Meeting requirements for English Proficiency is a challenge for Hong Kong’s teachers of English. An Australian in-service education and training program (INSET) for Chinese L1 teachers is in place to meet this challenge. The question is whether delivery of INSET in Australia leads to participant perceptions of the experience as gainful in terms of pedagogy and cultural knowledge as well as in fulfilling linguistic goals. The researcher indicates a positive response from the case study reported here. The case was designed to test an ongoing evaluation by Hong Kong teachers and the researcher-participant of the program and its consequences. One of the teachers provided the data reported in this paper as part of the larger case. Existing knowledge was reviewed in a literature search spanning internationalisation imperatives for Hong Kong and Australia, the history and implementation of INSET, and the significance of an individual’s personal history. Multiple forms of reflective data were gathered throughout the immersion experience to gather insights into the target participant’s perceptions of learning. These data indicated the learner’s perception of strong positive growth in English proficiency, which might have been expected given the purpose of INSET. However, they also revealed that she learned much about pedagogy and culture, providing insights into intercultural negotiation and learning. The result is important because of its insight into a means by which INSET providers might structure ongoing feedback and assessment of their intentions. Its adaptation to other students, other INSET implementations and locations is worthy of further research and discussion.
Contextualising the study

There are three major contexts for this study - internationalisation in Australian higher education, INSET programs and English language teaching in Hong Kong. The framing of these contexts is deliberate in that:

- Internationalisation imperatives provide the global context for the study;
- INSET provision informs the national context; and
- English language teaching in Hong Kong constitutes the localised context of the learners/participants of this study.

Internationalisation

Recent international trends in Australian tertiary education have facilitated the supply of INSET programs such as the one currently under investigation. Two major forces of change have been of particular impact stimulating the imperative for Australian higher education institutions to actively recruit overseas students and to provide tailor-made courses catering for the international market (Welch & Denman, 1997; Tinkler, Lepani, and Mitchell, 1996; Griffith University, 2003). First is the process of gradual deregulation of the higher education industry. Welch and Denman (1997) traced the history of internationalisation in Australian higher institutions from the initial altruistic sponsoring under the Colombo plan in the 1950s to the trend for private students in the 1980s to the aggressive curriculum models and organisational change (Pennington, 1996; Mok, 1999). Recently, teacher training has come under close scrutiny with concerns regarding the level of professional qualifications of serving teachers, many of whom must clarify the participants’ local context. Hong Kong education and the delivery of English as a second language - a compulsory language proficiency assessment - the Hong Kong Language Proficiency Assessment for Teachers (LPAT) as administered by the Hong Kong Examinations Authority (HKEA) and two Classroom Language Assessments (CLA) administered by the Hong Kong Education and Manpower Bureau (EMB) with the aim of ‘benchmarking’ English skills. The assessment scale ranges from 1 - 5 with a score of 5 reflecting near-native speaker ability. All serving teachers are required to pass the LPAT by the end of the 2005/06 school year.

Recent international trends in Australian higher education have facilitated the supply of INSET programs such as the one currently under investigation. Two major forces of change have been of particular impact stimulating the imperative for Australian higher education institutions to actively recruit overseas students and to provide tailor-made courses catering for the international market. First is the process of gradual deregulation of the higher education industry. Welch and Denman (1997) traced the history of internationalisation in Australian higher institutions from the initial altruistic sponsoring under the Colombo plan in the 1950s to the trend for private students in the 1980s to the aggressive curriculum models and organisational change. This latter trend continues to be evident in university strategic priorities such as The Griffith University Strategic Plan 2003 - 2007 which aims for “a phased extension of internationalisation with a target of doubling international education participation” (Griffith University, 2003, p. 6).

Second is the new global force in economic markets with a change in orientation from product-oriented to knowledge markets - a “productivity revolution” (Tinkler, Lepani, and Mitchell, 1996, p. 70). Arising from this productivity revolution is the increased demand for training from Southeast Asian markets (IDP Education Australia, 2003). Tinkler, Lepani and Mitchell (1996, p. 70) characterised the changing training needs of these markets as a search for graduates who are “symbolic analysts... problem identifiers, problem solvers or strategic brokers... the new global nomads”. The recent orientation towards the market approach to internationalisation is clear in the commodifying of post-secondary education and in the increase in competition for overseas student enrolments (Welch and Denman 1997, p. 21).

