JUTLP
Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice

Using Coaching to Support Experiential Learning in Global Virtual Teams (GVTs) – Interrogating Perceptions of Impact.

Dr Deb Gilbertson[a], Dr Virginia Cathro[b], Dr Morne Mail[a], and Dr Anelda Mail[a]
[a] Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand; [b] University of Otago, New Zealand

Abstract

In 2021, recognising the perceived strengths and risks, along with the tumult experienced by students in a Covid-19 university context, a coaching program was wrapped around the Global Enterprise Experience (GEE) to support student learning. This program involved the training, development and support of a 59 strong volunteer coach team. This paper reports the experiences of these coaches and the perceived impact of the coaching program from their perspective. Coaches participated in a semi-structured interview comprising open-ended questioning. Each coach was asked to voice their sense of did they have impact? Narrative responses were transcribed, collated within NVivo, and analysed using thematic analysis and concept mapping techniques (Braun & Clarke, 2006, 2019; Terry, Hayfield, Clarke & Braun, 2017). Findings suggest a volunteer coach belief that they had impact upon student learning. Impact was described in numerous ways. The program was valuable to coaches and team leaders alike. Most especially that as an offering the program has impact and is scalable and sustainable. This finding is noteworthy as scalability and sustainability in the mix of offering students support within experiential learning contexts remains challenging for educators and institutions to resource. These findings suggesting the coaching program impacted our volunteer coaches, an unanticipated positive finding, reveals a potent sustainability factor that might now be leveraged creating benefits for both coaches and team leaders alike. In so doing, this study contributes to understanding of coaching undergraduates engaging in experiential GVTs, with practical implications of structuring support.

Editors

Section: Developing Teaching Practice
Senior Editor: A/Prof Bekk Middleton
Associate Editor: A/Prof Martin Andrew

Publication

Received: 21 August 2023
Revision: 25 January 2024
Accepted: 31 July 2024
Published: 19 August 2024

Citation

Gilbertson, D., Cathro, V., Mail, M., & Mail, A. (2024). Using coaching to support experiential learning in global virtual teams (GVTs) – interrogating perceptions of impact. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice, 21*(9). https://doi.org/10.53761/0xm6wg52

Introduction

This paper reflects on the experience of offering coaching support via a team of virtual and volunteer coaches. It explores coaches' sense of impact coaching within the experience, encompassing consideration of the scalability and sustainability of such an offering. Scalability and sustainability are essential component of any collaborative team learning experience. Increasingly safeguarding students by offering support for their learning and wellbeing is not just a educator's goal but also an institutional reality. Programs embracing collaborative, technology enabled learning experiences are often popular placing additional stressors as while student numbers increase funding does not. The stark reality within a university context, is there is little if any funding to safeguard and support individual wellbeing and sense making of learning experiences. Any coaching program is constrained by funding yet needs to offer professional, multifaceted support offering to individuals such that discomfort in learning (Brown, 2016) can be embraced with confidence by individuals and organisations alike. While embraced by organisations, coaching is less visible within the undergraduate university classroom. Also, research tends to consider the experience of individual receiving coaching support rather than of the coach themselves (Curry, 2015).

Coaching to support experiential learning in higher education

Even prior to the Covid-19 global pandemic, international business and management scholars had readily recognise the impact of digital transformations changing work (Giraud-Carrier et al., 2021; Taras et al., 2013). Lockdowns and the need to socially distance in the physical world have accelerated bold change heightening reliance upon digital transformations dramatically reshaping organisations globally (Blackburn et al., 2020; LaBerge et al., 2021). This amplification of the role of technology presents too in the delivery and assessment of learning within higher education institutions (HEIs). There is pressing need for higher education to match these societal changes within tertiary classroom and teach the complex real-world skills needed enmeshing problem solving, collaboration, creativity, critical thinking, interpersonal communication, leadership, and culture has been argued (Giraud-Carrier et al., 2021; Govindarajan, 2020). Some would offer that international business and management educators have long since taken this initiative (Gonzalez-Perez et al., 2019; Gonzalez-Perez & Taras, 2015). Global virtual teams (GVTs) are being used to replicate organisational experiences and amplify international business education within university classrooms (Cathro, 2020; Velinov et al., 2021). GVT learned skills encompass managing team dynamics of virtual exchange (Lindner & O'Brien, 2019), also be referred to as the soft skills required by managers in an increasingly digital world (Rodríguez-Jiménez et al., 2021; Waller et al., 2017), or leadership agility (Cleveland & Cleveland, 2020). Experiences of this type are said to enhance digital capacities (Jørgensen et al., 2022), extend entrepreneurial thinking (Bandera et al., 2018; Goldstein & Gafni, 2019), and broaden cross cultural experiences (Luethge et al., 2016; Velez-Calle et al., 2020). They are also suggested to hone reflection, expressly intercultural reflection (Cathro, 2020; Nardon, 2019). Parry et al., (2023) draw upon Vanden Abeele (2020, p. 7) definition of digital wellbeing as the "subjective individual experience of optimal balance between the benefits and drawbacks obtained from mobile connectivity", suggesting that digital wellbeing research whilst still nascent is burgeoning. Students are proffered to demonstrate heavy reliance and excessive usages particularly within learning contexts that can

negatively associate with learning and academic performance which leads to them being a key demographic for scrutiny (Parry et al., 2023). Other scholars similarly suggest that there is a potential dark side to readily being able to access and engage with technology (Sánchez-Fernández & Borda-Mas, 2023). For example, problematic internet usage (PIU) has been described as a newly "emerging public health problem and university students comprise a high-risk population" (Sanchez-Fernandez et al., 2023, p. 1). This recognition of the risks on internet usage and its relationship to addictive usage behaviours encompassing depression and insomnia led spurs consideration of "the promotion of activities that do not involve the use of the internet, thus reducing the time spent online" (Sánchez-Fernández & Borda-Mas, 2023, p. 26). This suggestion represents one way to mitigate risk to individuals and institutions, but it is counter intuitive to programs and assessment reliant upon anywhere, anytime connectivity via mobile devices premised on internet capabilities of the internet currently embraced as a strategic adoption of collaborative online activities to mimic everyday organisational settings and internationalisation of international business and education adopting.

