



Contents lists available at [ScienceDirect](#)

# The International Journal of Management Education

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/ijme](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/ijme)



## Dyadic processes in postgraduate education: Insights from MBA student experiences



Linda Ronnie

University of Cape Town, Graduate School of Business, Breakwater Campus, Portswood Road, Green Point, 8001, Cape Town, South Africa

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Keywords:

Dyadic work  
MBA  
Management education  
Reflection

### ABSTRACT

Working productively with others is an expected norm in the work environment today. In the higher education milieu, most of the preparation for this reality is encouraged through group work. This study examines the phenomenon from a student perspective and provides insights into the challenges and learning opportunities embedded within dyadic group work. Postgraduate students enrolled on a management programme at a South African university were required to complete a short reflective paper on a group experience. Content analysis was used to analyse 440 student papers. The results showed four broad themes that included: communication strategies; intended future behaviours; fit, synergy, and learning; and issues of conflict. Collaboration and cooperation are sought-after graduate skills and academy's role must be to engender these competencies as part of higher education's contribution to developing individuals who can work effectively with others in the 21st century workplace.

### 1. Introduction

Institutions of higher learning have a responsibility to prepare students for the modern workplace where there is an expectation that graduates have developed the ability to collaborate with others (Hancock et al., 2009; Yorke & Knight, 2004). Thus, high-quality relationships have become increasingly important within dynamic and ever-changing organisational environments (Grant & Hofmann, 2011). Furthermore, the ability to relate to a wide range of people and make a contribution to the team are considered essential graduate attributes in South Africa (Griesel & Parker, 2009). Certainly the goal of a business school, beyond the academic prospect, is to develop professionals capable of consistent and productive interaction with others (Jackson & Chapman, 2012; Krass & Ovchinnikov, 2006).

Group work in its variety of forms has been defined as a pedagogic strategy where students work together without direct lecturer interaction or supervision towards a common objective (Killian, 2003). While various terms have been used to describe the practice of group work including cooperative learning and collaborative learning (Drake, Goldsmith, & Strachan, 2006) the process remains understood as one where students work together to achieve a common goal. Given that dyadic relationships are the central building blocks of organisations through daily interactions between people at work (Liden, Anand, & Vidarthi, 2016), many existing management education programmes include some variation of group work. Collaboration with peers is thus considered an essential form of learning (Summers, Bergin, & Cole, 2009).

While anecdotal evidence from both faculty and students indicates varying degrees of success with group work, there is a paucity of research in this domain in South Africa. Furthermore, while garnering some attention worldwide, research around dyadic relationships – those interactions occurring between two individuals (Joshi & Knight, 2015) – is still relatively undeveloped within the academic sphere. This qualitative paper explores the experiences of postgraduate students who worked in dyads for a Master in

E-mail address: [linda.ronnie@gsb.uct.ac.za](mailto:linda.ronnie@gsb.uct.ac.za).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2017.09.002>

Received 11 December 2016; Received in revised form 15 August 2017; Accepted 26 September 2017  
1472-8117/ © 2017 Published by Elsevier Ltd.

Business Administration work-based project. The study presents the findings drawn from 440 student reflective papers. Through the submission of a short assignment detailing their learning and insights, students individually reflected on their six weeks of working with a randomly allocated partner. The study explored whether dyadic group work detracted from or enhanced individual learning.

## 2. Literature review

### 2.1. Dyadic relationships

While group work is generally thought to consist of three or more individuals, dyadic relationships involve person-to-person activities. These relationships are pervasive in organisational settings and occur in several ways, such as leader-member, teammate-teammate and co-worker interactions (Liden et al., 2016). There are three key aspects to relationships in dyads that are pertinent to this study: interdependence, reciprocity, and exchange. Other contributory elements to the dyadic relationship include person perception – where first impressions are made and trust is established – and relationship development – the development of shared values and attitudes and role definition. Dyadic relationship efficacy is said to occur when both parties in the relationship attribute their peer's behaviour and intentions as authentic in terms of mutual benefit (Dasborough & Ashkanasy, 2002). This authenticity ensures that peers respond with a reciprocity of effort.

