Abstract: With enterprises in industrialised market economies attempting to lift productivity in increasingly competitive global markets, Japanese models of human resource management (HRM) and industrial relations (IR) have attracted much attention, as Western enterprises attempt to emulate the performance of Japanese industry. Much of the research hitherto has focused on manufacturing, with few attempts being made to examine the HRM/IR practices of the services sector. This preliminary study examines the HRM practices of Japanese-owned subsidiaries and Western-managed firms in the Australian tourist industry, and examines the propensity for Japanese firms to transfer their lean management practices. A transaction costs analysis is attempted to provide a theoretical framework. This study suggests that the type of industry being examined has a stronger influence on a Japanese subsidiary's HRM practices than a stereotypical Japanese model being transferred.

Introduction

In 1992-93, Japanese foreign investment approvals in Australia were worth over A$2 billion (Foreign Investment Review Board, 1992-93). Of this investment, 15 per cent went to services, including tourism, while less than eight per cent went to the manufacturing sector (with the bulk of investment in real estate, mining and mineral exploration). In the early 1990s recession in Japan, Japanese foreign investment in Australia fell from its peak in the late 1980s, but Japan is still a major foreign investor in Australia. Thus the issue of transferability of Japanese management practices will continue to be of relevance to Australian industry.

There has been a substantial genre of research and rhetoric about the advantages (and sometimes also of the disadvantages) of Japanese styles of management and IR in the 1980s. This was fuelled by Japan's post-1945 'economic miracle' and in particular by its success in adapting to the 'oil shocks' of the 1970s and the rapid international growth of Japanese manufacturing businesses in the car and electronics industries such as: Hitachi, Honda, Matsushita, NEC, Nissan, Sony and Toyota. Early studies of this genre (e.g. Abegglen, 1958) tended to focus on large Japanese firms and use cultural explanations for the apparent success of Japanese management practices. Most early studies, still prescribed in some management courses, over-simplify the Japanese model and overlook important issues regarding its transferability.

Such prescriptions are in spite of subsequent research that has looked at Japanese industry more broadly, and has, for instance, included examinations ranging from corporate governance to workforce structures. Some observers have characterised Japan's workforce as divided into core and peripheral employees (e.g. Chalmers, 1987). This research indicates that many of the so-called 'traditional' Japanese management practices enthusiastically endorsed by early researchers, are typical only in large companies and apply to only about a third of the workforce, who could be seen as core employees.

Research on Japanese HRM practices has concentrated on Japanese firms in the manufacturing industry (e.g. Dore, 1973; Kamata, 1982; Cusumano, 1985; Womack et al., 1990). This bias towards manufacturing industry has also carried over into much of the research on the transfer of Japanese HRM practices abroad (Komai, 1989; Fucini and Fucini, 1990; Dedoussis, 1991; Carr, 1992; Morris et al., 1993; Grant, 1994). In looking at the transfer of Japanese-style 'lean production' or 'lean management' practices to an Australian motor vehicle manufacturing plant, one study found evidence of a relatively successful transfer of certain Japanese management practices. The transition from the previous neo-Fordist approach to a Kaizen (continuous improvement) approach was being achieved through a number of initiatives. These included a strong emphasis on training, the introduction of Quality Circles, the adoption of just-in-time practices, and a move towards greater teamwork (Shadur and Bamber, 1994).

The results of these innovations were notable. In the 1990-1991 period labour productivity as measured by person hours per unit, improved by 30 per cent, and quality, as measured in terms of defects per car, improved by 72 per cent. While productivity was generally still below the level of
its parent plants in Japan and of Japanese transplants in some other countries, this could reflect the smaller scale of such plants in Australia, which also meant that there was less automation in such Australian plants.

In view of the apparent ability to gain such measurable results, data from these manufacturing industries have often been seen as indicative of Japanese HRM practices more generally. However, which types of management styles would be most appropriate for the service sector? For the maximisation of long-run profits, manufacturing enterprises and those in the services sector may need to deal with their workforces in different ways. Lewis et al. (1992) see this question as having important implications for modern industrial economies where services now account for the majority of employment and income. They postulate that productivity differences in service industries are increasingly determining productivity differences between industrialised market economies. Yarwood (1993) examines this issue in Japan. With the move from heavy industry to high tech and service industries there, he sees an increasing need for workers' behaviour in Japan to resemble more closely that which is more typical of the West. In this new context in Japan, perhaps independent thinking is becoming more important than group decision making.

