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Abstract

This paper reports on findings of evaluative research into student perceptions of a structured academic development workshop, which was specifically designed to induct and orient international students into the academic expectations of their program of study at a university in Australia. With most Australian universities engaged in the business of internationalisation of higher education, there is some debate about the adequacy of practices adopted by these institutions to familiarise their non English-speaking background (NESB) international students with the Australian academic culture. While the practices of some Western universities are sometimes said to be inadequate, there also appears some consternation about international students’ lack of motivation to learn and their inability to master Western academic conventions. Against this backdrop, the paper outlines the impetus for collaboration between the university’s Learning Skills Unit and faculty staff in designing and facilitating a tailored academic development workshop for graduate students. After laying out related literature and details of the workshop, there is discussion of the data collection methods, and an analysis of the data from students. The paper makes a call for repeat workshops at the beginning of every semester, as an indispensable component of the overall content delivery strategies in the faculty’s graduate program. The paper concludes by contemplating the educational integrity inherent in program and faculty staff development initiatives, which are focused on addressing the academic and cultural proclivities of an international student cohort.

Introduction

Australia’s tertiary education sector places some significant reliance on an income stream generated from international students (Department of Education, Science and Training, 2005). For a time, international student fees accounted for a period of prosperity and growth in the sector, with lesser focus perhaps on the educational and cultural experience of those international students. More recently, however, contrary economic trends and stronger global competition in the international student market have, in addition to other factors, contributed to a measure of turbulence in the sector. At the same time, many Asian nations have implemented developments to their own education programs (Medew, 2005). Accordingly, several Australian tertiary education institutions now appear to give more careful attention to the predicament in which many international students find themselves as they cope with what for many of them
is a foreign, if not to say alien, education system (Marginson, Nyland, Ramia and Sawir, 2005). Not that the impetus for such careful attention to the requirements of international students need only be driven by economic factors, but the economic gains to be derived from the international student body must inevitably provide an institutional rationale for addressing the difficulties faced by international students. This sets up a moral dimension to the need for higher education institutions to attend to the knowledge and skills base of commencing international students. The thrust of this paper is that, by admitting international students into their programs, Australian universities bear a moral obligation to educate those students in the local academic culture and conventions; and to do that in ways that are relevant to and consistent with the circumstances of their international students. The paper proposes a cascading responsibility for faculty teaching staff to show, in turn, cultural sensitivity for the academic conventions which international students bring to their experiences at Australian universities.

Commencing with a discussion of the literature, the paper threads the difficulties faced by international students with some of the pedagogical strategies for addressing them. While universities often provide academic support and language courses for their international students, academic preparation programs especially designed for international students are still not the norm at every university in Australia (Ingram, 2005). What's more, students may not be aware of the generic academic preparation programs, or even realise their importance. Therefore, academic preparation programs which are anchored to faculty characteristics and expectations of students may have a better capacity to make a positive contribution to students’ experience and learning.

The paper outlines the impetus for the collaboration between an Australian university’s Learning Skills Unit and faculty staff in designing and facilitating such an academic preparation program. The resulting workshop was designed for students of the Master of International Tourism and Hospitality Management degree, a discipline-focused business management coursework program for graduate students. Almost all of the students in the program were international students, mainly from Asia or the Middle East and, with two in-takes into the program each year, the cohort in any semester consisted of both new and continuing students. The paper reports on findings of research into these students’ perceptions of the structured academic development was specifically designed to induct and orient them into the academic expectations of their program of study. There is discussion of the data collection methods, as well as an analysis of the data. Based on students’ perceptions and evaluation of the workshop, the paper makes a call for repeat Workshops at the beginning of every semester, as an indispensable component of the overall content delivery strategies in the Tourism and Hospitality graduate program.

The paper concludes by contemplating the educational integrity inherent in program and faculty staff development initiatives, which are focused on addressing the academic and cultural proclivities of an international student cohort. The conclusion proposes that this type of attention to the commencing skills base of international students constitutes a moral responsibility for Australian universities.

