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Abstract:

This paper builds on previous study undertaken by the author and the findings from the previous paper presented at the following events: (1) The 5th Asia-Pacific Cooperative Education Conference 2004, Auckland, New Zealand; (2) The World Association for Cooperative Education (WACE) Asia-Pacific Conference 2006, Shanghai, China; (3) International Conference on Work Integrated Learning 2010, Hong Kong SAR, China.

The present work is a continued action-research effort by the author to support the claims relating to the students’ benefit by doing their Work Integrated Learning (WIL) in terms of a practice-based entrepreneurship course.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the students’ perceptions in light of the possible influence of “the four-stage model” group dynamics, while taking account the effect of student team behavior toward the generation of business ideas. The study presents and analyzes the responses and ensuing discussion to questions posed to 208 students during academic year of 2010/11, using “the four-stage model” assessment tools for evaluating student’s progress. Results indicated that review of the assessments show that most of the students are leaving this inquiry-based course with a clear improvement in conceptual thinking and understanding of the entrepreneurial process as well as content mastery.

This paper is also aimed to illustrate the power of WIL that can serve as a means of producing a more employable, well rounded and skilled graduates in Indonesia.
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INTRODUCTION

There are few studies to date concerning student views about their work integrated learning (WIL) in the form of students’ entrepreneurial activity at Institut Manajemen Telkom (IM TELKOM), Bandung, West Java, Indonesia. In one of a very few studies addressing that WIL marked an important milestone in the evolution of a practice-based entrepreneurship course that occurred during academic year 2003/4. The students reported about the beneficial aspects of the entrepreneurial activity, resulting in enhancement of their practical and their personal skills (Lubis, 2004, p. 5). In another study, Lubis (2006) surveyed the business management students at IM TELKOM, collected the data during academic year 2004/5 to address students’ preferences on five dimensions of teambuilding experience, namely, team trust, self-esteem, team awareness, team effectiveness and team bonding. The finding suggests that students’ preferences on partnership between the team members were predominantly the opportunity for professional growth. The latest study (Lubis, 2010) – a continued action-research effort by the author – reported the findings that WIL has been an eye-opener to the students and WIL was contributing to the students’ skills and knowledge of becoming the self employment business ownership.

In this paper the author reports the results of an experiment, by conducting a self-completion questionnaire during academic year of 2010/11. This questionnaire is intended to address the extent to which WIL was contributing to the students’ skills and knowledge toward the generation of business ideas. Of interest also was the extent to which the idea behind WIL in terms of a practice-based entrepreneurship course was being a catalyst to the students’ perception on how they value the influence of “the four-stage model” group dynamics (Tuckman, 1984, 2010). This action-research could be attributed not only to address the benefit of WIL for undergraduate students at IM TELKOM but also aimed to illustrate the author’s “work-in-progress” that highlights how the adoption of an action-research by the lecturer can contribute to the process of producing a more employable, well rounded and skilled graduates in Indonesia.

PREVIOUS RESEARCH

In implementing any work integrated learning program, there are concerns in maintaining the quality of the learning experience resulting from the subtle interplays of three key elements: curriculum, practice and
industry standards (Shakespeare & Hutchinson, 2007). Whilst the setting of the work related learning influences practice, the institution decides upon the curriculum and external accreditation bodies usually mandate the standards and competencies required from the WIL experience. For instance, it is common practice for higher education institutions to dissect the content and delivery of their WIL schemes in order to check that the programs systematically develop in their exiting students the specific knowledge for their discipline, together with the acquisition of professional and personal skills needed for their field (Cranmer, 2006; De La Harpe, Radloff & Wyber, 2000; Scoufis, 2000).

In particular, entrepreneurship course content is under continual review and change due to the evolution of the discipline and the introduction of new technologies. There has been much debate in the literature as to whether entrepreneurship can be taught (Henry, Hill & Leitch, 2003, 2005a, 2005b). However, there are few studies around methods in education for entrepreneurship. For example, Platt (2004) has reported positive learning results in attitude related competence areas in a program of teaching entrepreneurial skills in Dubai. Collins, Smith, and Hannon (2006) have shown the effect of synergistic learning methods and especially the action learning approach on learning entrepreneurial skills.