High interdependence of the task – such as a paired assignment set for students – requires sharing and exchange of critical information, resources, and skills to achieve the objective (Courtright, Thurgood, Stewart, & Pierotti, 2015). In an earlier study, Watanabe and Swain (2007) showed that there are several forms of peer-peer interaction such as collaborative, dominant/passive, expert/passive, and expert/novice. Regardless of pattern of interaction, the implicit expectation of a dyadic relationship is that peers depend on one another. Within an academic setting that draws on dyadic pedagogy, it may therefore be useful for the academics to scaffold the peer process and provide related support.

### 2.2. Benefits and potential rewards of working with others

Although studies have found evidence to the contrary (Bacon, 2005), the obvious benefits to working with others are that students are actively engaged in the process of learning (Freiberg & Driscoll, 2005) and that this process facilitates individual learning (Borredon, Deffayet, Baker, & Kolb, 2011; Olivera & Straus, 2004). An early meta-analysis revealed that, compared to settings that do not utilise any form of group-based methodologies, collaboration among students improved learning (Lou, Abrami, & D'Apollonia, 2001). The transfer of skills and knowledge between individuals is possible as students can build on each other's ideas. One way this occurs is through engagement in collaborative dialogue. This has been described by Swain (2006) as a process whereby students engage in joint problem-solving and build and shape knowledge through language. In this practice, students learn to create 'new' knowledge. When this method is effective, collaboration can improve understanding and develop higher order thinking (Litecky, 1992). The process can also assist students – especially individuals engaged in interactions with another – in developing critical social and emotional skills through dealing with possible interpersonal issues in a constructive manner (Jacques, 2000).

### 2.3. Challenges of working with others

In dyads, performance does not solely depend on individual skills, knowledge, and attributes. Relationship quality, communication, and personality differences between two independent individuals have the potential to affect output (Eberly, Holey, Johnson, & Mitchell, 2017). While responses to group work in educational contexts have mostly been encouraging (Elola & Oskoz, 2010; Shehadeh, 2011; Storch, 2005), several dynamics influence the process of working with other individuals and can result in negative attitudes. These issues include dysfunctional member behaviours (Cole, Walter, & Bruch, 2008); peers disliking each other (Sampson & Cohen, 2001); and social loafing, or free-riding. These aspects have been found to reduce the enjoyment of working with others (Hall & Buzwell, 2013; Simms & Nichols, 2014). A lack of coordination by team members may also cause ineffective functioning (Lu, Yuan, & McLeod, 2012). Within dyads, the inability to hold and cultivate open lines of communication and interaction can derail peer efficacy (Bornay-Barrachina & Herrero, 2017). These kinds of difficulties – if allowed to occur and to remain un-addressed – may negatively affect the capacity of students to learn from each other and their experiences and thus diminish the purpose and performance of dyadic relationships (Ren & Gray, 2009; Rusbult, Hannon, Stocker, & Finkel, 2005).

## 3. Methodology

The participants of the study were postgraduate students enrolled at a South African university. All students were pursuing a Master in Business Administration degree at the time of the research project. A collaborative task was designed to allow students to gain experience in conducting a small-scale research project at a company. At the start of the course students were randomly chosen to work together in pairs on the project. The dyads were expected to remain involved throughout the process, from deciding on the topic focus to delivering the final written project. In-person and online academic support was offered to the dyads during the task. After the submission of the project, students were required to reflect on the experience of working with others. A short one-page reflective assignment – completed individually – was an assessed component of the course and students were encouraged to be forthcoming and authentic about their interpersonal interactions during the length of the project. In terms of ethical considerations, all student submissions had numbers randomly assigned to ensure confidentiality of responses. These numbers and associated

**Table 1**  
Frequency of key themes.

	Theme 1 Communication strategies	Theme 2 Intended future behaviours	Theme 3 Fit, synergy, and learning	Theme 4 Conflict management
Cohort 1	65	44	23	12
Cohort 2	51	38	18	13
Cohort 3	70	39	26	15
Cohort 4	72	43	19	7
Cohort 5	68	50	37	19
Cohort 6	65	41	16	16
Cohort 7	64	49	23	9
n = 1012	455 (45%)	304 (30%)	162 (16%)	91 (9%)

pseudonyms have been used in the illustrative extracts shown in the findings. In addition, all students in the sample gave permission for the researcher to use the data for research and publication purposes. The respective university also granted ethical clearance for the study.