Acknowledging the potential of risk for individuals via a lens of digital wellbeing brings to the fore questions pertaining to the quality of institutional offerings as the safeguarding practices of these technology enabled collaborative learning spaces. It spurs HEIs to be more questioning of the impact of engaging via virtual collaboration generally. Transformational learning within teams carries with it potential to blur boundaries, to cross from content, praxis and a way of thinking into interpersonal interspaces. Engaging in experiences is suggested to lead to rich learning that fits within learning for future work roles. However, risks have also been identified. What is exhilarating for some is stressful and overwhelming for others. Academic stress might easily tip to distress with potential to further escalate to depression and addictive usage behaviours mooted as possible (Mun, 2023). Discomfort in learning needs ideally to be a balanced edge. Providing support is an obvious solution to mitigate risk and promote wellbeing and engagement. Furthermore, classrooms and many organisations struggle to fund support initiatives highlighting the need for offerings to be not only on point but also both scalable and sustainable. Aligning experiences with support is likely achievable via coaching (Curry, 2015) but comprises a cost. Coaching as support is a viable strategy to address both the experience of technology (Stehr, 2023), leadership and teaming (Curry, 2015; Lacerenza et al., 2015) and is evidenced as an organisational strategy (Maznevski & Chui, 2017)).

This research paper investigates the impact of a volunteer coaching program developed to support the development of future organisational coaches (Coaches in Training CITs) and the development and wellbeing of virtual team leaders (Leaders in Training LITs) evaluating the scalability and sustainability of such an initiative within the higher education classroom. CITs articulating perceived value and a sense of impact offering learning support via the experience of coaching within the broader GEE activity would in turn endorse sustainability. This is potentially a virtuous dynamic, as CITs who perceived impact are proffered more likely to continue to engage in the future and this will likely then impact any potential cohort of CITs with a flow on effect to scalability. What do CITs offer post experience regarding value and impact of their coaching experience? Do the answers to this question offer insight into how to address the quandary of scalable and sustainable support to safeguard individuals within tertiary and organisational contexts?

Literature

Best practice teaching via experience comprises quality debrief opportunities, pre-experience preparation enmeshing the skills of reflection and reframing, along with positive feedback and a sense of achievement, and assessment whereby grades are not directly linked to performance outcomes rather they are tethered to demonstrated learning (Cathro et al., 2017). However, risks with experience-based learning (EBL) remain (Bradford, 2019; Dean et al., 2020; Wright et al., 2022). Here Taras and Ordeñana's (2015) exploration of what enhances and or hinders international workgroup dynamics with student teams offers two insights. First, what individuals expected to find challenging was different to what was experienced. Second, that learning had latent impact and facilitated multiple expressions of success; success in in job interviews, gaining internship opportunities and the creation of friendships and connections where many students reporting that they stay in touch with team members long after the project is over. Perhaps not surprisingly, within international business, technology-enabled GVT experiences have been embraced as learning and assessment mechanisms in tertiary classrooms. Two bespoke well-established university delivered GVT project experiences are X-culture and the Global Enterprise Experience (GEE). Both collaboration forms have recently enmeshed coaching as a form of additional support (Taras et al., 2019).

GVTs, communication technology, experiential learning and wellbeing

HEIs offering programs of study with global participation and hence increase student diversity as well as a reliance on digital technology to facilitate learning are describe as endemic. Prisacariu and Shah (2016) suggest that "institutions are increasingly under pressure to ensure that strategy is well resourced with robust risk management processes in place" (p.153). They suggest that quality in higher education is more than stakeholder satisfaction and is multifaceted, multi-level and a dynamic concept that is fundamentally contextual (Prisacariu & Shah, 2016). Their discussion of ethics and moral values of the HEI sector gives focus to the pragmatic realities of students' experiences with technology enabled learning and assessment being likely hugely varied within any program. That there is an inherent need for program educators and institutions to be accountable for the quality of this type of program which includes safeguarding individuals engaging in this style of learning. The challenge inherent to HEIs is how to offer quality assurances that both benchmark and frame the needs of individual students balancing that learning by doing whilst any everyday norm is also unpredictable and a sustainable level. The central reality becomes how to do this within the context of technology-enabled global teams are often under-funded in a way that is both scalable to the size of classrooms, addresses a range of individual needs and is sustainable.

Framing experiential learning within technology enabled collaborative GVTs

Efforts to develop global leadership skills using experiential learning and technology are prevalent within international business education efforts in tertiary classrooms (Andino-Pratts et al., 2022; Cullen, 2022). The use of virtual collaboration experiences to internationalise classrooms and offer authentic activities has been embraced. Experiential learning for developing global leadership skills has been embraced (Cumberland et al., 2016; Mendenhall et al., 2020; Taras et al., 2013)and continue to develop whereby programs of this type typically push students to better

understand self-awareness and prompt 'trying to enact changes in thoughts and behaviours' (Vora, 2020)(247). Similarly, Luethge, Raska, Greer and O'Connor (Luethge et al., 2016) describe an undergraduate business course where students engage in GVTs to develop cross cultural communication skills and cultural knowledge necessary for globally minded business students embarking upon leadership roles within organisations. Fey (Fey, 2020)(2020) concludes that global leadership research now needs to further extend understanding of the individual and organisational enablers impacting development, including organisational support enablers. Moreover, understanding learning processes of individuals and organisations orienting towards a short-term learning perspective merits scholarly attention as does scales to better measure developmental shifts and forms of organisational support (Fey 2020, p.147). This call for understanding fits within higher education institutions as well as other forms of organisations. Herein, Vora's (2020) recognition of the drive for higher education institutions (HEIs) to develop "global leadership skills, relevant for any leader – not just those working in an international context" (Vora 2020, p.243), promotes learning geared for the development of these capabilities with surprisingly little evidence to support the claim that these curricula experiences do indeed develop the mooted capabilities.

Supporting experience-based learning (EBL) in GVTs

Experience based learning (EBL) is endemic within organisations. Individuals learn via experience. Organisations train and develop people for a wide variety of roles by offering experiences. It also works within tertiary classrooms. Burch et al., (2019, p. 239) suggest meta-analysis of four decades of experiential learning suggests this method of learning is effective whereby students experienced superior learning outcomes when experiential pedagogies were employed. Teaching via experiences is well-evidenced within international business (Gonzalez-Perez & Taras, 2015, 2019). "Experiential learning activities and experiential programs are often posited as an antidote to passivity and lack of engagement in learning"(Burch et al., 2019, p. 239), however concerns have also been expressed. Business schools priming students for contemporary organisations increasingly call for the use of this approach. "However, teaching practices that are consistent with experiential pedagogy deliberately engage students' emotions and may breach expected teaching norms" (Dean et al., 2020, p. 569). Increasingly, educators "are expected to engage in experiential education, but they are rarely trained in it" (Giraud-Carrier et al., 2021, p. 2) with some suggesting that best practice and development of educators using experience-based learning is generally neglected (Dean, Wright & Forray 2020).