Related literature

The issue of international students’ academic integrity is complex (Chanock, 2003; Hamilton et al. 2003, Leask, 2004, Carroll, 2005 cited in Handa and Power, 2005). Its analysis calls on the full range of the study-related problems that international students face in Western universities. In the higher education sector, the issue of academic integrity is normally only related to students. For example, in many academic conferences where academic integrity is the main theme, mostly it is the students whose integrity is the focus question. Similarly in many university policies, academic misconduct is again mostly related to students’ conduct. However, academic integrity within an institution can involve not only its students’ honesty but
also the moral attitude of its academic staff as well as the institution itself. In this way, providing quality – and culturally sensitive – education is very much the responsibility of universities and academics (Srikanthan and Dalrymple, 2002; Leask, 2005).

Research has confirmed that most new students face adjustment issues during their transition to university (Kantanis, 2000; McInnis, 2001; Pitkethly and Prosser, 2001; Krause, Hartley, James, and McInnis, 2005). This transition period is usually even more challenging for international students from a non English-speaking background (NESB). Conventions of scholarship in the Australian education system may be different from those of their home culture (Volet, 1999; Dawson and Bekkars, 2002; Handa, 2004) and their own cultural background and prior learning experiences can have an impact on their teaching and learning expectations in their new academic culture (Fisher, Lee and Bert, 2002). For example, international students may rarely have been previously required to engage in critical analysis, argumentative writing or referencing; and they may not have been required to participate in discussion at tutorials. According to Handa (2003), one of the most problematic hurdles in the academic adjustment of NESB international students in Western universities is their inability to comply with the cultural and educational requirements of their host institutes. Some of these problems – once they are acknowledged as developmental issues – can usually be resolved by giving the students extra academic support, as well as time to adjust to the new academic culture (Handa, 2003, Caroll, 2004).

Unfortunately, however, these needs can be overlooked by some Western academics who may have a view of NESB international students as poor writers and plagiarists (Chalmers and Volet 1997; Warner, 1999; Park, 2003; Intron, Hayes, Blair and Wood, 2003, cited in Leask, 2005). This perception might first of all stem from a lack of cross cultural understanding (Ramburuth and McCormick, 2001; Leask, 2001; Carroll, 2004 cited in Handa and Power, 2005). It is true that for many international students who come from a non English-speaking background when even following the content of their subject matter in another language is enough of a challenge in itself (Li, 1999), reading and writing tasks can be a struggle. But in many cases it may not be only their poor writing skills, it could be their lack of knowledge about Western academic conventions (Biggs, 2003) that can lead to sub-standard writing as well as to instances of ‘plagiphrasing’, cutting and pasting from a published source without acknowledgment (Ryan, 2000; Handa, 2003); thus branding such students as plagiarists and poor writers.

Another reason for teachers’ perception of students’ poor standard of writing could also result from the complexity surrounding the notion of plagiarism. Usually when students plagiarise or do not write well it is not always a straightforward case of dishonesty or poor English. It can be due to their ignorance of the conventions and expectations of the new academic culture: students’ lack of understanding of the requirements for critical analysis or referencing, say, can be an underlying reason for their poor standard of writing and for plagiarism (Handa, 2003). Plagiarism is a ‘culturally loaded concept’ that causes ‘much anxiety for both academics and students’ (Leask, 2005, p. 1) as both struggle in their respective efforts to learn or teach about it. Most new students struggle with the notion of borrowing and acknowledging others’ words and ideas in their writing at university (Carroll and Appleton, 2001; Carroll, 2002). Moreover, their teachers’ own inability to explain and define plagiarism (Carroll, 2003, Leask; 2004) and lack of instructions in how to avoid it (Handa and Power, 2005) can lead to more confusion. But for international students from foreign cultures, this might be an even more difficult situation, and their need for guidance and explicit instructions in this area might be even more urgent. Sometimes unacknowledged reproduction from other sources, which can be unethical in Western academic cultures, may represent a best practice in a student’s home culture (Scollon, 1995; Pennycook, 1996; James, McInnes and Devlin 2002; Carroll, 2004). Therefore, a perceived lack of academic integrity in many international students could more rightly be a matter of them not knowing, as well as not having the skills to follow Western academic conventions (Handa and Power, 2005). In such cases, the inclination for some academics may be to avoid looking beyond students’ inadvertent
or unintentional plagiarism and, instead, to take a punitive approach, rather than to see the situation as a learning opportunity for students.