INSET programs

Within this context of institutional change in response to internationalisation, we see the delivery of specialist courses for specific markets such as INSET training programs for teachers of English as a second language (ESL). Extensive literature exists on pre-service ESL teacher education (Nunan, 1991; Wallace, 1991, Freeman & Johnson, 1998). In-service teacher education literature, however, finds its main focus on such issues as materials design for program delivery (Ur, 1996; Doff, 1993; Tanner & Green, 1998) and the role of reflectivity within INSET programs (Woodfield & Lazarus, 1998). Roberts’ (1998) work on INSET program design and focus proved to be most relevant to this study. Roberts’ (1998) case studies of ESL teacher training programs focussed upon regions in the Basque Country, Israel, Austria and Latvia. These cases did not parallel two of the important aspects of this case: a) Chinese participants and b) the compulsory assessment. Another key departure in the literature is a paucity of research based upon non-native English speakers travelling overseas to undertake immersion models such as the Australian INSET phenomenon.

English Teaching in Hong Kong

In order to understand the imperative driving the existence of such an INSET as the one under investigation, we must clarify the participants’ local context. Hong Kong education and the delivery of English as a second language has been the subject of extensive research (Cooke, 2000; Littlewood, 1999; Tong, 1997; Tang & Absalom, 1998; Kwok 1998). In terms of teacher perceptions of their careers, high levels of stress are well documented within a context of rapidly changing curriculum models and organisational change (Pennington, 1996; Mok, 1999). Recently, teacher training has come under close scrutiny with concerns regarding the level of professional qualifications of serving teachers, many of who have no formal teaching degrees (Lo, 1999; HK SAR, 1999). One response to this concern has been the instigation of a compulsory language proficiency assessment - the Hong Kong Language Proficiency Assessment for Teachers (LPAT) for teachers of English and Mandarin (HK SAR, 2000). Serving language teachers who have not been deemed as exempt have until 2006 to complete the assessment and all pre-service language teacher education courses must ensure that students attain a specific level of proficiency before graduating.

1 The Language Proficiency Assessment for Teachers (LPAT) - English Language (HK SAR, 2000) is a set of four language proficiency papers administered by the Hong Kong Examinations Authority (HKEA) and two Classroom Language Assessments (CLA) administered by the Hong Kong Education and Manpower Bureau (EMB) with the aim of ‘benchmarking’ English skills. The assessment scale ranges from 1 - 5 with a score of 5 reflecting near-native speaker ability. All serving teachers are required to pass the LPAT by the end of the 2005/06 school year.
The Hong Kong LPAT syllabus has been devised by the Hong Kong Education and Manpower Bureau (EMB) and is administered in conjunction with the Hong Kong Examination Authority (HKEA). Serving teachers have until the mid-2006 deadline to satisfactorily complete the five assessment components of Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing and Classroom Language. Teachers have been given a variety of delivery options for completion. They may apply: a) for independent assessment of the five components; or b) to undertake assessment within a course; or c) for a combination of the two above. For teachers opting to undertake assessment within an accredited course, the pathways are many and varied from single-component, intensive or part-time delivery to assessment of all five components within an intensive course. The majority of accredited course providers are within the Hong Kong higher education system. There are, however, accredited offshore immersion courses for LPAT delivery in Australia such as the one under investigation in the current study.

Data analysis

The following data were collected as a part of the overall case design based on Stake (1995, 2000) and all qualitative data samples are expressed in italics with transcription conventions following Silverman (1993). Figure 1 below exemplifies the structure of the case with the two classes (Groups 1 and 2) taught by the researcher as embedded cases within the entire immersion case study.

Figure 1.
INSET case study.

For the purposes of this paper, a sample from Group 2 was analysed to exemplify the multiple forms of data gathered in order to investigate teachers as learners in this context. These multiple data forms triangulated evidence and established warrant. The data sample gathered for Participant E from Group 2 is representative of sources from the entire case study and consists: of pre-and posttest surveys; a semi-structured interview; a learner reflective essay; and a researcher’s journal. The timing of the data collection is represented in Table 1 below. The issue of timing is significant and will be discussed in the analysis.