Experiential learning creates discomfort, and this level of discomfort is essential to development but comprises risk (Brown, 2016). Wright et al., (2021, p. 3) suggest that "experiential educators can leverage students' negative emotions for valuable learning outcomes" and that "educators' specialized knowledge and skill in facilitating experiential activities are often the make-or-break factor for learning from activities". Classroom experiences with potential for student distress tend to comprise the risk of social judgment, higher emotional engagement, and self-disclosure. Here there is greater potential for unintended learning consequences (Wright et al., 2019). Wright, Dean and Forray (2021, p.3) use the term "emotional intensity" to capture "the likelihood of negative emotional outcomes with students' perceptions of risking some kind of real loss such as social standing, self-concept, or relationship changes". Schlaegel, Gunkel and Taras (2023) suggest that individuals with greater capacities to manage emotional, cognitive, and behavioural engagement

(self-regulation capabilities) are more effective in stressful situations within GVTS. Self-regulation can be developed and supported by organisations and that the development of individuals' resilience leads to stronger organisational resilience (Schlaegel et al., 2023). Educators and scholars also suggest the EBL has stood the test of time, works (Gonzalez-Perez et al., 2019) and that many of these inherent risks can be lessened (Bradford, 2018). Here, the role of coaching is requisite with recognition that this is an additional expertise deployed by educators (Wright et al., 2021).

Communication technology, international and social media usage, and wellbeing

Reliance upon collaborative learning within technology enabled teams has arguably increased since the global pandemic of 2020. As everyday use of digital technology to virtually collaborate has only become further embedded as a societal norm for both education and work, the impact of this style of engagement has garnered research scrutiny. Recently studies show both a dark side to virtual and digital engagement, where technology suggest addition of dependency presents with some suggesting that the myriad of forms potential impacts university students most notably. Drawing upon a small but increasing number of recent studies Sanchez-Fernaez, Borda-Mas and Mora-Mechans (2023) proffer that university students are not necessarily all impacted in the same way but that then tend to show a higher risk of problematic internet usage (PIU) behaviours and possibly less self-control.

Experiential learning support: Coaching and the present study

Within organisations coaching has been used extensively to support development of organisational capacity via the capability development of individuals (Theeboom, Beersma, & van Vianen, 2014; Bozer, & Jones, 2018). Much scholarly attention has been paid to the effectiveness of coaching, its form and sustainability, to the relationship between coaching and business excellence (Grover & Furnham, 2016). Coaching, be that executive or workplace coaching, relies on relationship between coach and coaches to navigate purposefully content linked to experiences. Coaching learning via experiences is suggested as a potential support mechanism within tertiary classrooms. Broadly, coaching processes and content align within GVTs algins in both organisational contexts and HEIs. However, HEIs tend not to allocate additional funding for the support of individuals in addition to program delivery and these classrooms tend to comprise larger numbers for shorter durations. Together, these two factors impact the costing of coaching and the sustainability of such support initiatives. "Coaching can have tremendously positive effects, but to date there has been little attention afforded to the possibility that coaching can also exhibit negative effects" (Schermuly & Graßmann, 2019, p. 39). Relationship quality between coach and coaches diminishes negative effects (Schermuly & Graßmann, 2019) and increasing the likelihood that both coach and coaches have a sense of positive impact. To date, attention has been given to the potential negative effects for coachees and what coaches and programs can do to prevent and mitigate such negatives (Schermuly & Graßmann, 2019) This focus does not fully address a coach perspective as the lens applied tends to give primacy to the risk of negatives for individuals (coaches) and organisations more so than the risk to coaches (Schermuly & Graßmann, 2019). And so, this study interrogates the efficacy of a coaching program developed to support both the development of coaches as well as the support of the students engaging in collaborative GVT leadership roles. It is part of a broader program of

evaluation seeking to canvass all experiences of a pilot program adding coaching to support GVT engagement to enhance individual performance and in turn organisational capability. The overarching research question of this study is “Do CITs supporting LITS engaging in GVT leadership experiences believe that they had impact?” If so, how and what is the nature of this impact?

Method

Recapping the overarching question for this study was ‘What do CITs offer post experience regarding value and impact of their coaching experience?’ The interview question was ‘As a coach, did you feel you had impact?’ and follow up prompts where ‘Can you tell me more?’ and ‘How?’ along with other interview encouragers such as head nodding and the like. As such, this study uses a qualitative thematic analysis to explore CITS evaluations of GVT coaching post experience. At the conclusion of the GEE contest, coaches participated in a debriefing interview comprising open-ended questioning. Each coach was asked the same question set pertaining to their sense of did they have impact? Narrative responses were transcribed, collated within NVivo and analysed using thematic analysis and concept mapping techniques. (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Terry, et al., 2017). Data was gathered via Zoom interview to capture interview responses. All CITs were asked the same questions in a semi-structured interview.

Study context: Virtual collaboration in the Global Enterprise Experience (GEE)

The GEE has been a cornerstone to classroom activities at the University of Victoria Wellington and the University of Otago since 2004 and 2012 respectively. Previous study suggests that the GEE is teaching students intercultural, virtual and leadership skills (Gilbertson & Cathro, 2015; Cathro et al., 2017). Over this time, the size of each annual cohort has grown. Over time has the logistical complexity increased in terms of numbers of teams and individuals comprising teams. So too has the variety and ease of access to information communication technologies, the range of countries, geographic, social cultural and temporal distinctions is genuinely global. The interplay of team challenges to amplify experience is a balancing point, achieved by selecting individuals for teams via submission of a bio from each individual; they introduce themselves and their self-evaluated skillsets, their geolocation, related time zones, technology, study path and work experience. While the global nature of the contest has morphed, the heart of the GEE has remained constant. The vision of the GEE is social enterprise, to develop creativity and passion for leadership, to ignite future leaders and inspire them to wish to connect and change the world positively. A review of GVT teams research suggest that student teams likely experience cultural diversity differently than organisational teams with less cultural challenges and conflicts (Gibbs et al., 2017). Student teams are likely less to experience technology challenges as they are assumed to be digital natives with virtual competences (Velez-Calle et al., 2020; Zwerg-Villegas & Martínez-Díaz, 2016). However, we also know that students are not always confident and that not all of them share the same cultural, leadership and technology exposure. Also, while very strong reflective and anecdotal feedback suggests that student find the GEE resoundingly positive (Gilbertson & Cathro, 2015) our concern remains, how do you provide timely and cost effective support in a multitude of forms? More truthfully, how do you provide quality coaching within an educational climate of financial constraint?

Ethical considerations

This study has adopted ethical practices consistent with the expectations of university ethical practices. Namely, informed consent, the opportunity to vacate the research process at any stage, the anonymizing of participant data and the use of unique identifiers and pseudonyms. It has also adopted a degree of separation in researcher role with those engaging directly with participants gathering data and anonymising data before sharing this content with the analysis team. The researcher conducting the interviews worked separate to the researchers' coding transcripts and all files shared within the research team used unique numerical identifiers. Data storage is also passwords protected and encrypted with participant data anonymised prior to sharing for analysis with the research team.