Universities often emphasize that the responsibility for knowing the rules of their academic culture resides in students. An alternative view would hold that this responsibility would need to be shared by the institution and its academics as well; they would have a responsibility to induct students into the academic culture of their institution (Leask, 2005) and, in that case, penalizing students for unwitting plagiarism may represent an inappropriate response.

Another area that international students can also have difficulty is participating in tutorial discussions or giving seminar presentations. Modes of communication are socio-culturally shaped (Li, 1999), and in many traditions more attention can be paid to written work, instead of classroom participation (Pennycook, 1996; Volet, 1999; Li, 1999; Handa, 2003). Therefore, students with different educational and cultural backgrounds who may have developed a preference for working and communicating in a written form, may be unfamiliar with and unconfident about other conventions like speaking out in class or tutorials. Just as communication breakdowns can occur between foreign teachers and local students in Eastern classrooms, "...when teaching methodologies developed in one educational context are exported to another educational context' (Li, 1999, p.14), international students from foreign educational and cultural backgrounds may find it difficult to appreciate Australian classroom practices. They can also be expected to have difficulty following examples from Australian contexts (Handa, 2004) making their classroom participation even more difficult. Similarly, educators who are unaware of the different learning styles of their international students may be unable to show a requisite degree of flexibility in their course delivery (Ward, 2001) and assessments. As a result, such a disjointed educational experience can lead to international students failing or even withdrawing from university altogether (Croninger, 1991; Birt, Sherry, Ling, Fisher and Lee, 2004).

In the light of these study related problems for NESB international students, which can be exacerbated by issues of isolation and loneliness (Deumert, et al, 2005), it is therefore imperative that such students receive academic support and guidance (Burns, 1991; Leask, 1999; Ryan, 2000; McInnis, 2001; Schevyns, Wild and Overton 2003; Chanock, 2003; Handa, 2003; Carroll, 2004). In the case of postgraduate students, teaching them the academic rules of the game (Leask, 2005) especially during their transition period becomes even more crucial. This is because, without knowledge of Western academic conventions, international graduate students arrive unskilled in those very academic attributes which are assumed of graduate students: including the ability to critically analyse, reference (Guilfoyle, 2004; Jepson, Turner and Calway, 2002) and to participate in class discussions. There is opportunity for this guidance and support to come not only from learning skills lecturers but also from faculty academics (Beasley and Pearson, 1999). While abiding by these higher academic standards is considered very much part of the learning of students, it is also a responsibility that students expect their teachers to explicitly demonstrate in their instructions to them. Therefore, any failure to explain to students the academic rules of the higher education ‘game’ can be understood to represent the failure of a moral obligation on the part of the institutions and its academics (Leask, 2005; Handa and Power, 2005).

It is therefore incumbent upon universities which often rely on the revenue from the internationalization of higher education to acknowledge the difficulties experienced by their international students. What’s more, “academic staff may also have to recognise these problems of transition by adapting their own style of teaching” (Ballard and Clanchy, 1991, p. 109). They need to acknowledge the diversity of learners in today’s universities (Volet, Renshaw and Tiezel, 1994; Ireson, Mortimore and Hallam, 1999; Marginson, 2000). However, students from foreign educational cultures must also show a willingness to follow the principles and philosophies behind Western academic conventions, and to become familiar with skills like argumentative and reflective
writing, and referencing techniques. Students need time to adjust to a new academic culture and to develop skills in academic writing and critical thinking, for example. Therefore creating a better cultural understanding is a responsibility that teachers must share with their students (Wu, 2002, cited in Handa and Power, 2005). The students are apt to be confused by unfamiliar and dominant-culture literacy driven teaching practices and assessments (Mackinnon and Manathunga, 2003). A lack of explicit instructions in how to accomplish these assessment tasks then may intensify the problem. During this period of adjustment and learning it is perhaps appropriate for Western academics to respect the academic cultures of their students (Biggs, 2003; Leask, 2005), by acknowledging students’ previous educational experiences and ideas and also by adopting forms of assessment that cannot be easily plagiarised (Carroll, 2002, cited in Marshall and Garry, 2005).