Despite this, and the international growth of Japanese banks and direct Japanese investment in the Australian tourism sector, it has attracted much less attention from researchers than manufacturing. This has important implications for the issue of transferability. For example, should an Australian company in the services sector be trying to improve its efficiency through emulating a textbook Japanese manufacturing management model (c.f. Schonberger, 1982), when little research has been undertaken to analyse and evaluate the benefits of such a move?

The 1990s also saw many Japanese or lean management practices included under the umbrella of ‘best practice’ methods, while there was also a range of alternative fashionable models for Western managers to imitate. These include notions of empowerment, quality management, leadership and strategic management. Using such different nomenclature it was no longer quite so apparent that Japanese management styles were a widely applicable model always to be emulated by others. Moreover, in the mid-1990s Japanese multi-national enterprises are not generally seen as quite the success story that they were in the 1980s. Further, the Japanese political economy has appeared to be rather unstable in recent years following the fall of the long-running Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) government in 1993. The LDP’s newly-acquired minority government status has also lent some uncertainty to the future political landscape of Japan.

In exploring these issues this paper considers: ‘To what extent are the product and labour market circumstances of the particular industry more important than country of ownership with regard to the types of HRM practices likely to be introduced by the firm?’

The transferability of Japanese or lean management styles

There is a considerable literature on notions of convergence and continuing diversity (e.g. Kerr, 1983; Poole, 1986) and on the transfer of ‘Japanese’ styles of management to Europe and North America especially to the UK and USA (e.g. Dore, 1973; Oliver and Wilkinson, 1992; Cusumano and Takeishi, 1991), but there has been much less research on the transferability of Japanese management to Australia.

This lack is despite the fact that by 1991 ‘at least 800 Japanese companies and representative offices were operating businesses in Australia. Altogether these companies accounted for over 110,000 people employed’. In 1988 the Japan External Trade Organisation (JETRO) conducted a survey of Japanese subsidiaries in Australia. It found that out of 26 firms researched, 22 of them listed labour relations as a major problem area (JETRO, 1989).

Dedoussis (1991) researched HRM practices in nine Japanese subsidiaries in the manufacturing sector in Australia and found qualified support for the proposition that some, but not all, Japanese management practices were being introduced into Australia by Japanese subsidiaries. He concluded that low-cost practices (such as job rotation and flexible demarcations) were being introduced but high-cost practices (such as lifetime employment) were not. This was explained through use of the core/peripheral model, with the Australian subsidiaries generally being treated as peripheral. Dedoussis, however, did not enlarge on why Japanese employers would choose to apply these high-cost practices to their core employees in Japan.
Franke (1993) examined Japanese subsidiaries in the automotive industry in Australia and paid particular attention to participatory management practices. She concluded that, of the companies studied, those with a greater degree of participatory management enjoyed higher staff morale.

As mentioned, the Shadur and Bamber (1994) investigation in the automotive industry in Australia found the introduction of lean management techniques created positive results in terms of increased productivity; however, the introduction of lean management did confront problems; not least of which was the extra stress perceived by supervisors responsible for managing the new practices. That study also noted that large distances and extended supply lines in Australia tend to limit the effectiveness of just in time delivery systems.

These studies, however, have not generally addressed whether ownership by a Japanese company has led to changes in the management practices in Australian subsidiaries which are substantially different from management practices being introduced by similar Western-owned firms in the same industry.
A transaction costs analysis of Japanese lean management

Koike suggested a model of a Japanese corporation concentrating on training and subsequent skill formation with 'minimal recourse to unique institutional and cultural variables' (1987: 289). This model yields important clues about Japanese management strategies when used in conjunction with a transaction cost analysis approach.

Transaction costs economics offers a theoretical framework to explain how an organisation can attempt to minimise its operating costs through its organisational structure. A transaction is seen as the basic unit of analysis, with firms being motivated to try and reduce the costs of their transactions to a point below those of their rivals (Williamson, 1991; Hennart, 1994). According to this approach the ability of a firm to minimise its transaction costs has a large bearing on its economic success. Transactions can either be conducted within the firm, or they can be conducted externally in the marketplace. In large Japanese firms, the labour market for core employees has been internalised, while the employment of casual and part-time employees has been left to the external market. Transaction costs economics gives an explanation as to why this has occurred.