Coach recruitment, training and resulting sample

Coaches were recruited via an open announcement on the GEE website and email direct to the alumni participants of the GEE. A total of 59 volunteer CITS entered the training program, of which 44 completed the program and the debriefing interview whereby 42 respondents answered the impact questions and consented for their responses to be used for research purposes and inform this study.

The coach program offered was structured around 34 hours of online work. The coach training program comprises 8 modules of flexible online individual study and expectation that four modules based upon 4 x 60-minute modules expected as pre-group work to be completed independently. After this initial work, a series is of at least 6 group sessions of 90-minutes (9 hours) comprising group discussion. Group sessions involved 'live' online discussion of coaching (expressly coaching within the context of the GEE), and leadership and experiences of working in teams. and dialogue work with 20 related modules of flexitime online study comprising coaching enmeshing fundamentals, building trust and rapport, using coaching models, asking powerful questions and listening, the power of silence, goal setting, creating accountability and giving feedback), coaching conversations online and the moment of impact as well as having difficult conversations, coaching for a growth mindset encompassing emotional intelligence, resilience wellbeing and change) and, the coaching of skills such as communication, time management, delegation, creativity and focus. This program differentiates itself with coaches gaining real online coaching experience as compared to theoretical discussions and activity in classrooms.

59 coaches joined the GEE affiliate coaching program; 44 coaches consented to participate in the research study and 42 responses were provided as data for analysis. The sample comprises 47 female CITs and 12 male CITs. CITs ranged in age from 25-46 years old with an average age of 30 years old, with 5-8 years work experience. CITs also tended to be based in New Zealand, however several CITs were globally geolocated (refer table 1 below). They tended to be GEE alumni responding to the direct email invitation. Most CITs worked in not-for-profit organisations or government institutions and enterprises, in a range of work roles, typically service and process team leadership roles, managerial leads, and advisory roles (refer table 2 below).

Table 1

Sample range for Country location and self-described ethnicity

Country	Number	Self-described ethnicity	Number
New Zealand	47	New Zealander	40
Australia	3	Māori	1
United Kingdom	2	Australian	3
South Africa	1	Fijian	1
America (USA)	1	Tongan	1
Thailand	1	Vietnamese	1
Vietnam	1	Thai	1
Malaysia	1	Singaporean	1
Fiji	1	Sri Lankan	1
Tonga	1	Malaysian	1
Southeast Asia	(4)	European (Italian, Serbian, Scottish, British)	4
Malaysia	1	American	3
		British	2
Total	59	**Total**	59

Table 2

Range of work roles.

Role description	Number	Example
Service/process roles	22	Graduate customer services, customer experience design lead merchant risk specialist, service delivery associate
Sales/marketing/events IT digital	12	Marketing analyst, communication officer, digital adoption manager, media executive
Manager, team lead	9	Manager, program manager, competence manager, brand manager, branch manager
Human resource management/Human resource development	8	Recruitment advisor, recruitment consultant, incentives specialist, advisor learning and development
Advisor roles	6	Senior policy advisor, consultant, Client development Business Advisor
Other	2	Doctoral candidate, associate broker
Total	59	

Analysis approach

Interviews were conducted via Zoom. They were recorded and transcribed prior to coding and analysis. Interviews were typically 60 minutes in duration comprising questions and discussion of

the respondents' experience of the coaching program and their GEE experience as CITs. Narrative gathered in response to the specific impact questions ranged from 12 to 20 minutes in duration. Once transcribed narrative responses were imported and collated within NVivo. After which they were coded and analysed using thematic analysis and concept mapping techniques (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Terry et al., Braun, 2017).

Results

Emergent themes

The narrative voice of respondents framed three clear emergent themes ("On them", "On me", and "the nature of impact"). Table 3 presents these three emergent themes for impact (see table 3 below). A sense of impact was clearly experienced by the coaches with clear articulation of the form of this impact as both inferred and concrete change as well as characterisation of the feeling of impact. Impact was described in multiple ways with 3 clear perspectives framing the narrative voice share by respondents. In terms of the impact perceived 'on them', where the CITs gave voice to whether they believed coaching was impactful for LITs. It was also articulated as a self-reflection; the impact that coaching had 'on me'. CITs articulate a sense of impact on LITs but also that coaching had an impact on self. This articulation was somewhat unexpected. CITs also voiced the nature of impact with some clear commonality. Here, impact was construed as a feeling experienced by the CIT, as a quantifiable form of change, and a sense of change tied to the LIT which also offered insights into how impact was created with the coaching engagement. Noteworthy is that not a single coach described no impact; all responses suggested some level of impact if not a definite sense of impact.

Table 3

Emergent themes articulating the perceived value and impact of coaching

Emergent theme(s)	**Subtheme(s)**
1. On them	Yes
	a) Yes-No – 'a qualified yes'
2. On me	a) Impact as personal growth in me
	b) Impact as transferring into my work
3. Nature of impact	
a) Direct observation of impact	As concrete change
	As a positively stated nature
	As when they (LITS) said it had impact
b) Indirect reflection	As a sense of change of feelings in 'their' LITS
	As a sense of change of feelings in themselves
c) Differentiation	Compulsion
	Didn't want to explore
	Didn't need to explore

Theme 1. "On them"

There was not a single CIT that offered that they did not perceive impact. Collectively, CITs perceived they had impact on LITs via two clear positions, "yes" and "yes-no". Many were confident that they had impact, responding definitively. Some offered very clear, qualified, description of not only this belief but also qualification of the nature of impact. For those offering affirmation, the nature of impact was further probed in the interview and analysis, which is in turn considered in turn. This directly voices CITs had been outright told by LITs that they perceived value from coaching, or indirectly that CITs observed characterizable shifts in how LITs described their GVT collaborations and engagement. For example,

> *"His feedback was that it really helped … he wanted to pick my brain and I gave him things to think about"* 021.

Other CITs offered a more hedging 'yes-no response where they believed impact was contingent. LITs deriving most value and benefit were those open to coaching and or where the timing of the coaching engagement fit with a perceived GVT need or challenge. Here, sessions too early (prior to experiencing some level of challenge) were construed by many CITs to be possibly of less relative benefit. Table 4 now presents exemplars.

