

Mass customisation of education and self-reflective frameworks: Early development in New Zealand.

Dr John Clayton

Waikato Institute of Technology

Abstract

Education has long been regarded as the foundation stone of national growth and international competitiveness. In the last three decades national educational reforms to improve access to higher education qualifications, individual higher education institutional aggressive national and international marketing initiatives and improved information and communication technology (ICT) systems and infrastructure has resulted in greatly increased participation in tertiary education. As a consequence, tertiary educators are now engaging with increased numbers of culturally and economically diverse learners in distributed ICT environments they are unfamiliar with. There is an unstated expectation these educators will be able to design learning modules to meet multi-cultural student needs, in a range of contexts, with no additional resources. In essence, it is anticipated learners will participate in individually customised learning events at a cost similar to traditional delivery. This requires a fundamental shift in educators and learners conceptions on the provision of education. The competing notions of resource intensive individualised learning and the benefits of economies of scale derived from mass delivery need to be balanced. The challenge for tertiary providers is to acquire the agility and flexibility to mass customise their educational offerings, in high volumes, at a reasonable cost. Institutions are meeting this challenge by pre-designing standardised learning modules for high volume consumption, while achieving customisation through learner-specific arrangement of these modules. This paper will explore “mass customisation” and the key building blocks required for mass customisation to occur. It will illustrate how this concept is being tentatively explored at a New Zealand institution.

1. Context

Driven by fiscal restraints and the need to remain globally competitive and internationally relevant in an increasingly networked world, national governments and individual institutions have introduced a number of educational reforms (Wilson, 2011; Ministry of Education, 2010). In general these initiatives have focused on firstly, improving performance and efficiency ensuring more learners, national and international, from a broader ethnic, cultural, economic and educational background can complete higher qualifications at an affordable or competitive cost (Clayton, 2011). Secondly, increasing the organisational integration of e-learning systems and Information and Communication Technology (ICT) applications for administrative purposes and teaching and learning enabling institutions to deliver educational activities to distributed sites nationally and internationally (Martinez, 2011; Ministry of Education, 2004). As a consequence of these changes educational institutions have broadened entry criteria and aggressively marketed course offerings both within their own countries and externally (Barboza, 2011). This has resulted in greatly increased enrolments from both domestic and international markets. Educators are now engaged with increased numbers of culturally diverse learners in environments that often discourage group and/or individual personal tuition. Learners and educators also need to acquire ICT skills and master software applications they were previously unfamiliar with. In essence, the introduction of these reforms has seen a fundamental shift in the role of educators and learners and their conceptions on the provision of educational courses (Clayton, 2011a). Educators are required to balance the competing notions of individualised learning and mass delivery to increasingly large, distributed, groups. They are challenged to mass customise their courses. This paper will explore “mass customisation” and the role of e-learning in personalising the learning space. It will then discuss the key building blocks required for mass

customisation to occur and finally illustrate how this concept is being tentatively explored at a New Zealand institution.

2. Mass Customisation an Overview

For the last two decades the limitations of traditional high-volume manufacturing practices have been exposed. The two bedrocks of this process-led mass production model, efficient pricing and product quality, providing firms with a competitive advantage, are being eroded. Rapid development of product, expanded product choice, limited shelf-life and increasing consumer demand for individualised goods and services and responsive delivery systems have seen a fundamental shift in behaviour. Firms are increasingly adopting customer centric operational practices such as mass customisation (McIntosh, Matthews, Mullineux, & Medland, 2010). Whilst it has been argued it is difficult to provide an all-encompassing definition of mass customisation there is common agreement it is a customer-initiated process to which providers respond (Turner, 2009). Under the production philosophy of mass customisation goods and services are produced to meet an individual customer's requirements with mass production efficiency. In essence consumers consume a service or product customised to their own specifications at a cost similar to pre-made, "off-the-shelf", generic products or services (Cross, Seidel, Seidel, & Shahbazpour, 2009; Xia, & Wang, 2010). The challenge for producers is to acquire the agility and flexibility to customise products and/or services of excellent quality, in high volumes at a reasonable cost. Firms are meeting this challenge by pre-fabricating standardised components in high-volume while achieving customisation through customer-specific assembly and/or arrangement of these components (Xia, & Wang, 2010; Verdouw, Beulens, Trienekens, & Verwaart, 2010). In this approach, where the final product and/or service is assembled from an existing inventory of standardised components, there is an assumption sufficient components with the right functionality are readily available to be rapidly configured to meet consumer demand (Verdouw, Beulens, Trienekens, & Verwaart, 2010). This particular mass customisation approach requires a robust and reliable, yet constrained, communication and design platform on which the customer can configure, and reconfigure, the product or service required until they are satisfied with the final outcome. This is normally accomplished by using information technology facilitated configurators that are personal and user friendly (Cross, Seidel, Seidel, & Shahbazpour, 2009). In mass customisation the service to the client, not the creation of the product, becomes the focus of the production process.