### 3.1. Data analysis

Qualitative data for this study were drawn in multiple phases from seven cohorts over three and a half years. A total of 498 individual written submissions on the experience of working on the group task were received. Fifty eight of these were excluded on the basis that students did not mention their interpersonal interactions in their reflections. Content analysis was chosen as the most suitable technique for analysis. Some of the benefits of using this analytic method are that it allows the study of a large number of documents over time, avoids any analyst effect as the assignments have already been written, and does so in a systematic and replicable manner (Babbie, 2013; Bryman & Bell, 2011). Although both forms of content analysis were utilised, a predominantly qualitative approach through latent coding was undertaken. Two independent raters received training in coding the data, based on the categories that had emerged during the interpretative pilot analysis phase. Each of the categories, as advised by Flick (2015), was mutually exclusive, based on discrete dimensions, and independent of the other.

As consistency amongst raters is essential for reliability (Bryman & Bell, 2011), particular consideration was taken with this aspect. Where a difference of opinion arose between the three analysts, the data were examined again and consensus reached on the appropriate category or, in some instances, a further category was introduced. Although eight categories were originally developed, these were consolidated into four main themes. The manifest content of the materials was also coded. Thus the frequency of each of the key themes was counted per individual dataset resulting in a total of 1012 entries due to multiple comments by each individual student. Through this counting process, it was possible to establish the numeric frequency of the key themes as seen in Table 1.

In the next section, reporting of the findings is structured around the major themes noted above.

## 4. Findings

### 4.1. Communication strategies

As the cornerstone of dyadic work is effective communication, it was unsurprising that this was the most cited theme. Forty five percent of students discussed how initial meetings set the ground rules and clarified roles and expectations. The planning stages of the project were essential in creating a conducive working partnership. This initial exchange set the parameters for the assignment workflow as seen in the extracts below:

The first conversation we had as a newly formed team was not about the content of the assignment, but rather what our overall goals and expectations were. This proved to be vital to our success. Not only did this eliminate potential conflict down the line, but it also allowed us to be more efficient with our work effort (respondent 310)

Even under the time constraints that we experienced, we were able to keep our heads cool and still sit back and plan our assignment before jumping into the details. It is often too easy to feel pressured. This planning I believed paid off and saved us a lot of time on rework and alignment (respondent 620)

Fortunately, we both appreciate the value of planning before initiating the writing process. Thus, the process was relatively easy and our meetings were well-structured and goal-directed (respondent 122)

From the beginning we were clear about our expectations and we managed to distribute the work in a fair and equitable manner (respondent 486)

From the time we knew we were going to be on a team together, Pete and I both made an effort to get to know one another and understand a bit more about our respective lives. I've learnt I respond best to this kind of open engagement, and that having clear roles is important to me (respondent 204)

I discovered that paired assignments work very well when we define responsibilities, deliverables and timelines right from the start. We successfully implemented this and we managed to harness our collaborative efforts effectively (respondent 529)

The key experiences which helped me included communication, with listening being absolutely vital (something which has been a development need for me in the past); being honest about my strength and weaknesses and thereby agreeing a plan which aligned with each of our strengths (respondent 736)

Where the dyad had limited communication or little initial clarification of roles, the students experienced some challenges such as misaligned expectations of each other, miscommunication, delays, and uneven workload distribution. These drawbacks were illustrated in the following quotes:

While we agreed on a topic very quickly, unfortunately, we didn't write down exactly how/what we were going to do. So we ended up working tangentially for a while before we defined exactly what it was that we were doing (respondent 123)

Initially I struggled a lot with my partner. It was difficult to work with someone who did not want to meet and discuss our assignment. It also frustrated me when he did not arrive for scheduled meetings. This made it difficult to get any sort of momentum with our work and it also put a strain on our working relationship (respondent 561)

I didn't feel like my partner and I were on the same page in terms of our communication style, work flow process (getting things done early and not leaving to the last minute), and overall sense of urgency. I felt like I had to be the driver and since I assumed that role early, I felt like my partner was fine letting me be the leader so it ended up putting pressure on me (respondent 156)

These extracts show a range of possible collaborative strategies within various dyadic interactions. Poor coordination between pairs clearly impacts effect functioning. Planning, role clarity and discussion of decision-making steps are key components to working successfully with others. There are many different effective ways of communication and it is imperative for peers to identify the best method as it aids in clarifying many misconceptions and misunderstandings that are likely to affect dyadic efficacy.