Table 4

CITs perceived impact on LITs

"On them" [42](45)	**Exemplars**	**Notes**
Yes [30](30)	"I doubted that I would have such impact, but I realised that I was especiallu7 after I did the work and then it changed" 025 "Definitely. We even went off the topic of the GEE and talked about other life problems in general". 009	Point of distinction between the two (Yes vs. Yes-no)? a) Definitively - A stronger sense of impact on them b) Qualified – timing, openness or acknowledgement of time needed
Directly stated definitely had impact [5] (5)	"I think I had a bit of impact because without being asked almost all of them thanked me asking me questions about staying in touch after the GEE." 018 "When they said thank you or that it had impact	
But it takes time [3] (3)	"You can have impact where you are allowed to have impact but it takes time" 023 "…some just needed more sessions and getting past these have to be done" 047 "…and yes about 15 hours later he said outright I had impact on him"	
Yes- No [12](5) Some more willing than others [5](5)	"I definitely had impact but some I had more impact than others" 011 "I think it depends to be completely honest…" 014 "….if they have to do it or chose to do it" 022 "Can have impact where you are allowed to have impact" 023	Two positions: 1. Impact is related to timing and need 2. Impact is connected to LITs willingness to be open.

Note [number of individuals], (number of responses coded)

These findings support the foundations of the coaching program and the value proposition that connection and conversation allowed students to recognise and express their own emotion and the emotion of others. In so doing, they were able to actively think out loud, reflect and reframe their experience. Moreover, because coaching was a support structure accessible in the periods were students might be finding things challenging this in turn would support the development of resilience and continuing to engage within fullness in their experience. Students were not all embracing of this coaching experience, and coaches felt that those forced to do it for course work tended to engage in the activity with less openness and more transactionality. Those students who voluntarily engaged in multiple coaching sessions were observed to gain the most benefit. The inherent surprise finding was that CITs found that their engagement with students also impacted their own professional lives. Indeed, many coaches indicated that there were going to continue in relationship with individuals post classroom.

Theme 2.''On me''

CITs voiced changes in themselves as personal growth, diffuse for some and specific for others. For example, as a change in confidence. Others described impact as a transfer of their CIT learning into their work roles and 'real lives'. 27 CITs, more than half of the respondents, answered without prompting that they perceived a positive change (that they valued) in themselves. No respondents outright stated that they had no impact. Themes and subthemes of this perspective are now presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Value of impact perceived – “On me”/Change in me as a coach or a person

‘On me’ – [27] (30)	Exemplar	Notes
Personal growth in me [15] (15)	“it did impact me… it impacted how I converse with people and changed my thinking about how to engage with strangers…” 032	Change in CIT behaviour, both general and specific.
	“I think I definitely underestimated how powerful it is for people to have space to talk…” 008	
	“I have learned so much but also gone back to the person I was….. I was so confident such a free spirit ready to take on the world… now... speaking with others (CITs) makes you realise everyone is on their own different journey, that is doesn’t mean you are stuck… just speaking with them was motivation enough” 058	
Confidence - Change in me and what I would offer [5] (5)	“It taught me to stop and think about how other people think and my compulsion to give advice is not the only way taking me to just talk with people, listening for the sake of listening, that there is a person there, not just listening to respond”. 033	Confidence
	“I found it really rewarding, feeling like I want to do more like I am actually heling someone and growing in myself” 040	
Transferring into my work [2] (2)	“I now do coaching with my own team members on a monthly basis and it’s a formula without an agenda” 035	Transfer of CITs learning experience
	“It impacted me to know them and their questions. I was so humbled by holding the same space with them but not to fix it and this has been spilling over into my own work” 022	
	“I have become a lot more comfortable within myself with my own teamwork … it’s made me more aware of what I do and how I do it and stepping back and not getting flustered… it’s made my team work more dynamic. I have not had team dynamic problems now in quite a while now and it’s also helped me with other difficult situations that I have had at work in new spaces”. 036	

Note [number of individuals], (number of responses coded)

Theme 3. Nature of impact

Impact was articulated as three sub-themes. First, by way of direct observation with a sense of concrete change or something different which encompassed the LITs stating a thank you acknowledging a definable change. Second, as an indirect reflection where CITS expressed a sense of feelings, feeling a change in LITs as a form of impact. Third, as a sense of the impact in each response to some degree being different. Here, some voiced the sense that their experience of impact was tethered to if the LITs had to engage with the coaching program on offer or if they chose to engage. Compulsion was felt to impact engagement and in turn impact; that LITs taking MANT317 were more into getting it (the coaching sessions) done and not genuinely open to coaching resulting in CITs feeling less able to genuinely have impact. Other agreed that they had a sense of differentiation but that this was attributable to them not experiencing a need to fully engage as they didn't need to seek support or solutions. Hence, this theme and subthemes capture a sense of differentiation where MANT317 students were less likely to openly engage but that this might be for very different reasons (refer table 6 for exemplars). Taken together this voices a suggestion that CITs felt impact was of greater magnitude for some as compared to others. Furthermore, LIT willingness and readiness was tied to compulsion and or need. For example,

> *'…he didn't really want to be there until – he never really expressed interest until he came across the need to be asking' 026*
>
> *"those with mandatory coaching (were) very closed – "I'm just here because I have to do sessions" 016*

Discussion

This study interrogates the experience of CITs in terms of how they construe their impact and their assessment of the impact of coaching support for the LITs engaging in intensive GVT collaborations. The clear emergent themes support the CITs belief that they had impact upon LITs learning. Impact was described in numerous ways. CITs voice a sense of impact regarding both LITs and themselves. This impact on self was somewhat unanticipated and in turn it is likely that for future GEE contests CITs will likely continue to offer their service to the program based of their sense of it being impactful and that like this cohort of CITs interest others potentially share interest in developing their coaching capability others are also potentially interested in developing as coaches. That volunteer coaches shared a sense of being impactful and are likely to re-engage as a source of future coaching support suggests potential sustainability and scalability for the program for the support and wellbeing of LITs in GVT collaborations. Scalability results from the number of willing participants as well as the potential to use these participants as graduate to further support CITs allowing program growth without dramatically increasing program costs. It also offers insights into how to measure engagement as direct observations and as feelings of impact as future metrics of the CITs and LITs experiences of such a program to enhance and support experiential learning. Many voice experiences of differentiation whereby students mandated to engage with coaching are less willing. However, this requires further research as CITs.

Practical implications

That the program, CITs felt they had impact regardless of their location or institutional affiliation. They also felt they derived personal benefit and energy through connection influencing their own professional roles stating they were likely to engage with future GEE cohorts and suggest the program to others. With a future cadre of coaches, this coaching program demonstrates a scalability ideal for undergraduate adoption of GVT as classroom activities, and a sustainability. CITS showed to fund their own coaching development.

Limitations and future research

This qualitative study might now be extended with a design experiment study using bioth quantitative and qualitative data (e.g., Eden, 2017; Highhouse, 2009) to generate further insights. Future research might also undertake longitudinal analysis of the impact of the coaching programs for both CITS and LITS. As part of a broader research program, this study focuses on the coaches' experiences and perspectives suggests merit in further study examining the role of CITs perceptions of impact upon LITs. This research study is part of a broader, ongoing research program. Research might now further explore student experiences of coaches and in particular, the framing of engagement with the coaching program as required coursework, optional or something that you are invited to connect to as part of your GEE GVT engagement. Ideally it would also investigate the impact of deploying coach mentors for organisational GVT roles especially with the abundance of stressors comprising remote engagement and virtual work practices.