In general, large manufacturing firms in Japan expend considerable time and resources on training new employees, and retraining and upgrading the skills of employees. However, this generalisation applies to core employees to a much greater extent than peripheral ones. The skills taught are generally those which are specific to the needs of the firm. The worker, therefore, gains a high degree of asset specificity, with the degree of specificity being measured by the ease with which a resource can be put to an alternative use. Given that the costs of training a new employee in the firm-specific skills are high, it is cost-efficient for an employer to give incentives which will encourage regular workers to remain committed to the firm. Thus, long-term job security is implied in the labour contract. Promotion is linked to seniority, and employer-subsidised welfare schemes offered. According to Koike, 'seniority wages simply reflect the nature of skill; skill is developed in a career over a long period within a firm' (1987: 327).

As long as the firm sees the cost of offering these incentives as being less expensive to the company than the cost of high labour turnover, the incentives will remain. There are also disincentives for employees to leave. It is difficult for an employee to transfer firm-specific skills to another company. Starting at a new firm often means starting at the bottom of the seniority ladder. Thus, the granting of extensive benefits to core workers, relative to other employees in the Japanese workforce, reflects an effort to minimise organisational transaction costs, rather than simply altruistic largess on the part of the firm towards its core employees.

Peripheral employees, such as casual and part-time workers engaged by the large firms, do not receive the same incentives. These workers are generally engaged to do work that requires generic skills, which can usually be found more easily in the external labour market. Similarly, while extensive subcontracting is common, most large companies in Japan still retain in-house those sections of the production process which give them a firm specific advantage over competitors (Asanuma, 1992). In these situations, the total costs of subcontracting out key production process, are seen as greater than the costs of conducting them inside the firm. In terms of transaction costs analysis, it is more economical to internalise the transaction than to externalise it.

On the propensity for large Japanese firms to have broad job descriptions, planned job rotations, and a group orientation, Aoki (1987, 1990, 1992) sees these as methods that facilitate greater decentralised decision-making in Japanese firms. Broad job descriptions and planned job rotations allow employees to gain a wide range of skills, as well as gaining a better appreciation of the firm as a whole. A group orientation allows for a better exchange of information on the shop floor. Such decentralisation of some decisions in a Japanese firm is regulated by the control of a centralised personnel department. The department looks after promotions and co-ordinates activities such as job rotations and training programs. This system of decentralised decision-making and centralised hierarchical control allows a Japanese firm considerable flexibility with its labour force, but it does incur costs. Economies that can be gained through specialisation are sacrificed and extra time is required for communication and co-ordination between the workgroup on the shopfloor. Thus, the leaders of such Japanese firms think that the benefits gained from these practices outweigh the costs involved.

Aoki sees the above Japanese model as being a superior one when the 'external environments are continually changing but not too drastically', while the Western model of specialisation is seen as superior when the environment for planning is stable (Aoki, 1990). The value of the information created by broad job descriptions and job rotation has allowed the firm to respond better to changes
in market demand. This benefit more than compensates for the losses in economies of specialisation.

Thus, Japanese HRM practices can be shown to be part of an organisational strategy to minimise transaction costs. On the issue of transferability, a transaction costs analysis approach would see Japanese companies having an incentive to transfer only those practices which would help to maximise efficiency and to minimise transaction costs in the environment of the host country. The firm-specific skill level required of employees in the industry would help to determine the type of HRM practices being introduced.

Japanese influences on management styles in Australia

Studies were conducted of five Japanese subsidiaries and five Western-owned companies in the tourist industry in 1994. The companies selected were all medium to large firms in Queensland with interviews being conducted with local managers and two Japanese expatriate managers. Surveys of employees were also conducted in each company, using questionnaires.

Interviews with managers

Managers were asked similar lists of questions, which were divided into the following groups: enterprise agreements; engagement, promotion and remuneration; unions, training and job demarcations; and socialisation and communication (see Table 1).

On the issue of the transfer of lean HRM practices to Japanese subsidiaries in Australia, responses from management provided mixed results. While two of the Japanese subsidiaries were considering negotiating an enterprise agreement, neither had made any formal efforts to do so. Of the Western firms, one had an enterprise agreement, one was considering one, and the remainder were not interested. Notwithstanding current exhortations by governments, unions and employers’ organisations, the majority of managers of all the firms seemed to see enterprise agreements as a future long-term possibility, but too much trouble in the short term.

Centralised personnel departments were in operation in the four largest Japanese subsidiaries; however, they were also in operation in the three largest Western firms. This suggested that their presence was more linked to the size of the firm than the country of ownership.