Table 1 Timing of data collection (Participant E)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research instrument</th>
<th>Course time (6 week period)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher journal</td>
<td>Week 1 - Week 6 (daily entries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test survey</td>
<td>Week 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structure interview</td>
<td>Week 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test survey</td>
<td>Week 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Essay</td>
<td>Week 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pre- and posttest survey design used four-point Likert scale items to establish a quantitative base for measurement of individual’s self- assessment of proficiency in terms of: a) linguistic skills as relating to the five LPAT components; and b) pedagogic skills as relating to factors within content delivery and classroom routines. These two predetermined domains - self-perceptions of linguistic skills and pedagogic skills - were established from an earlier, unpublished study as two significant areas of learning. Working within a phenomenological framework, the case study analysis is open to establishing other domains of learning. This occurred with analysis of Participant E’s insights and reflections. Biographical information and open-ended, qualitative questions added to the richness of data gathered in the survey. Figures 2 and 3 below indicate the responses to the four-point Likert scale item from Participant E’s pre- and posttest surveys.

Before analysing the interview data, it is important from a constructivist perspective to identify the interactional dynamics at play within the interview so as to establish role relations and their effect upon the quality of the data. Underlying much of the constructivist approach to interview data analysis is the interactionist belief in the “moral order” of an interview (P. Freebody, lecture 2002). This echoes Silverman’s (1993, p. 114) assertion that “interviews share with any account an involvement in moral realities”. The moral realities of these particular interviews strongly delineate what is said and unsaid. Impinging upon this are the roles, power relations and trust between the researcher and interviewee. Within the social context of the interview, Participant E’s position in relation to the interviewer could be constructed as disadvantaged in terms of power relations. First, she is linguistically in a weaker position, as
she must speak in her second language to her class tutor—a native speaker and experienced ESL educator. Second, this tutor holds power, as she will be one of the assessors.

In order to obviate any negative effects from this imbalance of power, this researcher conducted herself ethically and showed active concern for workload, stress and participant obligations throughout the data gathering process from: a) the distribution of the consent package; to b) the call for voluntary participation; to c) the request for an interview. Participant E's involvement in the interview was voluntary. In organising the interview time, this teacher/researcher was careful to select a non-assessment day and to minimise disruption to studies. Participant E was relaxed and spoke freely during the interview reflecting a high level of comfort within the interaction.

In terms of linguistic gain in Figure 2, results reflect a perceived growth in three of the five components of the LPAT syllabus (Listening, Speaking, Writing). There was no effect on the other two components (Reading, Classroom Language). The results from the pedagogic item on the surveys as displayed in Figure 3 indicate mixed perceptions. Further rigorous examination of these quantitative results utilising multiple sources of qualitative data allows richer insights into Participant E's self-reporting. Not only does it shed greater light upon the Likert item results in Figures 2 and 3 above but also it sets new areas of investigative interest beyond the initial two categories. It is argued here that such an examination will lead us also to question whether a quantitative, self-report measure is sufficient to measure learner/client perceptions of their linguistic and pedagogic gain. Finally, wider implications regarding course evaluation will be discussed.

**Participant E**

The pre-test profiles Participant E as having 9 years of teaching experience, currently employed as a private school primary teacher. This is elaborated upon in the interview with the additional information that she has been teaching for nine years ... in primary school and also ... this is my second school and both schools are primary and private schools yeah I mainly teaching um teach English and Putonghua... two classes of E nglish... one is the junior class and one is the senior one primary four to five um and the junior's primary one to three (.6) yeah. We now know that her language teaching is not only confined to English and that her current English teaching load is two classes in both the upper and lower primary age groups. In this interview, participant E presents as a very committed teacher: I really enjoy teaching children and so um this is (.4) not my not on-only my job is also my career. Already we see additional information gathered to 'flesh out' the rough skeleton drawn in the questionnaire instruments and a fuller construction of learner identity is achieved – albeit based upon self-reporting. In the pre-test questionnaire, Participant E indicates that she had been exempted from the LPAT. However, in order to be eligible for a promotion, she was required to complete the LPAT and to gain an overall level 4 or above. Stress levels were then bound to this extrinsic motivator and professional goal. In her reflective essay, she stated:

Though I am qualified in teaching English, I am not proud of myself being exempted from the English Proficiency Assessment. On the contrary, I see the incompetence of my English skills. Luckily, the awareness of my incompetence in the language has a positive effect upon my English learning and teaching.