Induction programs designed to clarify “how their programme will work, including assessment matters and early diagnostic exercises to identify those needing additional help” (Carroll, 2004, p. 1) are considered valuable for all students. Similar recommendations to improve the education experience of international students have been suggested by many (Phillips, 1990; Ballard and Clanchy, 1991; Ramburuth, 2001; Bretag, Horrocks, and Smith, 2002; Volet, 2003). New international students need to learn and adapt to the requirements of studying at a university very early in the semester (Weiland and Nowak, 1999) and academic preparation programs are the key to the transition. Positive outcomes have been reported from such initiatives (Harris and Bretag, 2002) and, although they have been recommended (Ingram, 2005); academic preparation programs for newly arrived international students are still not the norm at every university. Bridging these gaps for international students just like in the case of most other students “is either left to the interventionist (such as the learning adviser), or the student learns it by osmosis” (Peach, 2005, p.7).

While bridging programs and orientation activities can provide new students with important information and instructions, international students are sometimes known to arrive to campus late in their semester. They therefore miss out on orientation activities and, like domestic students, they may not immediately realize their deficit (Cargill, Percy and Bartlett, 2003, p. 91). What’s more, in a climate when higher education students generally engage in the “relentless pursuit of marks” (Maher, 2004, p. 52) and when students’ motivations and expectations are “tell us what we need to do, [and] we’ll do it” (Ottewill and Macfarlane, 2003, p. 34), the relevance of academic preparation programs can be overlooked by students, including international students. This approach can be thwarted, however, when academic preparation and support activities are built into faculty programs, and when academic reading and writing techniques are taught in the context of specific units of study (Weiland and Nowak, 1999; Cottrell, 2001; Biggs, 1999; Ramsden, 1997; Hounsell, 1997; Laurillard, 1996, cited in Peach, 2005).

This identifies a place for a collaborative approach – between both faculty and learning skills staff involved in academic preparation – towards the delivery of academic skills preparation (Harris and Bretag, 2002) in content-driven faculty contexts. Moreover, there is further scope to create interactive, positive learning environments when such programs involve both international and domestic students, and new and continuing students. In such cases, and with something of a cross-pollinating effect, both domestic and international students can be found to benefit from each other’s participation (Anderson and Baud, 1996; Cortazzi and Jun, 1997; Volet, 2003; Handa, 2004).

**Rationale for the Academic Development Workshop**

As a prerequisite for admission, students in the Master of International Tourism and Hospitality Management program were generally required to hold an undergraduate degree. Because the vast majority of these students were international students, their understanding and perception of tertiary education were garnered from their
undergraduate experiences in their home countries. With such a large proportion of students in the program from Asia and the Middle East, the Australian tertiary education system contrasted with what they had previously experienced.

For this reason, the university had, as a matter of course, made available to all students, occasional training sessions and short courses to assist with the academic demands of university study in Australia. These training sessions and courses were delivered by the university’s Learning Skills Unit, whose remit was to provide generic study and learning assistance for students: this was in addition to the usual discipline-focused assistance provided by academics in the university’s faculty. Attendance at the Learning Skills Unit’s training sessions and short courses was on a voluntary basis, usually outside the timetabled classes in the program.

Although careful and direct invitations to attend these sessions and courses were made to these Tourism and Hospitality students, attendance was very poor. With the focus on academic preparation, analysis and writing, these sessions and courses, by their nature, were not solely and immediately connected to the students’ current units of study. Anecdotally, it had been found that the generic nature of this study and learning assistance was considered by students to indicate that the assistance was a somewhat dispensable element in their learning. This led to a stronger collaboration between the academic staff in the Learning Skills Unit with those in the discipline-based faculty. A joint staff roundtable discussion drew attention to the difficulties experienced by students and staff in teaching international students. The discussion articulated an apparent discord between students’ and faculty expectations of the learning experience, with differences stemming from a range of perceived factors including students’ unfamiliarity with academic analysis and writing, and staff’s assumptions about graduate students’ ability to engage in classroom discussion.

To address such matters, the Learning Skills Unit and faculty staff further collaborated in designing and facilitating the compulsory, full-day Academic Development Workshop, for both new and continuing students, in the second week of the spring semester 2004. Students were specifically required to attend the Workshop, which was explained to be a ‘compulsory’ component of their course of study (although no sanctions for non-attendance were outlined). Some 42 students attended the Workshop.