#### 4.2. *Intended future behaviours*

Almost a third (30%) of students could reflect a level of insight into how their future relational behaviours might require adjustment in similar situations. Comments centred on personal characteristics, the value of open communication, and knowledge sharing.

This has been a very big learning curve for me because it has identified that I need to be a lot more persuasive, committed and determined in my points of view. I need to be more assertive with my beliefs. This is certainly an area where I can improve in working with others (respondent 557)

I have learnt that as a leader, I need to be able to work with people or a team in solving problems. I learnt that timeous communication is very key when working with someone (respondent 324)

Things I will do differently next time: Entering into new partnerships and collaborations with a positive and open-minded attitude. By doing so, I do not waste energy on being apprehensive and thinking about what could go wrong but rather using my energy effectively to build a positive relationship with future opportunity in mind. Part of this is being more confident in my own abilities (respondent 217)

I'm always happy to help out, and did offer to do so many times in this assignment. Maybe my offerings of help do not come across in the most sincere manner, resulting in [the person] choosing not to take up the offer, despite them wanting to. I truly had never thought of this before, but it has definitely given me food for thought (respondent 118)

Working with my new partner was much closer to working with someone "in the real world". We didn't know each other and our different cultures very well; we didn't know each other's strengths and weaknesses, and we worked under pressure. For the next time I attempt a similar project, I will include time in our schedule to talk about each other's preferences, strengths and weaknesses as I have found the value of it through this report (respondent 640)

As is apparent in these extracts, postgraduate students in the study exhibited a genuine desire to improve their interpersonal behaviours and their individual practices. Importantly, the examination of and reflection on their peer relationship allowed students to link their academic experience to their work roles. Individuals developed an insight into the role they played in ensuring conducive interpersonal relationships and how these might be improved in future.

#### 4.3. *Fit, synergy, and learning*

Compatibility between peers appeared to play an essential role in the perceived success of the project. Students noted their surprise at their own collaborative zeal for the project. Where students were also open to learning from others, the results appeared promising on both personal and academic levels.

It was a great experience for me to work with my classmate to do this report. It gave me an opportunity to share my ideas as well as learning to accept their ideas. There is a lot of understanding and compromise that that happens and this makes a great

experience of personal development (respondent 608)

A preconceived idea of mine was that by working on an assignment with someone else, I wouldn't be able to sustain the level of academic achievement I was accustomed to. In contrast to my initial thoughts, the most enjoyable part of the assignment was working with my pair. Not only did it open my eyes to a different way of seeing things, but I gained a friend in the process (respondent 325)

I learnt a lot from her patience, attention to detail and diligence through the process. I'm a very fiery person who likes to get to the point and get on with it. I've learnt a lot about my patience threshold and also about accepting the level of detail my partner wishes to discuss, which previously I would have swiftly moved along from (respondent 241)

I found working with [her] very stress-free. She and I have the same manner of working. We are both relaxed, but passionate about our work. We worked fluently and effectively together. The pressure is always more when working with a partner, due to the fact that your work is a reflection on you and your partner. There is also a level of trust needed between partners; otherwise there would not be an effective relationship (respondent 133).

Managing a relationship requires active participation – one needs to connect, engage and maintain a level of respect about the opposite person, while keeping up your own end of the deal. I learnt some good habits to adopt. I was amazed at my partner's working style and realised the value of technological efficiency. He had a very cool approach to every aspect of the task, always provided insightful thoughts and then submitted interesting thoughts on paper as well. This provided a further opportunity for me to learn (respondent 717).

My assignment partner brought a different dynamic to the process, in her ways of working, thinking, problem solving and general personality. Working with someone so different to me meant that we had different strengths which could be leveraged at different points in the process. We often worked together to make difficult, time consuming tasks easier. Working with diverse people brings added efficiency to the process as people generally do the things they are good at (respondent 440)

These extracts show that where fit between the partners' work styles and values was achieved, both synergy and learning were likely outcomes. In addition, the findings highlight how differences between group members can be leveraged to produce a more promising outcome and can also result in the emergence of new individual perspectives.