From the reflective essay, we see this learner identity as constructed with low self-esteem in terms of her language skills. When considering that she is enrolled in a special class designed to assist those wishing to gain a LPAT score of 4 or above, the low linguistic self-rating on the surveys becomes problematic. Why would she come to Australia if she considered herself so far below the desired rating? Why not join the 'regular' LPAT class (Group 1) and be assured of more skilling and less explicit methodology? Further analysis allows for greater insights into the learner's accounts.

**Perceptions of linguistic gain**

While E indicates moderate linguistic gain in three of the five skills (Listening, Speaking and Writing) and no effect...
in two skills (Reading and Classroom Language) in the pre-and post-tests, her reflective essay written during the last week of the course reflects a highly positive assessment of linguistic gain:

To my surprise, I can see improvements in my English during the 6-week ETTP course which is a comparatively short period of time. By gathering qualitative data in conjunction with the surveys, we see a more positive picture of self-evaluation of linguistic growth and gain deeper insights into learner perceptions. She explains her perceived skill development in listening as:

E: ... because of the env-the real environment I listen to the radios every morning and then (.4) um I listen I have uh (.7) attended all the classes in English and different courses and then also I can watch TV at night actually in Hong Kong I do not have such a habit ... maybe if (.5) even even if I watched a films maybe I will look at the ... or something like that but now is the best time is good time for me to get used to the (.5) accent and get used to the intonation and pronunciation of English. (.5) and er from different people ... I think er I have improved a lot in listening skills

This perception of improved a lot in listening skills is only measured quantitatively in the pre-post-test as an improvement of .5 to 2.5. This difference between a post-course numerical rating for skill development and the qualitative data is important in recognising the different results that can be yielded from the different sources. Triangulation is achieved with a positive growth recognised in both instruments but the measurement of this perception of growth becomes problematic. Reflective writing is a further tool that allows us to gather greater insights regarding the learner's perceptions and sheds light upon the discrepancy between the surveys and the interview.

Perceptions of pedagogic gain
As with the category of linguistic gain, qualitative data regarding perceptions of pedagogic gain conflict with the Likert scale results but the disparity here is even greater. Participant E has awarded herself a lower rating for her content area pedagogy and her routines - general effectiveness with no effect in routines - general efficiency (Figure 3). According to the quantitative data, her only appreciation of improvement is in her general pedagogy.

While the posttest result indicates no participant perceptions of gain in terms of pedagogy, in the end-of-course interview and reflective essay Participant E indicates that she has made methodological observations and learnt new strategies which she intends to incorporate into her future teaching. She articulates these perceptions in the interview excerpt below:

E: ... I think I've so much input from er from the methodology of different skills ... we do not er just learn er the skills the language skills and we also get a lot from (.5) um to consolidate our skill in teaching and then ... and we get something more from the methodology listening skills or ... we get a lot of input regarding how to teach um efficiently and effectively and and also I've got so many ideas from the lecturer and so that I can use in my classroom

Within the interview, we see Participant E voicing strong pedagogic learning in terms of so much input; the methodology of different skills; consolidate our skill; so many methods; and so many ideas ... that I can use in my classroom. The depth of the course's impact upon her perceptions of learning regarding the craft of teaching is extensive. The qualitative data may shed light here on the apparent loss in terms of content area pedagogy revealed in the quantitative display (Figure 3). The learner can be seen here to be reorienting her thinking to methodology. This reflection upon practice, while inspiring the learner, may also lead to a rethinking of content area pedagogy in the posttest survey. While quantitatively a negative impact is registered, qualitatively we see a wealth of learning.