There are also tensions around finding assessment tools that are reliable, produce consistent and objective results that also measure what is truly valued in experience-based education. Assessment of student learning is a complicated but important aspect of education. Universities and academics have spent considerable time refining assessment tools for all kinds of learning, but still grapple with the problem that “assessment of complex skills and knowledge… remain[s] a complex task” (Baume, 2001, p.12). Many authors contend that experience-based learning presents additional challenges (Coll, Hodges & Zegwaard, 2003; Hodges, Jones & Smith, 2004; Hodges, 2008) not only because of the complexity and holistic nature of the learning, but also because of the “situatedness of the achievement” (Woolf & Yorke, 2010, p.15).

Finding appropriate assessment tools is a significant factor in ensuring the sustainability of experience-based education in universities. Davidge-Johnston (2007) observes, however, that using traditional assessment models can be problematic because it is “difficult to validly measure learning in one learning model with tools designed for a completely different model” (p. 140), contributing to the tensions around
finding assessment tools that are reliable. Many traditional methods do not address or adequately measure the new kinds of learning that this type of education seeks to engender, such as the so-called soft skills, graduate capabilities/attributes or personal development and transformation. These aspects of learning do not fit neatly into “proscribed and specific learning outcomes” (Hodges, 2008, p. 11).

Hodges et al. (2004) argue, “the multiple variables that affect both the design and subsequent implementation of assessment practices, particularly in cooperative education, will inhibit attempts to produce absolute instrument validity and assessor impartiality” (p. 50). It is not, however, an impossible task and may require inventive thinking, which presents opportunities “that are not ‘boxed in’ by traditional assessment methods” (Woolf & Yorke, 2010, p. 35).

RESEARCH APPROACH

For the purposes of this research, the term “action-research” will be defined as an approach that is intended “to enable practitioners and social scientists to collaborate to find different means by which to bring about necessary change” (Leitch, 2007). Furthermore, Leitch (2007) observes, however, the overriding perspective that contemporary forms of this approach have in common is the belief that research with human beings should be participative, democratic and inclusive, and emphasize the full integration of action and reflection. In implementing action-research, the present work is a continued action-research effort by the author to support the claims relating to the students’ benefit by doing their Work Integrated Learning (WIL) in terms of a practice-based entrepreneurship course.

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The Aims of the Research

Researching the entrepreneurial activity at IM TELKOM was seen as a significant opportunity as it strongly encapsulated the institution’s strategic imperative which strives to develop its students and equip them with its core values, stated as “Integrity, Entrepreneurship and Best for Excellence”. Since 2004 the author conducted the action-research and the findings suggested the entrepreneurship course was valuable. Several student cohorts were surveyed regarding their entrepreneurial activity, in particular, the WIL played in managing the team and its processes (Lubis 2004, 2006, 2010). However, because there has been
no formal evaluation of the groups’ dynamics associated with WIL, the author instigated the undertaking of an action-research. Consequently, the author planned to develop a deeper understanding of the value of WIL experience for students’ personal development in order to gain information to establish a more rigorous evaluation of the entrepreneurship course.

This action-research was guided by the following research questions:

(1) How do the students rate the present stage of the groups’ dynamics that the group is presently operating in?

(2) What are the common benefits of participation in the WIL in terms of a practice-based entrepreneurship course?

Taking students’ perception into consideration, it therefore can be considered that the recent curriculum content at IM TELKOM, combined with the author’s previous findings, may further impact the institution’s strategic planning for curriculum changes. The introduction of new curriculum for undergraduate program will be launched at the start of the next academic year 2011/12 and entrepreneurship course will be part of the changes.

**Research Design**

The author requires students to be reflective about their learning processes and use the Tuckman's four-stage model as an assessment tool for evaluating student groups’ dynamics. The assessment responses provide a measure of the students’ current knowledge and help the author identify potential benefit of students’ entrepreneurial activity as well as a measure of knowledge gained from entrepreneurship course.

Since this is an assessment tool used in practice-based course, rather than a research tool, it has not been formally checked for reliability or validity. However, the author believed the data collected would still be useful for further research in order to extend the author understanding of WIL experience.