Conclusion

Our exploratory results offers a variety of contributions. First, by focussing on the CITs perspectives, these findings add insight into how we might more broadly evaluate the impact of structuring support and cross leveraging experiential learning to both develop coach capability and support the wellbeing of experiential learning within GVTs. At the level of theory, this study contributes to placing CITs central to the evaluation of impact and perceived value to the effect of support of experiential learning in the development of individuals within GVTs. It extends the potential evaluation of such programs to include coach perspectives. Specifically differing focal points for measuring impact are identified. CITs see impact via concrete or discrete changes as well as sensing a shift in how LITs felt. This suggests forms of impact might be measured as describable behaviour changes as well as emotional shifts. Second, at a more practical level, this study demonstrates that integrating coaching support within GVT collaborations as a mechanism to support the wellbeing of LITs engaging via experiential learning is viable. Both scalable and sustainable. Coaches voice and experience of being impactful and seeing it of value to both themselves and others in a tangible fashion suggest that coaches are likely to value engagement and be available in the future. This in turn suggests coach availability and potential for CITs to have coach mentors within the context of the training program as a whole The coaching program itself is scalable and which translates to sustainability and scalability. This being the case it could be suggested that there is potential for sustainability in the sense of future CIT talent. Additionally sustainability is achieved with the delivery of a coach effective CIT program which costs the same for 10 as it does 100, that has global draw. From a tertiary education perspective this is also cost

neutral as funding to support LITs is via CITs and the organisations they work for and not via students or HEIs. This study suggest that deeper investigation is now warranted to consider CITs-LITs support dynamic, most specifically regarding self-regulation changes, stress load and individual performance.

Acknowledgements

The author(s) disclose that they have no actual or perceived conflicts of interest. The authors disclose that they have not received any funding for this manuscript beyond resourcing for academic time at their respective university. The authors have not used artificial intelligence in the ideation, design, or write-up of this research as per Crawford et al. (2023). The authors list the following CRediT contributions: Deb Gilbertson, conceptualisation, methodology, formal analysis, writing original draft, writing review and editing; Virginia Cathro conceptualisation, methodology, formal analysis, writing original draft, writing review and editing; Morne Mail, project admin, data curation, writing review and editing; Anelda Mail, data gathering, investigation, data curation.

References

Andino-Pratts, A., Irizarry-Quintero, A., Peña-Hevia, J. A., & Sierra-Monroig, C. (2022). Using Technology in the Classroom to Promote Global Education. *Network*.

Bandera, C., Collins, R., & Passerini, K. (2018). Risky business: Experiential learning, information and communications technology, and risk-taking attitudes in entrepreneurship education. *The international journal of management education, 16*(2), 224-238.

Blackburn, S., LaBerge, L., O'Toole, C., & Schneider, J. (2020). Digital strategy in a time of crisis. *McKinsey Digital, April, 22*.

Bozer, G., & Jones, R. J. (2018). Understanding the factors that determine workplace coaching effectiveness: A systematic literature review. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *27*(3), 342-361.

Bradford, D. L. (2019). Ethical issues in experiential learning. *Journal of management education, 43*(1), 89-98.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.

Brown, B. (2016). Brené Brown encourages educators to normalize the discomfort of learning and reframe failure as learning. *About Campus, 20*(6), 3-7.

Burch, G. F., Giambatista, R., Batchelor, J. H., Burch, J. J., Hoover, J. D., & Heller, N. A. (2019). A meta-analysis of the relationship between experiential learning and learning outcomes. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education, 17*(3), 239-273.

Cathro, V. (2020). An odyssey of virtual global team activity in the experiential learning environment of the Global Enterprise Experience (GEE). *Computers in Human Behavior, 107*, 105760.

Cathro, V., O'Kane, P., & Gilbertson, D. (2017). Assessing reflection: Understanding skill development through reflective learning journals. *Education+ Training, 59*(4), 427-442.

Cleveland, S., & Cleveland, M. (2020). Leadership competencies for sustained project success. *International Journal of Applied Management Theory and Research (IJAMTR), 2*(1), 35-47.

Cullen, J. G. (2022). The Management Classroom of the Future: Megatrends and Global Challenges. In *The Future of Management Education* (pp. 172-183). Routledge.

Cumberland, D. M., Herd, A., Alagaraja, M., & Kerrick, S. A. (2016). Assessment and development of global leadership competencies in the workplace: A review of literature. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 18*(3), 301-317.

Curry, C. D. (2015). Coaching global teams and global team leaders. *Leading global teams: Translating multidisciplinary science to practice*, 141-168.

Dean, K. L., Wright, S., & Forray, J. M. (2020). Experiential learning and the moral duty of business schools. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 19*(4), 569-583.

Eden, D. (2017). Field experiments in organizations. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 4, 91-122.

Fey, N. (2020). How global leaders learn from international experience: reviewing and advancing global leadership development. In *Advances in global leadership* (Vol. 13, pp. 129-172). Emerald Publishing Limited.

Gibbs, J., Sivunen, A., & Boyraz, M. (2017). Investigating the impacts of team type and design on virtual team processes. *Human Resource Management Review, 27*(4), 590-603.

Gilbertson, D., & Cathro, V. (2015). A Decade of Global Enterprise Experiences. In *The Palgrave handbook of experiential learning in international business* (pp. 149-168). Springer.

Giraud-Carrier, F. C., Fawcett, S. E., & Fawcett, A. M. (2021). SPARRING: a deliberate practice pedagogy for business education. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education, 19*(4), 229-240.

Goldstein, A., & Gafni, R. (2019). Learning Entrepreneurship Through Virtual Multicultural Teamwork. *Issues in Informing Science & Information Technology, 16*.

Gonzalez-Perez, M. A., Lynden, K., & Taras, V. (2019). Learning and Teaching International Business and Management Using Experiential Learning Pedagogy. In *The Palgrave*

handbook of learning and teaching international business and management (pp. 3-6). Springer.

Gonzalez-Perez, M. A., & Taras, V. (2015). Conceptual and theoretical foundations: Experiential learning in international business and international management fields. In *The Palgrave handbook of experiential learning in international business* (pp. 12-16). Springer.

Govindarajan, V. (2020). COVID-19's Impact on the Future of Higher Education: What University Leaders Should Be Thinking About Now. *Harvard Business Publishing, Webinar, May, 20*, 2020.