Further to the issue of pedagogy is the metacognition voiced by Participant E. By repositioning herself as a learner rather than as a teacher and by experiencing these new teaching methods, Participant E was able to recognise their effect upon learners' cognitive processes:

E: uh for example the ( ) dictation and ( ) it can be used and uh and my dictation lesson or reading and listening ... h and also (.5) um the songs we can use the songs as listening ... h um less during the listening lessons and dramas dramas is a good tool to to teach to arouse their um their interest and to get students easier to or involve in my lessons. h and also I think I think ... h um language is not er is not a boring thing and and we should arouse a student's interest to get involved in in-in-in to that subject and then they have int-they have interest they are interested in it and then they can learn more from the language=

From the evidence above, we see that the experiential aspect of the INSET enhanced Participant E’s understanding of the learning process, especially with regard to student motivation - to arouse their um their interest and to get students easier to er involve in my lessons. Indeed, the concept of interest is highlighted in the above excerpt as she orientates herself to issues of learner engagement. The repositioning of self from teacher to learner has also strongly impacted upon Participant E’s methodology in reinforcing this issue of learner engagement:
E: they give us so many activities to motivate us as students (small laugh)) and so it's easy for us students to get involved into the classes so I try to look for...um many many good books resources such as the game books and activity books...h and also I've got so many ideas from the lecturer and so that I can use in my classroom.

Such observations indicate the depth of reflection prompted by the enacted INSET curriculum which, arguably, should impinge directly upon personal pedagogic constructs. If the teacher-as-learner has been able to reflect upon the issue of engagement and intends to take agency by looking for...um many many good books resources and taking so many ideas to apply in my classroom, then significant pedagogic gain must have occurred. Other qualitative evidence from the case study supports these assertions. Researcher journal observations of Group 2 reflect the general degree of critical thinking and reflection evident with Participant E and her peers:

> Real sign of metacognition of lessons > also incorporating ideas from this and my other classes such as 'noisy dictation'.

(Researcher's Journal, Week 2, Tuesday, 23/7/02)

This evidence triangulates with the interview data above where Participant E responds to new pedagogic input in the form of a variety of dictation activities in listening lessons. With such strong qualitative evidence acknowledging pedagogic observations and learning, one must question the pre-and posttest Likert item results in Figure 3. Participant E has expressed clear and positive growth in terms of her pedagogic constructs in the interview but this is not corroborated in the quantitative data.

Culture learning
Culture learning is a further category of learning that is strongly established within the qualitative data. Though not initially established in the pre-and posttest, a phenomenological approach to case study analysis opens this new category to investigation. Participant E's interview represents the degree of importance attached to culture learning:

E: ...this methodology and culture exchange can help me benefit us or advantage...h to give advantage for me to to um to develop my language and other skills (.5) I do believe that

In the interview, she placed great value upon the immersion aspect of the course in recognising areas of linguistic improvement and culture learning where she asserted: I've learnt a lot from the Australian culture. Further, her awareness of cultural sensitivities within registers is noted where she discussed her acquisition and usage of colloquial language:

E: um (1.0) um the slang (.5) the slang so is um ( ) is difficult to remember it's quite interesting for me to know about their culture the slang um and its ah its a kind of communication...h and and and also I know some different from young people and old people...h because I talk to my host parents

The importance of living with a host family is repeated throughout the data. In the interview, we see support for current theorising regarding cross-cultural negotiation or 'interculturality' (Lo Bianco, Crozet & Liddicoat, 1999):

E: = yeah (.6) so and also um the children are so independent um there are two children in my fam-in my host family...h they are studying and working and they earn money for themselves and maybe but um (.6) what surprises me is that I thought um parents do not um give ah any (.4) do not or er I thought Australian parents make or this or let the student er make um much freedom to make decisions...h but is ah is difference...h actually um my host parents try to give much guidance and much opinions to their children and this make their children not very happy because they are at the teens they are teenagers

E: ... but at this time when I er when I um cope with the cope with my host family...h I saw er quite similar ((E laughs)) to our Chinese culture parents like to get in more ( ) in their in their studies and working=

In the interview excerpts above, we see what surprise the learner as she moved from preconceptions about Australian parents and their teenage children's freedom to make decisions to a rethinking of this position and further reflection upon our Chinese culture. The learner works to negotiate a 'third place' where the two cultures - Australian and Chinese - meet in a sphere of identity formation (Lo Bianco, Crozet & Liddicoat, 1999). Her own identity and conceptualisations regarding cultural stereotypes are reconsidered in this reflection upon intercultural issues.

Prior concerns regarding the immersion aspect are identified and dispelled with the observation that:

E: ...h and also some people said that er is difficult to get used to the er Australian accents...h but I found less difficulty this time um (.5) is I-I-I I think um I can understand most of the things from people...