**Population and Sample**

During the academic year 2010/11, the population for the entrepreneurship course was 672 students who embarked on the program in the Department of Business and Management Education. Thirteen classes were set up and they were divided into class-A (52 students), class-B (52 students); class-C (52 students),
class-D (52 students), class-E (50 students), class-F (52 students), class-G (52 students), class-H (51 students), class-I (52 students), class-J (52 students), class-K (52 students), class-L (52 students) and class-M (52 students). The author conducted the delivery of entrepreneurship course in four classes (class-A, class-I, class-K and class-L) with the total of 208 students. The four classes were similar in terms of the courses’ syllabi and the duration of practice-based entrepreneurship course (up to four months). Each class was then set free to organize themselves into groups and start thinking about the entrepreneurial projects they would undertake. All four classes formed themselves into 38 groups; each group consists of five or six members. All the 38 groups participated in the survey.

**Instrument**

Although a number of instruments for data collection could have been used, the self-completion questionnaire was deemed most appropriate for the study in order to gather data from a respondent that is completed alone without the researcher’s involvement. Questionnaires are easy to administer, friendly to complete and fast to score and therefore take relatively very little time of researchers and respondents.

Additionally, review of literature on studies that evaluated work-integrated learning programs showed that similar studies (e.g., Aleisa & Alabdulahfez, 2002; Coll & Chapman, 2000; Spowart, 2006) made the most use of researcher designed questionnaires for data collection.

In this study, all the 38 groups of students were given the self-completion questionnaires to fill in. Those questionnaires included 32 Likert-scaled items related to the parameters of the Tuckman's four-stage model
(forming, storming, norming and performing). The four-point scale was used for the study as against the traditional five-point scale due to the tendency for individuals to select responses in the center of the scale if an odd number response scale was used (Anderson, 1985; Casley & Kumar, 1988). The responses for the four-point scale were: almost never (1), seldom (2), frequently (3), and almost always (4). This Tuckman's four-stage model is intended to assess individual team members' general knowledge of groups’ dynamics over a semester's team experience in order to effectively evaluate inquiry-driven course that also emphasize the development of skills and conceptual understanding. Students were issued an assessment survey in the middle of their practice-based entrepreneurship course. An identical assessment survey was issued once the course was completed. This assessment survey is to help the students assess what stage their group normally operates. The lowest mean score possible for a stage is one (almost never) while the highest score possible for a stage is four (almost always). The highest mean of the four scores indicates which stage the students perceive their group to normally operates in. If the mean score is three or more, it is a strong indicator of the stage the group is in. The lowest of the three scores is an indicator of the stage the group is least like. If the lowest score is two or less, it is a strong indicator that the group does not operate this way.

**RESEARCH FINDINGS**
The research findings are ordinal level, therefore only estimated means can be computed, and the results can be used only to show the rankings. It is important to note that the focus of the evaluation was upon a student perspective, and so the results reported here, particularly concerning the extent to which the students is achieving improved entrepreneurial skill as a consequences of the practice-based assignment – in the form of entrepreneurial project – must be regarded as descriptive research at this stage. The mean score for each of the Tuckman’s four-stage model are given in Table 1.

**About the Respondents**

The questionnaires were distributed and collected personally. During the mid semester, of the 208 students, a total of 203 completed the questionnaire – a response rate of 97.6%. As a comparison, when the course was completed, of the 208 students, a total of 200 completed the questionnaire – a response rate of 96.15%. The total number of students taking the assessment differs due to absences and withdrawals. Overall, the response rate was approximately 96.88%.