Grover, S., & Furnham, A. (2016). Coaching as a developmental intervention in organisations: A systematic review of its effectiveness and the mechanisms underlying it. *PloS one*, *11*(7), e0159137.Highhouse, S. (2009). Designing experiments that generalize. *Organizational Research Methods, 12*(3), 554-566.

Jørgensen, M., Mason, A., Pedersen, R., & Harrison, R. (2022). The transformative learning potential in the hybrid space between technology and intercultural encounters. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 26*(3), 318-333.

LaBerge, L., O'Toole, C., Schneider, J., & Smaje, K. (2021). How COVID-19 has pushed companies over the technology tipping point—and transformed business forever, 2020. *URL: https://www.mckinsey. com/business-functions/strategy-and-corporate-finance/our-insights/how-covid-19-has-pushed-companies-over-the-technology-tipping-point-and-transfor med-business-forever, McKinsey & Company. Website. Last validation, 3*, 31.

Lacerenza, C. N., Zajac, S., Savage, N., & Salas, E. (2015). Team training for global virtual teams: Strategies for success. *Leading global teams: Translating multidisciplinary science to practice*, 91-121.

Lindner, R., & O'Brien, D. (2019). The global virtual teams project: Learning to manage team dynamics in virtual exchange. *Telecollaboration and virtual exchange across disciplines: In service of social inclusion and global citizenship*, 81-89.

Luethge, D. J., Raska, D., Greer, B. M., & O'Connor, C. (2016). Crossing the Atlantic: Integrating cross-cultural experiences into undergraduate business courses using virtual communities technology. *Journal of Education for Business, 91*(4), 219-226.

Maznevski, M. L., & Chui, C. (2017). Leading global teams. In *Global leadership* (pp. 273-301). Routledge.

Mendenhall, M. E., Burke-Smalley, L. A., Arnardottir, A. A., Oddou, G. R., & Osland, J. S. (2020). Making a difference in the classroom: Developing global leadership competencies in business school students. In *Research handbook of global leadership*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Mun, I. B. (2023). Academic stress and first-/third-person shooter game addiction in a large adolescent sample: A serial mediation model with depression and impulsivity. *Computers in Human Behavior, 145*, 107767.

Nardon, L. (2019). Reflection and intercultural competence development. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management*.

Parry, D. A., le Roux, D. B., Morton, J., Pons, R., Pretorius, R., & Schoeman, A. (2023). Digital wellbeing applications: Adoption, use and perceived effects. *Computers in Human Behavior, 139*, 107542.

Prisacariu, A., & Shah, M. (2016). Defining the quality of higher education around ethics and moral values. *Quality in Higher education*, *22*(2), 152-166.

Sánchez-Fernández, M., & Borda-Mas, M. (2023). Problematic smartphone use and specific problematic Internet uses among university students and associated predictive factors: a systematic review. *Education and Information Technologies, 28*(6), 7111-7204.

Schermuly, C. C., & Graßmann, C. (2019). A literature review on negative effects of coaching–what we know and what we need to know. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, *12*(1), 39-66.

Taras, V., Baack, D., Caprar, D., Dow, D., Froese, F., Jimenez, A., & Magnusson, P. (2019). Diverse effects of diversity: Disaggregating effects of diversity in global virtual teams. *Journal of International Management, 25*(4), 100689.

Taras, V., Caprar, D. V., Rottig, D., Sarala, R. M., Zakaria, N., Zhao, F., Jiménez, A., Wankel, C., Lei, W. S., & Minor, M. S. (2013). A global classroom? Evaluating the effectiveness of global virtual collaboration as a teaching tool in management education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 12*(3), 414-435.

Taras, V., & Ordeñana, X. (2015). X-Culture: Challenges and best practices of large-scale experiential collaborative projects. *The Palgrave handbook of experiential learning in international business*, 131-148.

Terry, G., Hayfield, N., Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2017). Thematic analysis. *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research in psychology, 2*, 17-37.

Theeboom, T., Beersma, B., & van Vianen, A. E. (2014). Does coaching work? A meta-analysis on the effects of coaching on individual level outcomes in an organizational context. *The journal of positive psychology*, *9*(1), 1-18.

Velez-Calle, A., Mariam, M., Gonzalez-Perez, M. A., Jimenez, A., Eisenberg, J., & Santamaria-Alvarez, S. M. (2020). When technological savviness overcomes cultural differences: millennials in global virtual teams. *Critical perspectives on international business*.

Velinov, E., Bleicher, J., & Forrester, P. L. (2021). Creating and Managing International Virtual Teams of Students in Management Education. In *Developments in Virtual Learning Environments and the Global Workplace* (pp. 124-140). IGI Global.

Vora, D. (2020). Reflections on developing a global leadership course. In *Advances in global leadership*. Emerald Publishing Limited.

Waller, L., Sherratt, S., Culpin, V., & Wilkinson, S. (2017). Developing global leaders in a digital world.

Wright, S., Dean, K. L., & Forray, J. M. (2022). Negative student emotions and educator skill in experiential education: a taxonomy of classroom activities. *Higher Education, 83*(5), 987-1002.

Zwerg-Villegas, A. M., & Martínez-Díaz, J. H. (2016). Experiential learning with global virtual teams: developing intercultural and virtual competencies. *Magis. Revista Internacional de Investigación en Educación, 9*(18), 129-146.

References

Afrianty, T. W., Artatanaya, I. G., & Burgess, J. (2022). Working from home effectiveness during Covid-19: Evidence from university staff in Indonesia. *Asia Pacific Management Review, 27*(1), 50-57. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmrv.2021.05.002

Al-Kumaim, N. H., Alhazmi, A. K., Mohammed, F., Gazem, N. A., Shabbir, M. S., & Fazea, Y. (2021). Exploring the Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on University Students' Learning Life: An Integrated Conceptual Motivational Model for Sustainable and Healthy Online Learning. *Sustainability*, *13*(5), 2546. http://doi.org/10.3390/su13052546

Anderson, L. J., & Berhtram, C. (2022). *Lessons from Teaching and Learning at Stanford During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A review, 2020-21*. Stanford Digital Education. Retrieved from: https://pandemiced.stanford.edu/

Aristovnik, A., Keržič, D., Ravšelj, D., Tomaževič, N., & Umek, L. (2020). Impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on life of higher education students: A global perspective. *Sustainability*, *12*(20), 8438. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12208438

Attree, K. (2021). On-campus students moving online during COVID-19 University closures: Barriers and enablers. "A practice report". *Student Success, 12*(3), 106-112. https://doi.org/10.3316/informit.154368499310505

Bandara, W., Furtmueller, E., Gorbacheva, E., Miskon, S., & Beekhuyzen, J. (2015). Achieving rigor in literature reviews: Insights from qualitative data analysis and tool-support. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems, 37*(1), 8. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.17705/1CAIS.03708

Bartolic, S., Matzat, U., Tai, J., Burgess, J.-L., Boud, D., Craig, H., Archibald, A., De Jaeger, A., Kaplan-Rakowski, R., Lutze-Mann, L., Polly, P., Roth, M., Heap, T., Agapito, J., & Guppy, N. (2022). Student vulnerabilities and confidence in learning in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Studies in Higher Education, 47*(12), 2460-2472. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2022.2081679

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*, 77-101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 11*(4), 589-597. https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806

Chang, H., Ngunjiri, F. W., & Hernandez, K. C. (2013). *Collaborative autoethnography*. Left Coast Press.