On the issues of engagement and promotion, the Japanese subsidiaries had no preference for immediate high school or university graduates. They did not implement seniority pay structures, and only one of the subsidiaries had a bonus pay system. While promoting internally was preferred to bringing in outside applicants, the issue of seniority was not a major factor in deciding an employee's suitability for promotion. In this respect, the Japanese subsidiaries showed little difference in their responses to the Western firms.

The Japanese subsidiaries were more inclined to have an induction training program than the Western firms. They had a high implementation rate for on-the-job training programs, while two also conducted regular off-the-job training programs; however, four of the five Western firms had also implemented on-the-job training programs, and two of these Western firms also conducted regular off-the-job training programs.

Table 1: Managers’ perceptions of the adoption of lean management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Japanese Subsidiaries</th>
<th>Western firms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Enterprise agreement?</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Centralised personnel department?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) School/university leavers preferred?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Induction: longer than one day?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Is promotion more seniority based?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Internal favoured promotion?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Are seniority increments paid?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Company bonus scheme operating?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Broad job descriptions?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Are there planned job rotations?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Multi skilling an objective?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Divided in work groups?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Planned on-the-job training?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14) Regular manager/staff meetings?
15) Suggestion box?
16) Newsletter?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Scores</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: 1994 Survey: 5 Japanese Subsidiaries and 5 Western Firms)

Broad job descriptions and planned job rotations had also been implemented in two of the Japanese subsidiaries, while one Western firm was regularly rotating its staff, and multi skilling was seen as a long-term objective by four of the other Western firms.

Communication between staff and management in the Japanese subsidiaries was assisted by regular meetings in four cases. Although their usefulness was said to be limited, two subsidiaries also operated suggestion boxes. All of the subsidiaries had company newsletters. Three Western firms held regular meetings between staff and management, though only one operated a suggestion box. Three of the Western firms also had a newsletter. Communication between staff and management in the Japanese subsidiaries, therefore, appeared to be slightly more highly developed than in the Western firms.

Most managers in both categories of firms saw communication between sections as properly going through the section head or supervisor. Thus, the concept of horizontal communication did not seem to have been introduced to any great degree either in the Japanese subsidiaries or Western firms. However, before we could draw firmer conclusions about such issues, it would be necessary to conduct more detailed research.

Overall, there was not a large difference between the responses of the two categories. To facilitate comparisons, we constructed a simple index of lean management by assigning a value of 1 to each of the lean management characteristics. Using this tentative index, from a maximum possible total of 80, the five Japanese subsidiaries scored a total of 38 (i.e. an average of 47.5 per cent), while the five Western firms scored 28 (i.e. an average of 35 per cent). Hence there appeared to be a slightly greater propensity for the Japanese subsidiaries to adopt lean management. This appeared more pronounced with company induction programs, and communication between management and staff, however, the different scores between the two categories should not be overemphasised, given the small samples.

Surveys of employees

The questions for the employees were divided into the following groups: on-the-job training and identification with the company; promotion, job rotation, decentralised decision making, and multi-skilling; group orientation and communication; and job security (see Appendix 1 for more details on survey data). Three hypotheses were tested:

1. Were lean management practices being introduced into the Japanese subsidiaries?
2. Were these being introduced to a higher degree than in the Western firms?
3. Were the introduction of lean management practices dependant on country of ownership?

Analysis of the questionnaires indicated that employees of the Japanese subsidiaries perceived that some Japanese-style HRM practices had been implemented; however, in most cases similar practices were also being implemented by the Western firms.

The main area where the perceptions of employees of Japanese subsidiaries differed from those of the Western firms was that of group orientation and communication, with these employees seeing group meetings as a more significant part of their work.

As shown in Table 2, comparison of the data obtained from employee surveys in the tourist industry showed little difference in the results from the two samples of firms. The results from the employee survey broadly support the results obtained from the interviews with managers.

Towards an explanation

Let us try and explain the above results using a transaction costs analysis. While training in the hospitality industry is undoubtedly important, an employee can generally be trained relatively quickly. Perhaps more importantly, training in the hospitality industry tends to be more for generic skills, rather than for firm-specific skills. Thus, a cocktail attendant or waiter would find that the skills gained in one enterprise would generally carry over to the next establishment.
Table 2: Employees' perceptions of lean management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Test 1</th>
<th>Test 2</th>
<th>Test 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1994 Survey: 5 Japanese Subsidiaries and 5 Western Firms

Test 1: + = lean management practices have been introduced into Japanese subsidiaries
0 = lean management practices have not been introduced into Japanese subsidiaries