#### 4.4. Managing conflict

Interpersonal and negotiation skills were put to the test during the paired project and sometimes found wanting when dealing with different work ethic, approaches, views, and learning styles. Students reported growing levels of frustration and described how relationships suffered.

I have a very particular working style; I look ahead, and set deadlines for certain tasks in my calendar, build in scope for unforeseen problems, and then stick to it. Whilst my partner was in agreement with this, he seemed unable to stick to the timelines. On the whole, I found it not only disappointing at times, but also somewhat disrespectful (respondent 485)

Working with new people is always challenging. I felt that our group dynamic started well but due to other commitments, I was not able to keep to the strict schedule we had set. I was also unpleasantly surprised to see that all my work had been rewritten without consulting me. I feel that it is not worth fighting about and that petty things like this should not bother me; however, it does (respondent 735)

I will admit that I am thoroughly dissatisfied with experience of working with him, but it is not the quality of work that I am dissatisfied with; it is the quality of his character (respondent 146)

Yet, conflict or disagreement amongst peers might not always be a negative component of dyad work. Indeed, as several respondents commented:

My new partner turned out to be resourceful and action oriented, with an approach akin to my own. Similarities in working style made the process easy and without conflict, yet having a partner that would approach things differently could have also been of great benefit, as our strengths would be highlighted on different parts of the project separately (respondent 426)

I was lucky (and unlucky) to be paired with someone whom I share a very similar analytical approach to work, this allowed for the project to flow extremely smoothly. In new working relationships, I tend to avoid conflicts and try to be accommodating in the agreed approach. While this helps facilitate the progress of projects, it also tends to result in new styles and ideas being overlooked in the preference of the utilisation of more familiar approaches (respondent 552)

We both have calm personalities which allowed us to work very well together. There were a number of occasions where we had conflicting ideas on how to approach certain sections but we managed to compromise in the end. The resolution of the conflicts in our thinking resulted in a more refined report in my opinion (respondent 321)

Although only 9% of the sample highlighted this aspect of group work, disagreement between members in dyads has both its disadvantages and advantages. This shows that while conflict may impact collaboration, use of small group work – even in dyadic form – as a pedagogical strategy remains a sound approach.

## 5. Discussion and conclusion

The underlying question this study sought to answer was: does dyadic group work enhance or detract from individual learning? Although Bacon's (2005) research showed a negative impact of a group assignment on learning, the findings of this study revealed high levels of functionality. Where pairs appeared to be productive, the results indicated that this was due to early conversations around ground rules, having trust in the other's ability to deliver on time, and maintaining good, ongoing working relationships. Where members had complementary styles or similar values, the dyadic processes were reported as cooperative and effective. Key elements of interdependence, reciprocity, and exchange underpinning dyadic relationships as highlighted by Liden et al. (2016) are seen here. Although possibly not directly attributable to dyad interaction, 30% of the students could reflect on their own behaviours in the paired process and expressed a desire to improve specific aspects.

The challenges faced by the postgraduate student sample stemmed predominantly from interpersonal conflicts, varying work styles, and limited or inadequate communication. This indicated that the dyadic process was by no means devoid of disadvantages. Although the students in this study were familiar with one another as they had previously worked together in their class cohorts, not all of them could be expected to work together when paired together given the various possible patterns of dyadic relationships (Watanabe & Swain, 2007). Students did not have the opportunity or power to change their partners and merely had to adjust to each other's idiosyncrasies and focus on the demands of the task. While Courtright et al. (2015) argued that task interdependence ensured dyadic cohesion, this was insufficient in some instances where communication, the relationship itself, and personality alignment exerted a more meaningful impact (Eberly et al., 2017). Despite a meta-analysis that suggested a negative relationship between relationship conflict and team performance (De Dreu & Weingart, 2003), several postgraduate students expressed the view that a lack of disagreement had the potential to inhibit the pair's performance.