**Perceptions of the Tuckman's Four-Stage Model**

Throughout the semester, all 38 groups were given the team-building opportunities, which allowed them to develop from mere forming stage group dynamics of students into performing stage teams. Comparisons between two assessments – mid semester and at the end of semester – are shown in Table 1. It clearly shows that the pattern of the mean scores during mid semester is interesting in that it drops for norming stage and then rises again with performing stage, forming stage and storming stage. In this case, the mean score shows that all 38 groups’ dynamics are not that straightforward, both for those two assessments.
Table 1
Students’ ratings of the groups’ dynamics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Tuckman’s Four-Stage Model</th>
<th>Mid Semester n1</th>
<th>End of Semester n2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By doing the entrepreneurial project in this course, I would say that .....</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forming Stage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. We try to have set procedures or protocols to ensure that things are orderly and run smoothly (e.g. minimize interruptions, everyone gets the opportunity to have their say).</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Team members are afraid or do not like to ask others for help.</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Team members do not fully trust the other team members and closely monitor others who are working on a specific task.</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. We are trying to define the goal and what tasks need to be accomplished.</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. We assign specific roles to team members (team leader, facilitator, time keeper, note taker, etc.).</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. There are many abstract discussions of the concepts and issues, which make some members impatient with these discussions.</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It seems as if little is being accomplished with the entrepreneurial project's goals.</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Although we are not fully sure of the project's goals and issues, we are excited and proud to be on the team.</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean for Forming Stage</strong></td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Storming Stage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. We are quick to get on with the task on hand and do not spend too much time in the planning stage.</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The team leader tries to keep order and contributes to the task at hand.</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. We generate lots of ideas, but we do not use many because we fail to listen to them and reject them without fully understanding them.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Many of the team members have their own ideas about the process and personal agendas are rampant.</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The tasks are very different from what we imagined and seem very difficult to accomplish.</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. We argue a lot even though we agree on the real issues.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The goals we have established seem unrealistic.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. There is a lot of resisting of the tasks on hand and quality improvement approaches.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean for Storming Stage</strong></td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norming Stage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. We have thorough procedures for agreeing on our objectives and planning the way we will perform our tasks.</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. We take our team's goals and objectives literally, and assume a shared understanding.</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The team leader ensures that we follow the procedures, do not argue, do not interrupt, and keep to the point.</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. We have accepted each other as members of the team.</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. We try to achieve harmony by avoiding conflict.</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. The team is often tempted to go above the original scope of the project.</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. We express criticism of others constructively.</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. We often share personal problems with each other.</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean for Norming Stage</strong></td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performing Stage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Our team feels that we are all in it together and shares responsibilities for the team's success or failure.</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. We do not have fixed procedures, we make them up as the task or project progresses.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. We enjoy working together; we have a fun and productive time.</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. The team leader is democratic and collaborative.</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. We fully accept each other's strengths and weaknesses.</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. We are able to work through group problems.</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. There is a close attachment to the team.</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. We get a lot of work done.</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean for Performing Stage</strong></td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n1 = 203; n2 = 200; The number of students (n) varies due to absences and withdraws. Ratings are on a 4-point scale; 1 = almost never; 2 = seldom; 3 = frequently; 4 = almost always*
It is important to note that the questionnaire was posed in a positive and negative manner, in order to avoid the students’ perceptions towards a particular response. For example, this condition is clearly shown from the mean scores of the forming stage dimension during mid semester assessment (Q7, Q8), which ranged from a low of 1.45 on “… is being accomplished …” to a high of 3.98 on “… excited and proud …”. Similarly, this significant deviation is shown from the mean scores of forming stage dimension at the end of semester assessment (Q7, Q8), which ranged from a low of 1.27 to a high of 3.99.

With regard to the first research question in this study, the highest mean score of 3.23 during mid semester indicates that all 38 groups operated in storming stage. As a comparison, the highest mean score of 3.64 at the end of semester indicates that all 38 groups operated in performing stage.

Surprisingly, halfway through the semester, Table 1 presents the results that all 38 groups are likely to show significant deviations from the path laid out by stage theories or Tuckman’s linear model. The author hypothesized that this pattern is due to the human processes are frequently characterized by variability and flux. Although the results presented in Table 1 should be further investigated before firm conclusions are drawn, they illustrate how “the four-stage model” assessment tools can be used to test the students’ progress, in particular in the inquiry-based course.

**Perceptions of the common benefits of participation in the WIL**

The author investigated further the influence of WIL upon the effect of the practiced-based entrepreneurship course. Students are assessed individually at the end of semester through the submission of recording individual reflective learning and how they consider they have individually contributed to the achievement of the team's tasks. This captures the benefits of reflective learning as promoted by King (2002). The author investigates various elements in the individual reflection paper, namely:

- individual contribution of the student to the progress of the entrepreneurial project;
- overall tasks completed by the team;
- how their individual contribution added value to the overall progression of the entrepreneurial project;
- individual objectives for team’s tasks; and
- key decisions made and their suitability to the entrepreneurial project.
Excerpts from their responses tell the story best.

Personally what I found most surprising was the level of knowledge and learning one can acquire by working with a team […] remarkable.

Feel it is the first time that I learnt something that I can use in the real world.

Very practical and hands on experience gained.

At the beginning of the course, I had no idea that my group come as far as we did and create such an amazing and useful product.

This class provided me a great amount of fun and useful teamwork experience for the real world.

I know what to do, how to behave and how to manage the entire process of this entrepreneurial project; […] having to act as one of a team members taught me more than I could have learnt from books or lectures.