Crawford, J., Allen, K.-A., Sanders, T., Baumeister, R., Parker, P., Saunders, C., & Tice, D. (2023). Sense of belonging in higher education students: an Australian longitudinal study from 2013 to 2019. *Studies in Higher Education*, 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2023.2238006

Crawford, N. L., Emery, S. G., Allen, P., & Baird, A. (2022). I probably have a closer relationship with my internet provider: Experiences of belonging (or not) among mature-aged regional and remote university students. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice, 19*(4). https://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol19/iss4/11

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. Sage publications.

Department of Education. (2024). *Australian Universities Accord: Final Report.* https://www.education.gov.au/australian-universities-accord/resources/final-report

Ellis, C. (2007). Telling Secrets, Revealing Lives: Relational Ethics in Research With Intimate Others. *Qualitative Inquiry, 13*(1), 3-29. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800406294947

Fook, J. (2011). Developing Critical Reflection as a Research Method. In: Higgs, J., Titchen, A., Horsfall, D., Bridges, D. (eds) *Creative Spaces for Qualitative Researching. Practice, Education, Work and Society* (5th Ed.). Sense Publishers [Online].

Guppy, N., Matzat, U., Agapito, J., Archibald, A., De Jaeger, A., Heap, T., Moreno, M. M., Rodrigo, M. M., & Bartolic, S. (2022). Student confidence in learning during the COVID-19 pandemic: what helped and what hindered? *Higher Education Research & Development,* 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2022.2119372

Hennink, M., Hutter, I., & Bailey, A. (2020). *Qualitative research methods*. Sage.

Iwu, C. G., Okeke-Uzodike, O. E., Anwana, E., Iwu, C. H., & Esambe, E. E. (2022). Experiences of Academics Working from Home during COVID-19: A Qualitative View from Selected South African Universities. *Challenges, 13*(1), 16. http://doi.org/10.3390/challe13010016

James, T., Bond, J. T., Kumar, K., Tomlins, M., & Toth, G. (2022). We were all learning and doing our best: Investigating how Enabling educators promoted student belonging in a time of significant complexity and unpredictability. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice,* 19(4). https://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol19/iss4/18

Karalis, T., & Raikou, N. (2020). Teaching at the times of COVID-19: Inferences and implications for higher education pedagogy. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 10*(5), 479-493. http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v10-i5/7219

Kift, S. (2009). Articulating a transition pedagogy to scaffold and to enhance the first year student learning experience in Australian higher education: Final report for ALTC senior fellowship program. Australian Learning and Teaching Council.

Lapadat, J. C. (2017). Ethics in Autoethnography and Collaborative Autoethnography. *Qualitative Inquiry, 23*(8), 589-603. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800417704462

Martin, L. (2020). Foundations for Good Practice: The Student Experience of Online Learning in Australian Higher Education during the COVID-19 Pandemic. Australian Government Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency.

Metcalfe, A. S. (2021). Visualizing the COVID-19 pandemic response in Canadian higher education: an extended photo essay. *Studies in Higher Education*, 46(1), 5-18. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1843151

Mezirow, J. (2003). How critical reflection triggers transformative learning. *Adult and Continuing Education: Teaching, learning and research*, *4*, 199-213. https://www.colorado.edu/plc/sites/default/files/attached-files/how_critical_reflection_triggers_transfo.pdf

Moja, T. (2021). National and institutional responses – reimagined operations – pandemic disruptions and academic continuity for a global university. *Studies in Higher Education, 46*(1), 19-29. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1859688

Naidu, S. (2023). In the wake of COVID-19—A time to rethink and reengineer education systems. *Distance Education, 44*(1), 1-5. https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2023.2165432

Osburn, L., Short, M., Gersbach, K., Velander, F., Mungai, N., Moorhead, B., Mlcek, S., Dobud, W., Duncombe, R., & Kalache, L. (2021). Teaching social work skills-based learning online during and post COVID-19. *Social Work Education*, 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2021.2013795

O'Shea, S., Koshy, P., & Drane, C. (2021). The implications of COVID-19 for student equity in Australian higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 43*(6), 576-591. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2021.1933305

Pokhrel, S., & Chhetri, R. (2021). A literature review on impact of COVID-19 pandemic on teaching and learning. *Higher education for the future, 8*(1), 133-141. https://doi.org/10.1177/2347631120983481

Sahi, P. K., Mishra, D., & Singh, T. (2020). Medical Education Amid the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Indian Pediatrics, 57*(7), 652-657. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13312-020-1894-7

Stevens, D. D., Chetty, R., Bertrand Jones, T., Yallew, A., & Butler-Henderson, K. (2021). Doctoral supervision and COVID-19: Autoethnographies from four faculty across three continents. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, *18*(5), 6. https://doi.org/10.53761/1.18.5.6

Stone, C., & O'Shea, S. (2019). Older, online and first: Recommendations for retention and success. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 35*(1). https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.3913

Thompson, N., & Pascal, J. (2012). Developing critically reflective practice, *Reflective Practice, 13*(2), 311-325. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2012.657795

Tice, D., Baumeister, R., Crawford, J., Allen, K.-A., & Percy, A. (2021). Student belongingness in higher education: Lessons for Professors from the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, *18*(4), 8–20. https://doi.org/10.53761/1.18.4.2

van der Merwe, D., & Levigne-Lang, R. (2023). The lessons learnt from emergency remote teaching to strengthen a pre-service teacher education course on lesson design. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice,* 20(3). https://doi.org/10.53761/1.20.3.03

Wallengren Lynch, M., Dominelli, L., & Cuadra, C. (2021). Working and learning from home during COVID-19: International experiences among social work educators and students. *International Social Work, 0*(0), 00208728211051412. https://doi.org/10.1177/00208728211051412

Walters, T., Simkiss, N. J., Snowden, R.J., & Gray, N.S. (2022). Secondary school

students' perception of the online teaching experience during COVID-19: The impact on mental wellbeing and specific learning difficulties. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 92*, 843-860. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12475

Yin, R. K. (2016). *Qualitative Research from Start to Finish* (2nd Ed.). The Guilford Press.