2.1 Mass Customisation in Education: The Role of e-Learning

In a traditional classroom environment learners are bound by time, place and pace. Learning activities are scheduled to occur in a specified room and a educator systematically guides learners to achieve stated objectives through a variety of teaching methods and learning events (Syed-Khuzzan, & Goulding., 2009). E-Learning environments are not as constrained as these traditional environments. Learners have more choice in the time they learn and the place the learning will occur. While instructors have carefully structured digital content and designed e-learning events to achieve identified objectives, the ultimate responsibility of achieving those outcomes is transferred from the instructor to the learner. In these more personalised environments learners need to be more self-motivated and self-directed (Clayton, 2009). Advances in information and communication technologies and digital databases have encouraged educators to further personalise these learning environments and apply increasingly sophisticated communication technologies and databases in the design of intelligent tutoring and testing systems. In these systems learner progression can be controlled and, if required, review and remediation interventions can be organised. The data-collected during these training sessions can be used to identify future training requirements. (Hwang, Tseng, & Hwang, 2008; Peter, Bacon, & Dastbaz, 2010). A technical example of this automation of learning is the European learning grid infrastructure (ELeGI) approach to formal learning. The ELeGI approach is based upon personalised knowledge construction using experiential based and collaborative learning approaches situated in a personalised networked environment. Formal learning experiences are based on the automatic generation a unit of learning (UoL) that dynamically adapts the learning process based upon the participants behaviour within the environment (Gaeta, Gaeta, & Ritrovato, 2009). An educationally focused example is the construction of a personalised learning environment

(PLE) prototype for the construction industry in the United Kingdom. The prototype is based on the assumptions that learners have different levels of motivation, different attitudes about teaching, different approaches to learning, and will react differently to specific learning environments or instructional practices. By using a diagnostic questionnaire, a in-depth understanding of instructional design theories and pedagogical approaches a learning environment meeting the learning styles of individual participants is created (Syed-Khuzzan & Goulding, 2009; Syed-Khuzzan, Goulding, & Underwood, 2008). In essence e-learning provides the platforms to customise learning for the individual.

2.2 A Model for Mass Customised e-Learning Environments

The design of personalised e-learning environments, involving multiple stake holders with multiple points of view of learning, is a complex task. These environments need to respond to three divergent schools of thought, behaviorist, cognitive, constructivist (Peter, Bacon, & Dastbaz, 2010). Behaviorists' argue learning occurs as a response to stimuli. Positive stimuli will result in learners repeating behavior; negative stimuli will discourage a repeat of the behavior. Cognitivists argue learning is a process. To fully engage learners we need to understand individuals learning style and match teaching methods and content to this style. Constructivists argue learning is constructed through reflection and interaction. To constructivists learning occurs as individual reflect on their current knowledge and interact with the physical and social environment created for learning (Learning Theories Knowledgebase, 2011). Therefore, any e-environment platform implemented needs to be agile. Agility means the infrastructure created is sufficiently flexible to be quickly adapted meet the technical requirements and teaching and learning approaches of all schools of thought (Syed-Khuzzan & Goulding, 2009). In the literature there appears to be general agreement the development these agile platforms are based on three fundamental building blocks (Syed-Khuzzan, Goulding, & Underwood, 2008; Gaeta, Gaeta, & Ritrovato, 2009; Hwang, Tseng, & Hwang, 2008).

1. Firstly, the learner interacts with the environment through an intuitive user interface. The interface is interactive and obtains from the learner background information on current capabilities, learning style preferences and identifies user requirements.
2. Secondly, the structured data gathered in step one interacts with distinct databases, such as learner profile, teaching approach, knowledge repository and assessment rubrics) to create personalised learning plans (PLP) designed to meet the students learning style preference and identified requirements.
3. The PLP is delivered, at the appropriate level; to the learner in an environment they are comfortable and competent in.