Indeed, she went on to further exemplify the benefits of the offshore immersion feature:

E: ...since I have been attending this course this is my first time to study abroad and then (.3) I have decided er or I try to...h to um to to take one class abroad every summer it's good for us or it's good for me to learn foreign language because I try to get um to go or to stay in that environment so I I (.4) believe I believe that language ( ) language environment is...h is the best way to learn English so I try to attend maybe take a course every year um either in Australia or in Britain or other...h other E English speaking country=
The course has had a strong influence upon learner motivations with her final resolve to attend maybe take a course every year or the other...it other English speaking country. Within this immersion component, the homestay is seen as vital not only for its cultural benefits but also linguistically.

I: so you'd still like to do another homestay if you could
E: yeah yeah and also I (.5) I think because um this ( ) ah um this kind of lesson um is is trying to consolidate my skills=

The reflective essay provides triangulation for this valuing of the offshore immersion experience with Participant E noting the benefits of language use in the local community:

As it is the most efficient and fun way to gain familiarity with the English language in an English-speaking country like Australia, immersion in first-hand language has given me plenty of opportunities to practice English both at University and in the local community.

This new category of participant perceptions of culture learning was not established on the pre- and posttest survey design. The researcher originally had discounted it as a 'given' facet of the experience. The high degree of reflection provided in the qualitative data demanded a rethinking. For Participant E, culture learning arose as an important, highly valued category in the interview and reflective essay. By taking a phenomenological approach, a new key domain—culture learning—is established. We can see, therefore, the value of the case study approach within a constructivist framework as new categories of participant perceptions of learning are established from the multiple forms of data gathered at strategic points throughout the immersion INSET.

Conclusion

Participant E's strong belief that the course experience is worthy is apparent in the qualitative data and appears at odds with the display of her pre-and posttest results. We then need then ask ourselves why these instruments have provided such different data and what the 'fleshed out' picture of Participant E's experience tells us about learner perceptions. Munby's (1999) observation of course evaluation on a teacher education pilot program may shed some light on this issue.

Questionnaire data from the exit survey showed that candidates delivered their harshest criticism earliest—during the focus groups interviews—of that they were the most thoughtful about the power of the restructured program when they had had the time to reflect on the value of the extended practicum almost a semester later.

This observation is especially relevant to such a 'high stakes' experience. Final results could not be released to students before their departure from the provider and the anxiety over results remained high. Timing of the posttest was critical here as, although it was on the last day, it came at the end of the final assessment week and so, if one follows Munby's (1999) argument, reflections would still have been negatively influenced by examination pressure. Also, in terms of evaluating perceptions of pedagogic gain, a time lapse that allows participants to trial new methods in their own classroom and then to reflect upon and refine these methods could afford a richer data yield. The value of another posttest survey administered 6-12 months after the course when the participants have returned to Hong Kong must be considered. In terms of course evaluation and reflection, then, it is significant to note that the time factor—an intrinsic feature of such intensive courses—combined with the high-stakes assessment proved to negatively affect teachers' reflections and judgements as self-reported on an end-of-course, survey instrument.

The apparent disparity in Participant E's results suggested further analysis. In terms of course evaluation, one must ask the question: is a quantitative, self-reporting measure such as the standard course experience questionnaire/student satisfaction survey sufficient as a stand-alone measure of learner/client perceptions of learning? The response to this question is, "No". This has great impact. The evidence above supports the need for formal provision of multiple data gathering tools as a basis for evaluating learners' perceptions. Analysis of these will help providers to gauge more closely the impact of intensive immersion INSET on learning— an important issue for the designing of future INSET programs.

The trend in Australian Higher Educational provision for immersion programs such as the one exemplified in this case study is a relatively new phenomenon. In this paper, the contextual forces at work in creating this new trend towards 'boutique' immersion courses for international markets, particularly targeting Southeast Asia has been investigated. These contextual forces include such factors as: a) global forces of internationalisation; b) Australian models of INSET provision; and c) local forces of demand in Southeast Asian educational markets. The case study approach and this early phase of data analysis provide warranted insider accounts of learning. Reflection based upon a phenomenological approach focusing on rigorous analysis of these accounts is important to both Australian higher education and the international market it serves and provides learner and teacher/researcher insights which will inform future INSET design and delivery.
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