These were the objectives of the Academic Development Workshop:

- To explain to students what was expected of them as Masters students. This included discussion of the faculty’s expectations that students should:

  - attend all classes (and explain any failure to attend before the absence from class);
  - take an independent, self-directed approach to study;
  - meet coursework and assessment submission deadlines; and
  - participate actively in class discussions.

In the explanation of these expectations, students were invited to reflect on how these might differ from their experiences in their undergraduate studies in their home countries. In discussions about these expectations, some cultural variances were quickly identified. For example, the view was expressed that in one Asian country, students’ contributions to class discussions were rare, while that was not the case in another. Also, students sought to excuse themselves from participating in class, arguing they were disadvantaged by having to participate in their second language.

- To give students some general academic study and learning tools and techniques that would assist them in their studies and in completing assessments. The Workshop included explanation of the various forms of assessment used in the Program, instruction (and a practice exercise) in
academic writing and critical analysis and the program’s requirements for referencing students’ written work. The discussion also introduced students to plagiarism, with some discussion of its ethical relevance to ‘cheating’. The focus of the discussions was explained as giving students the ‘rules of the game’, in the sense that the university practices and philosophies they were familiar with from their previous study may well be different in the Australian university.

- At an Interpersonal level, to give students an opportunity to become acquainted with other students and faculty staff.

Some of the other themes of the Workshop sessions included the need for students to be independent learners, time and stress management, working and studying in syndicate groups, and careers and employment advice. Most of the sessions included a student-based activity, and the topics were supplemented by an explanatory Workbook of the material covered.

**Workshop evaluation**

At the conclusion of the Workshop data was collected from students about their experience of the Workshop, and about their perceived value of it. In addition, in the last week of classes, students were surveyed again in a Follow-up Evaluation, for their reflective feedback, following their opportunity during the semester to apply the academic skills that had been covered in the Workshop.

The Workshop Evaluation consisted of these four substantive parts:

1. A rating of the usefulness of the Workshop, on a Likert scale ranging from 1 being ‘not much use’ to 5 for ‘a great deal of use’, and this was followed by a space for general comment;
2. An indication of which parts of the Workshop were most useful;
3. Any suggestions for changes or improvements; and
4. Areas in which the student-respondent required further assistance.

The ‘Follow-up Evaluation’ was similar to the one used at the conclusion of the Workshop, except that the sessions covered in the Workshop were listed, and students ticked those which they considered useful.

**Analysis of the evaluative data**

From the 39 surveys completed at the conclusion of the Workshop, the mean rating on the “usefulness” scale was 4.1 (with a possible highest score of 5), and with no score below 3. Some 46% of students provided a general comment about their rating: these are grouped into four key themes and shown in Table 1 in order of frequency (from most to least frequent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY THEMES</th>
<th>SAMPLE OF STUDENTS’ RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop provided learning</td>
<td>“Workshop made the standards &amp; requirements clear”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Clarified what is expected”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Specially useful for writing assignments”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great for new students</td>
<td>“Helpful for new students to settle in”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Should be offered at the start of each semester”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecific positive comments</td>
<td>“Workshop was perfect”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“A great workshop”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Conducted with great spirit and dedication”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comments</td>
<td>“Should be shorter”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Workshop was too late for me because it was my last semester”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Mandatory attendance was not appreciated”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 summarises (without exhausting) student responses on the remaining substantive parts of the Workshop Evaluation:
Table 2: Summary of student responses on other parts of the Workshop Evaluation

For the end-of-semester follow-up evaluation, responses were received from 30 students. Their mean rating of the usefulness of the Workshop was 4.1, the same rating given at the conclusion of the Workshop. At the end of the semester, however, students seemed clearer about suggested improvements to the Workshop. They identified the need for:

- More information about critical thinking and analysis, assignment writing, academic writing and referencing;
- More examples and opportunities to practise; and
- More workshops.