If students in the sample share commonalities with other postgraduate or management students, then several implications exist for the working environment. Specifically, common work ethic, planning, communication, and organisation strategies appear key factors in ensuring the successful outcome of a dyadic task rather than focussing on matching through surface similarities (Liden et al., 2016). Furthermore, disagreement between members in a pair should not necessarily be discouraged as these perceived 'conflicts' may have the potential to produce new ideas. A peer relationship that is too contented may also impede learning. This is a significant pedagogical insight. While a turbulent relationship could lead to a lack of cohesion, fragmented ideas and plans, and a lack of agreement on how to progress the project, a comfortable relationship, where peers are in agreement about everything, has the potential to inhibit innovation or result in a lack of challenge to the other about how the project could be done or approached differently. Managers of teams should therefore not shy away from pairing dissimilar individuals with one another on a project as productivity and innovation could be enhanced through these differences.

Criticisms have been levelled against business schools for not preparing postgraduate students adequately for current and future realities in the workplace (Datar, Garvin, & Cullen, 2011; Navarro, 2008). The findings of this study suggest that MBA students have the ability to both function well in dyadic tasks and are also able to reflect and adjust their own behaviours in the process. This bodes well for productivity in South Africa as managing dyadic work relationships is the fundamental element of interpersonal interactions in the workplace (Liden et al., 2016).

From this study, it is clear that the learning students gain from working in pre-allocated pairs is an important part of their overall learning and development, feeding into their development as employable graduates. Encouraging them to reflect on their experiences enables them to understand their own strengths and weaknesses of working with others. This approach could be replicated across other undergraduate and postgraduate programmes as part of the overall student learning experience and preparation for employment.

## 6. Limitations and future research

Due to the exploratory nature of the study, there were three main limitations. Firstly, students were requested to complete a reflective task on a single collaborative assignment and therefore the findings cannot be generalised. Similarly, the data were limited to a business school at a single university and these findings may not be representative of other postgraduate students. A final limitation concerns the process. Dyadic relationships are not without their challenges. Students cannot be expected to instinctively know how to work with others and educators will need to ensure not only the provision of support for students through these kinds of pedagogic experiences but that their curricula devote sufficient attention to enhancing students' collaborative competencies. Future studies could explore the group process phenomenon across a variety of group tasks across postgraduate programmes. A further avenue for research might be to conduct a comparative analysis where each person's experience of the paired process is contrasted with their partner. A study of this nature will provide a more nuanced understanding of dyadic pedagogy.