Our small team did whatever it took … “wanting to” vs. “having to” work on a project makes all the difference in the world.

What I personally gained from participating in this entrepreneurship course was a tremendous sense of satisfaction and added confidence.

The greatest strength of the course was its incorporation of students with very different cultural backgrounds, and along with that different strengths and weaknesses.

Over the course of the semester I’ve learned many things about working in a group and my own overall contributions that I can provide. I think that I was able to take away skills of cooperation and time management with this project.

I feel as if I have found a group of people and a goal that spark my interest and creativity.

This entrepreneurship class was the most refreshing class I have had in a long time, yet I feel one of the most productive as well.

Essentially teamwork adds value to the student in three main ways; personally, socially and educationally. Stein (2006) cited the personal benefits of teamwork as building confidence; making assignments more enjoyable and increasing the relevance of work interaction for learning and for the work place. Social benefits include making friends, exposure to business people and networking and from an educational perspective problem-solving skills; reasoning skills; communication, listening and leadership skills were developed. A synergy exists between the three sets of benefits which develop holistically a more knowledgeable, informed and confident graduate. Integrative learning is at the core of practice-based learning as students are encouraged and enabled to draw together their past and present experiences with learned knowledge relevant to a specific context. In achieving this, integration emphasis is placed on the educator to facilitate the student to develop into a reflective learner connecting with reflective practices and behavior and develop reflective writing skills. Reflection is viewed as a deliberate process during which the candidate takes time, within the course of their work, to focus on their performance and think carefully.
about the thinking that led to particular actions, what happened and what they are learning from the experience, in order to inform what they might do in the future (King, 2002). The use of reflective learning and assessment in the pedagogy facilitates the individualizing of critical student learning, whilst allowing for team learning to simultaneously co-existing.

Engagement by the student in teamwork and in experiential learning and reflection requires them to move from a passive mode of learning, to one where they take ownership and responsibility for their own learning and assume roles of problem solvers, decision makers, negotiators, conflict managers and communicators, which are common roles and responsibilities of employees within the workforce.

With regard to the second research question in this study, WIL in terms of a practice-based entrepreneurship course is not for the timid. Teaching students to be entrepreneurs poses challenge from pedagogical perspective. It requires the educators to relinquish an exceptional amount of control over their course. At the same time, it is not replacement for true experiential learning experiences (internships, for example). Compare to didactic methods, this inquiry-based course requires much greater educators flexibility, and requires educators to spend considerably more time monitoring students’ progress.

CONCLUSION
The Department of Business and Management Education at IM TELKOM Bandung, West Java in Indonesia has included a compulsory entrepreneurial project. This gives students the opportunity to relate theory to practice and to be well prepared upon completion to prepare their students for success in the workplace. The author’s data originated only from business students. Accordingly, the findings could differ among students with a technical background, for instance. Their understanding of technological changes, for example, could provide a different basis for studying entrepreneurship and particularly for the generation of ideas. In addition, genuine multi-disciplinary student teams might contribute to different learning outcomes, due to a broader and more diverse resource base acquired through the team behavior. Thus, examining the relationship between student team behavior and the learning outcome in the context of entrepreneurship education merits further empirical study. In addition, in this study the author relied on self-assessed perceptions of the learning outcome. However, the external evaluations given by advisors and
experts were team-level measures, and so did not offer the opportunity for feedback on individual variations in each team. Accordingly, the use of external assessment of the elements of creativity and feasibility might generate different results. The use of expert opinions and other external evaluations on similar course assignments should be tested empirically in further studies. The present study thus adds a different dimension to the literature on WIL.

From the findings of the study, it could be concluded that the students of the practice-based entrepreneurship course expressed high satisfaction and its usefulness. For IM TELKOM, the course’s usefulness lies in the opportunity to produce a more employable, well rounded and skilled graduates in Indonesia. Thus, the practice-based entrepreneurship course appears promising and The Department of Business and Management Education that runs it would undoubtedly feel encouraged by the findings which could act as a promising experiment in students’ entrepreneurial activity. That notwithstanding, the department needs to reflect on the findings, identify the possible causes of the course’s success, and thereafter, institute measures to maintain the identified success factors so that the expressed high attainment of the objectives of the course and usefulness would not slip. Also, this may further impact the institution’s strategic planning for curriculum changes in the coming academic year 2011/12.
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