each other.

In 2011, a further barrier to understanding and communication for several domestic students was feeling intimidated by the international students' first hand knowledge of unit content such as poverty, HIV/AIDS, civil war, the negative effects of transnational corporations. These domestic students felt reluctant to express their ideas or ask questions because their knowledge was from texts rather than first hand. It was the case, that the international students' class status – in most of their cases – achieved through access to education has not distanced them from families, including their own, living in chronic poverty, with HIV/AIDS, and socio/economic insecurity without government welfare systems to rely on. This first hand knowledge of

issues the *GGCP* unit focuses on brings a wealth of knowledge to the class and sharing in this is a benefit and privilege for the domestic students, which they appreciate once they overcome their own insecurities in a respectful environment.

Working in small groups

In both 2011 and 2012, working in small groups, a large part of the two-hour weekly tutorial was a key factor to the success of the unit, reflecting my belief that when students develop social interaction and communication skills they learn more effectively. According to Illingworth and Hartley work in groups is used "to manage a large cohort; to develop appropriate skills in collaboration; to simulate a real work environment; etc. and is considered by some to "lead to greater efficiency and effectiveness" (West, 1994 in Illingworth and Hartley, 2007, 1). Others argue, "teams are inherently inferior to individuals, in terms of efficiency" (Robbins and Finley, 2000 in Illingworth and Hartley, 2007, 1). For me, depending on the student cohort and the purpose, one of the key considerations is whether group work facilitates students' collegiality and learning.

Volet and Mansfield argue, in their writing about group work, that understanding the value of "social forms of learning" (Volet and Mansfield, 2006, 335) can be "challenging for lecturers and students" most particularly when group assignments "are emotionally and socially demanding with unclear benefits for student learning" (Volet & Mansfield, 2006, 341). Further, as Barron (2006) argues, domestic students can resent small group work if they feel international students lack of English skills will jeopardise their own grades; this is particularly true for students who regard education as a product. To alleviate students' defensiveness about their grades or feelings of disadvantaging others, there was no grade directly attached to group work (in all three years). Rather, students used part of the group time to discuss texts, concepts and lectures and connect these to practical examples, before doing individually assessed writing exercises. This will not always be ideal but as my central concern was group cohesion and open communication it worked well.

In 2011 and 2012, as students discussed the weekly topic, I moved between groups ensuring that all students participated by asking questions of quieter students. This monitoring of the groups and prompting acted as a model and the outgoing students actively prompted others. This is consistent with Volet and Mansfield's finding that "explicitly valuing, and monitoring of group processes" … "encourage[s] positive outcomes for individuals and the group" (Volet and Mansfield, 2006, 355). Once students were working to include everyone in the discussions, they became more patient about listening to others; thus encouraging the less confident ones to speak. They were in Volet and Mansfield's terms "regulating peers' behaviours and motivations to reflect concern for peers' benefits (Volet and Mansfield, 2006, 355). As each group, and all students, had to report to the class, the confidence to have something to say was important.

Encouraging students to speak to the whole class

Students' having the confidence to speak to the class was a key concern. A few weeks into semester in 2011 and 2012, I announced a series of guest speakers in tutorial, to elaborate in some way on the week's topic. Students initially thought this was to be an external speaker. Then because I had just heard one of the Asian students, in the small group discussions, explaining community consultation processes in the villages where he worked, I asked him to tell the class about this. My strategy was to choose students who had spoken on a topic in the small groups because they had rehearsed it informally. Students remained in their groups. The informality of the seating was less threatening than standing in front of a class. After a few minutes, I asked a question and others followed. We did this every week with more than one student speaking some weeks. This form of impromptu oral presentations was useful because students did not feel burdened to prepare work separate to the week's readings. It had the added benefit of keeping students on task, rather than them just chatting, when in small groups.

In 2011, one of the domestic Gen Y students asked for notice the week before she spoke, as she was not confident of having enough to say. Several domestic Gen Y students required more questions to prompt

them. Their dilemma arose because they could not speak with first hand knowledge of issues relying instead on the readings and general media information. They were reticent feeling that they had to gauge the validity of the statistics and information from the readings in relation to what international students said about these topics. For some domestic students the international students were the arbiters of the validity of much knowledge, this included the Gen Y students who were looking up material in class. These students were concerned that everyone else already had all their knowledge. They were also more likely to direct their speaking to me rather than the larger group, a sign of their insecurity. Because of the nature of the tutorial group and the close monitoring of small group discussions this did not cause negative dynamics; however it could have and certainly some students were uncomfortable which I needed to address.

While I tried to alleviate the domestic students' difficulty by explaining Australia as a political, economic model like any other country, I had not built this into the curriculum adequately in 2011. I reworked the unit so that in 2012, students focused on issues, including transnational corporations, the increase in HIV/AIDS in Western Australia as they do with the same issues in Tanzania, for instance. This more clearly situated Australia in the global sphere and increased their confidence of the social context about which they were speaking. It did not eliminate their need to rely on secondary sources, for few of them have direct experience of the issues – though they may well have family working on mines – however, more felt they had some authority on the topic. Each year there will be a new group of students and the same issue may not apply; however, Australia will always need to be situated in the international context.