## References

- Babbie, E. (2013). *The practice of social research*. Canada: Cengage Learning.
- Bacon, D. R. (2005). The effect of group projects on content-related learning. *Journal of Management Education*, 29(2), 248–267.
- Bornay-Barrachina, M., & Herrero, I. (2017). Team creative environment as a mediator between CWX and R&D team performance and moderating boundary conditions. *Journal of Business Psychology*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10869-017-9495-8>.
- Borredon, L., Deffayet, S., Baker, A. C., & Kolb, D. (2011). Enhancing deep learning: Lessons from the introduction of learning team in management education in France. *Journal of Management Education*, 35(3), 324–350.
- Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2011). *Business research methods*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Cole, M. S., Walter, F., & Bruch, H. (2008). The affective mechanisms linking dysfunctional behavior to performance in work teams: A moderated mediation study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(5), 945–958.
- Courtright, S. H., Thurgood, G. R., Stewart, G. L., & Pierotti, A. J. (2015). Structural interdependence in teams: An integrative framework and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*(6), 1825–1846.
- Dasborough, M. T., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2002). Emotion and attribution of intentionality in leader– member relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly, 13*(5), 615–634.
- Datar, S. M., Garvin, D. A., & Cullen, P. G. (2011). Rethinking the MBA: Business education at a crossroads. *Journal of Management Development, 30*(5), 451–462.
- De Dreu, C., & Weingart, L. (2003). Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(4), 741–749.
- Drake, R., Goldsmith, G., & Strachan, R. (2006). A novel approach to teaching teamwork. *Teaching in Higher Education, 11*(1), 33–46.
- Eberly, M. B., Holey, E. C., Johnson, M. D., & Mitchell, T. R. (2017). It's not me, it's not you, it's us! An empirical examination of relational attributions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102*(5), 711–731.
- Elola, I., & Oskoz, A. (2010). Collaborative writing: Fostering foreign language and writing conventions development. *Language Learning and Technology, 14*(3), 51–71.
- Flick, U. (2015). *Introducing research methodology: A beginner's guide to doing a research project* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Freiberg, H. J., & Driscoll, A. (2005). *Universal teaching strategies*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Grant, A. M., & Hofmann, D. A. (2011). Role expansion as a persuasion process: The interpersonal influence dynamics of role redefinition. *Organizational Psychology Review, 1*(1), 9–31.
- Griesel, H., & Parker, B. (2009). *Graduate attributes: A baseline study on South African graduates from the perspective of employers*. Pretoria: Higher Education South Africa and the South African Qualifications Authority.
- Hall, D., & Buzwell, S. (2013). The problem of free-riding in group projects: Looking beyond social loafing as reason for non-contribution. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 14*(1), 37–49.
- Hancock, P., Howieson, B., Kavanagh, M., Kent, J., Tempone, I., & Segal, N. (2009). *Accounting for the future: More than numbers*. Strawberry Hills, NSW: ALTC.
- Jackson, D., & Chapman, E. (2012). Non-technical competencies in undergraduate business degree programmes: Australian and UK perspectives. *Studies in Higher Education, 37*(5), 541–567.
- Jacques, D. (2000). *Learning in groups: A handbook for improving group working*. London: Kogan Page.
- Joshi, A., & Knight, A. P. (2015). Who defers to whom and why? Dual pathways linking demographic differences and dyadic deference to team effectiveness. *Academy of Management Journal, 58*(1), 59–84.
- Killian, R. (2003). *Effective teaching strategies: Discussion, cooperative learning, role play, problem solving*. Tuggerah, NSW, Australia: Social Sciences Press.
- Krass, D., & Ovchinnikov, A. (2006). The university of Toronto's Rotman school of management uses management science to create MBA study groups. *Interfaces, 36*(2), 126–137.
- Liden, R. C., Anand, S., & Vidarthi, P. (2016). Dyadic relationships. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 3*, 139–166.
- Litecky, L. (1992). Great teaching, great learning: Classroom climate, innovative methods and critical thinking. In C. A. Barnes (Ed.). *Critical thinking: Educational imperative* (pp. 83–90). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Lou, Y., Abrami, P. C., & D'Apollonia, S. (2001). Small group and individual learning with technology: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 71*(3), 449–521.
- Lu, L., Yuan, C., & McLeod, L. (2012). Twenty-five years of hidden profiles in group decision making: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 16*(1), 54–75.
- Navarro, P. (2008). The MBA core curricula of top-ranked U.S. Business schools: A study in failure? *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 7*(1), 108–123.
- Olivera, F., & Straus, S. G. (2004). Group-to-individual transfer of learning: Cognitive and social factors. *Small Group Research, 35*(4), 440–465.
- Ren, H., & Gray, B. (2009). Repairing relationship conflict: How violation types and culture influence the effectiveness of restoration rituals. *Academy of Management Review, 34*(1), 105–126.
- Rusbult, C. E., Hannon, P. A., Stocker, S. L., & Finkel, E. J. (2005). Forgiveness and relationship repair. In E. L. Worthington, Jr. (Ed.). *Handbook of forgiveness* (pp. 185–206). New York, NY: Brunner-Routledge.
- Sampson, J., & Cohen, R. (2001). Designing peer learning. In D. Boud, R. Cohen, & J. Sampson (Eds.). *Peer learning in higher education: Learning from and with each other* (pp. 21–34). London: Kogan Page.
- Shehadeh, A. (2011). Effects and student perceptions of collaborative writing in L2. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 20*(4), 286–305.
- Simms, A., & Nichols, T. (2014). Social loafing: A review of the literature. *Journal of Management Policy and Practice, 15*(1), 58–67.
- Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*(3), 153–173.
- Summers, J. J., Bergin, D. A., & Cole, J. S. (2009). Examining the relationship among collaborative learning, autonomy support and student incivility in undergraduate classrooms. *Learning and Individual Differences, 19*(2), 293–298.
- Swain, M. (2006). Linguaging, agency and collaboration in advanced language proficiency. In H. Byrnes (Ed.). *Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 95–108). London: Continuum.
- Watanabe, Y., & Swain, M. (2007). Effects of proficiency differences and patterns of pair interaction on second language learning: Collaborative dialogue between adult ESL learners. *Language Teaching Research, 11*(2), 121–142.
- Yorke, M., & Knight, P. (2004). *Embedding employability into the curriculum*. York, England: Higher Education Academy.