The evaluative data collected from students indicates that, while academic study skills (such as academic writing, critical thinking and analysis) were areas of most benefit to students, some of these were at the same time the areas in which students continued to crave still further knowledge and skills. This appeared to be so for “seasoned”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY OF RESPONSES</th>
<th>SAMPLE OF STUDENTS’ RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most useful part of the workshop (in order of most to least frequent)</td>
<td>&quot;Identification of analytical standards&quot; &quot;Assessment levels&quot; &quot;Writing academic assessments&quot; &quot;Essay planning and referencing&quot; &quot;Criteria about assignments&quot; &quot;Critical thinking&quot; &quot;Academic writing&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested changes for improvement (in order of most to least frequent)</td>
<td>&quot;I want to know more about writing assignments&quot; &quot;Should be organized at the start of each semester&quot; &quot;Please provide us with updates if you can&quot; &quot;Better to talk about issues with more examples&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas in which students required further assistance</td>
<td>&quot;More on writing skills&quot; &quot;Communication skills both orally and on paper&quot; &quot;Finding information from internet&quot; &quot;Career qualification coordination&quot; &quot;Communication skills&quot; &quot;Academic writing; career development&quot; &quot;Assistance in the research area&quot; &quot;Further clarifications on academic writing&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Most useful part of the workshop (in order of most to least frequent) | • General study & learning skills, including critical thinking and analysis, learning skills, referencing, time management • Academic writing and forms of assessment, including assignment and report writing • Group work/group assignments • General program & miscellaneous matters |
| Suggested changes for improvement (in order of most to least frequent) | • Approximately 25% of students suggested changes that would require more of what was already included, for example more handouts, examples and more about assignments. • Follow-up workshops • Three responses were negative: "workshop was too long", "change the room", "too much about referencing". |
| Areas in which students required further assistance | • Academic writing and analysis • Career development • Communication skills • Research and searching for information |
continuing students as much as for the new in-take. This, coupled with the high overall "usefulness" rating by students, was taken to signal a call to conduct the Workshop every semester, and to trial the introduction of "lunch-time seminars", during the semester, on those topics of particular concern to the students.

Concluding remarks

In general terms, student feedback about the Workshop confirmed a level of their satisfaction about its usefulness. While the earlier "optional" generic academic preparation sessions formerly offered by the university’s Learning Skills Unit had been poorly attended, data suggested that the "compulsory" Workshop appeared to have some strong support among the students. This response may result from the Workshop’s alignment to their specific program of study, but there does seem to be some support for the notion that even when academic preparation activities are known to be useful and beneficial to them most students are disinclined to engage in these activities and that sometimes for their own good these have to be ‘forced’ upon them. In this context, at least, the attitude of international students might not be too dissimilar to their domestic classmates.

So, at some levels, as mentioned earlier, international students can be understood to respond to the education experience much like any other student; in a pursuit of marks and attending to instruction on what to do. Yet, with their different educational backgrounds, international students are nonetheless in need of academic preparation and, like other students, left to their own devices, may be reluctant to engage in that, without some clear indication of how that might contribute to the educational outcome in the form of a passing grade. This therefore points to the need for higher education institutions, in recognition of their moral obligations to international students, to schedule academic preparations into faculty-level content delivery strategies. In this context at least, this study finds support from literature that records the benefits for international students of such an approach (Beasley and Pearson, 1999). Thus, in admitting international graduate students into their programs, it is thought to be obligatory for Australian universities to first recognise the need to impart to these students knowledge of, and skill in, Australian educational culture and conventions – and in so recognising that need, to impart that knowledge and skill in ways that are relevant for, consistent with and culturally sensitive to students’ previous educational experiences and circumstances.

Not unrelated to this institutional responsibility is the scope for faculty staff to factor knowledge of international students’ prior educational experiences into content delivery strategies. For example, simply expecting international graduate students to engage in in-class discussions or expecting them to produce accomplished written academic texts especially in the first few weeks of their course, when the students are unfamiliar with these skills, might result in unsatisfactory experiences for both students and staff. Such skills may need to be developed over a period of time, starting with meaningful induction into the new academic culture and with staged activities which enable students to explore and learn the skills required to fully participate in classroom discussions and engage in the discourse of their discipline.

This type of attention to the commencing skills base of international students – which should perhaps be no less so than for domestic students – is understood to constitute a moral responsibility for Australian universities (Srikanthan & Dalrymple, 2002), when they accept international students (and international student fees) into their institutions.
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