Test 2: + = lean management practices have been introduced to a higher degree in Japanese subsidiaries
0 = lean management practices have not been introduced to any higher degree than Western firms

Test 3: + = A firm's country of ownership is a factor in its introduction of lean management practices
0 = A firm's country of ownership has no influence over its introduction of lean management practices

Therefore, these employees have a low degree of asset specificity. Also, as the practice of seniority promotions is not common in the industry, an employee does not feel disadvantaged when moving to a new company. The industry employs a large number of casuals. This reflects the low degree of firm specific human capital and the substantial fluctuations in demand (e.g. seasonally, and even comparing Fridays with Mondays, in many establishments). Casualisation further mitigates against a long-term association between the employees and the firm. Thus, ease of entry and exit by employees, combined with the firm's ability to train new employees relatively quickly, means it does not make economic sense for Japanese subsidiaries in this industry to try to introduce an internal labour market, with seniority promotion.

The firms' policy-makers evidently see lean HRM practices that are being implemented as being of some benefit to the firm. From the perspective of transaction cost economics, firms have the choice of choosing those structures and practices which will minimise their organising costs (Williamson, 1991; Hennart, 1994). It suggests that the firms in the two samples have chosen to implement those HRM structures and practices which they think will be of the most economic benefit to the firm. Significantly, given that reasonably similar practices were found in the Japanese subsidiaries and the Western firms studied, it implies that these practices are seen as being beneficial to firms in the market circumstances of this particular sector. Thus on-the-job training is seen as a relatively cheap and effective method of training new employees, while regular meetings with staff and the provision of company newsletters provides an inexpensive method of enhancing staff communication and improving morale. To a lesser extent, broad job descriptions, and planned job rotations have been introduced in some firms to gain increased job flexibility, at minimum cost.

Lean management practices are being implemented, then, on the basis of whether they are cost efficient in the tourist industry, and not on the basis of simply copying a stereotypical Japanese model. In the two samples studied, this appears to be happening at a broadly similar rate whether the firm is owned by a Japanese parent company or not. Another aspect is that many of the above practices are no longer seen as peculiarly Japanese, but, rather, have now been incorporated into the notion of best practice. Consequently the study of lean management practices can still provide important input into debates about best practice.
Conclusions

In the manufacturing sector, the introduction of lean production strategies by a Japanese motor vehicle manufacturer to its Australian subsidiary resulted in significant increases in productivity and quality control. At present only a low proportion of Japanese investment is in Australian manufacturing industries; hence increases in Australian productivity in manufacturing could attract more overseas investment to this sector.

In the Australian service sector, little empirical research has been done concerning the management practices of Japanese subsidiaries, despite Japanese investors accounting for 67 per cent of all foreign investment in tourism in Australia in 1990/91 (Commonwealth Department of Tourism, 1991). The research reported in this paper indicates that practices in the tourist industry are conditioned by employees’ firm-specific skill levels and hence the asset specificity of employees. Thus, many of the lean practices taught in management schools as being ‘traditionally’ Japanese, such as long-term employment, are not so applicable in this environment. This has important implications given that services employ more than 69 per cent of the Australian workforce (Bamber and Whitehouse, 1993: 283).

With the similarities between lean management practices and notions of best practice, continued research in this area could continue to bear fruit as Japanese companies come to terms with the rises in the value of the Yen; a sluggish Japanese economy; and moves to a more service orientated economy.

For these reasons the field of research into Japanese-style lean management practices still has much to offer, especially if such research can develop further from the narrow base where it has been concentrated in the past. It is especially pertinent to Australia given the current moves towards enterprise bargaining, and the greater reliance that many Australian firms are placing on casual and part-time (peripheral) employees. Furthermore, the above type of transaction-cost analysis may provide a useful analytical framework for scholars in the field of comparative HRM and IR practices.
Appendix

A total of 106 employees were surveyed (N = 106) with answers to the questionnaires being recorded on a five point ‘Likert-type’ scale. The results were analysed through the use of a one tailed student t distribution test and the two categories compared using the z distribution statistic. A Chi Square test was also performed on the data to ascertain whether responses varied with the firm's country of ownership. A total of 15 questions were asked, but due to space constraints it is not practicable to give more details. Should any person wish to see a copy of these questions, or discuss the data further, please contact Peter Ross, Graduate School of Management, Griffith University, Nathan Campus, Brisbane (tel: 07 3875 6494/fax: 07 3875 5582/email: P.Ross@gsm.gu.edu.au).
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