In conclusion, as I reflect on my teaching with diverse student groups, I appreciate that interrogating pedagogy, adjusting curriculum and teaching strategies to meet specific group needs is central to providing the best possible learning experience. Enhancing communication between all students and the teacher is the most important step in this process. Clearly, it is not possible given the time constraints to radically review curriculum content after meeting new student groups for the first time. However, time taken to learn

about their backgrounds and providing them with ways of drawing on their socio-cultural experiences to understand and contribute and possibly finding supplementary readings is rewarded. Teaching strategies adapted to the particular student cohort are central to making students learning experience as comprehensive and positive as possible. For future classes, I evaluate and decide on as many teaching strategies as possible once I have met classes. This is difficult when student numbers are large, it is also complicated by having more than one tutor in a unit. In 2013, I propose to work with a tutor who is willing to work in a similar way. We will begin by deciding what it means to each of us to be a reflective teacher and how this will inform our teaching decisions.

I am very happy with domestic and international student's continuing responses to their experience of GGCP in particular, their recognition of benefitting from speaking up, even though they were uncomfortable doing so at the time. I am enjoying ongoing conversations with students who feel they have made strong connections with others because the class overcame the desire "not to offend" and opened up discussions of sensitive issues. For me, this is about having created a safe learning environment, facilitating students to become transformative intellectuals, which they take to other situations.

References

Arkoudis, S. (2011) 'Teaching International Students: Strategies to enhance learning', Centre for Higher Education: The University of Melbourne.

Barron, P. (2006) 'Stormy Outlook? Domestic students' impressions of international students at an Australian university', *Journal of Teaching in Travel and Tourism*, 2(2), 5-22.

Barron, P. (2010) 'Teaching international students'. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, 9(1), 128-131.

Beall, M. Gill-Rosier, J. Tate, T. Matten, A. (2008) 'State of the Context: Listening in Education', *The Intl. Journal of Listening*, 22, 123-132.

Bond, C. (2012) 'An Overview of Best Practices to Teach Listening Skills'. *International Journal of Listening*, 26(2), 61-63.

Gardner, S., and Eng, S. (2005) 'What Students Want: Generation Y and the Changing Function of the Academic Library', *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 5(3), 405-420.

Giroux, H. (2010) 'Bare Pedagogy and the Scourge of Neoliberalism: Rethinking Higher Education as a Democratic Public Sphere'. *The Educational Forum*, 74(3), 184-196.

Illingworth, V. and Hartley, P. (2007) 'Group Development Theory'. *In Group Development Literature Review.*

learnhigher.ac.uk/resources/files/Group%20work/group_theory.doc

Jones, S. (2011) 'Supportive Listening'. *International Journal of Listening*, 25(1), 85-103.

Larrivee, B. (2000) 'Transforming Teaching Practice: becoming the critically reflective teacher'. Reflective Practice, 1 (3), 293-307.

Melymuka, K. (2006) 'Political Correctness REVISITED'. Computerworld 40(39), 42-42. http://search.proquest.com/docview/216093423?accoun tid=12629.

Osmond, J. and Roed, J. (2010) 'Sometimes it means more work... Student Perceptions of Group Work in a Mixed Cultural Setting', in Jones, E. (ed.), *Internationalisation and the Student Voice: Higher Education Perspectives,* New York and London: Routledge.

Rothstein, M. and Epps, P. (2001) 'Pharmocogenomics and the (ir)relevance of race', *The Pharmacogenetics Journal*, 1, 104-108.

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

Skene, J. Cluett, L. Hogan, J. (2007) Engaging Gen Y students at university: what web tools do they have, how do they use them and what do they want? Student Services: The University of Western Australia.

http://www.fyhe.com.au/past_papers/papers07/final_papers/pdfs/2b.pdf

Snowman, J., Dobozy, E., Scevak, J., Bryer, F., and Bartlett, B. (2009) *Psychology Applied to Teaching*. Milton Qld: John Wiley & Sons.

Volet, S. and Mansfield, C. (2006) 'Group work at University: significance of personal goals in the regulation strategies of students with positive and negative appraisals'. *Higher Education Research & Development Journa*l, 25(4), Nov 341-356. Routledge.

The Higher Education Academy (2012) 'Pedagogic Theory'. Retrieved September 20, 2012 from http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/ourwork/ teachingandlearning/internationalisation/internationalstudents

The Higher Education Academy (2012) 'Group Work'. Retrieved September 20, 2012 from http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/resources/detail/ internationalisation/ISL_Group_Work

About the Author

Kathryn Trees *teaches in the School of Arts at Murdoch University. Her teaching and research focuses on issues of equity and social justice.*

Contact Details

School of Arts
Murdoch University
90 South Street,
Murdoch, WA, 6150

K.Trees@murdoch.edu.au