A schematic diagram of this process is illustrated in Figure 1 below




Figure 1: Conceptual overview of constructing personalised e-learning environments.

3. Building Blocks of Mass Customisation in Education

The concept of self-reflection (the conscious act of purposefully thinking about activities undertaken) has been widely debated in educational circles for a number of decades (Kreber, 2004; Korthagen, & Vasalos 2005). To advocates of reflective practice, deep learning is dependent on individuals making meaning from their experiences through the process of reflection (Brockbank & McGill, 2007). The outcomes of the reflective process help individuals firstly, highlight the strengths of their current skill and knowledge and, secondly, identify areas where undertaking educational activities or training would facilitate increased capability. It is argued this on-going reflection helps individuals iteratively build their capability and capacity (Clayton et al, 2009; Carlson, & Parry 2003; Sugerma et al, 2000). In essence, reflection creates individualised learning environments that are on-going (sustained), connected to their needs (situated) and focused on individually generated tasks (authentic).

3.1 Self-Reflective Frameworks

A fundamental criterion for the success of reflection is the ability of the individual to make the appropriate connections between their existing skills, knowledge and experience and industry expected skill, knowledge and behaviours. If the learner has limited workplace experience, or limited exposure to other colleagues, their capacity to make informed judgements on their current competencies will be limited (Clayton, 2011). To address this barrier, to engage participants in the self-reflective process and to aid them in making connections between their previous experiences and professional practices, self-reflective frameworks, based on acceptable standards and detailed in assessment rubrics, have been developed (Clayton, 2011a).

Fundamentally, these assessment rubric based self-reflective frameworks are designed to help individuals, with limited experience, or limited exposure to, or engagement with, other workers or colleagues, to make connections and comparisons between their existing skills and knowledge and industry accepted best-practice. This comparative process, using industry accepted standards, enables the individual, no matter their location, culture or language, to identify which competencies they are considered to be proficient in and those competencies they need to develop. The result of this reflective process is the generation of industry-grounded personal learning plans (PLPs) (Ward and Richardson, 2007) enabling them to become self-regulated learners (Zimmerman, 1990).

3.2 Assessment Rubrics

In educational settings it is generally agreed assessments should be reliable (measurements of the same skills or knowledge produce the same results), consistent (all skills and knowledge are evaluated by identical procedures), and transparent (assessors and learners all share the same levels of expectation) (Latimer, Bergee, & Cohen, 2010). Increasingly carefully designed assessment rubrics are being used to ensure reliability, consistency and transparency (Ciorba, & Smith, 2009; Kieke, Moroz, & Gort, 2007). At a fundamental level a rubric is an instrument that defines the requirements for a specified standard by dividing that standard into performance criteria and providing a description of what constitutes the level of performance for each of those individual criteria (Ammons, & Mills, 2005). At this level the rubric serves to clarify expectations about individual student's level of performance. The agreed criteria and associated descriptions provided learners and educators with consistent standards to achieve within the course (Kerby, & Romine, 2010). At a more sophisticated level rubrics can radically alter institutions as the very act of developing and implementing rubrics forever alters perceptions of educators and administrators of student learning and assessment. These altered perceptions can create an educational culture that is transformed from one that is teaching-focused to one that is more learner-centered (Kieke, Moroz, & Gort, 2007). In the creation of rubrics a number of developers use statements to define the standard and Likert-Scales to solicit responses. In the development cycle of these rubrics an inclusive set of items; describing identified aspects of a specific skill, competence or level of knowledge in a given discipline are created. These items then are paired with Likert-type, categorical response scales and assessors use these scales record student achievement against the specified description (Ciorba, & Smith, 2009). Critically, the feedback provided by these rubrics empowers students to reflect on their current performance and identify

weaknesses and strengths. This means they can direct future efforts to identified areas of improvement. The feedback also allows educators to revise information provided, assignments set and instructional approaches used (Kerby, & Romine, 2010). In essence assessment rubrics enable the personalisation of learning.

3.3 Mentors

It could be argued the focus on standards-based, rubric driven criteria as the foundation of reflective frameworks act as a constraint in the reflective process; it could restrict the acquisition of additional skills and knowledge and rigidly prescribe limited learning events (Strudler & Wetzel, 2009). These valid concerns can be addressed by the appointment of an experienced mentor. The term mentor originates from Greek mythology when the well-travelled, and absent parent, Odysseus entrusted the care and education of his child to his friend called Mentor (Penner, 2001). Traditionally, in business and industry, mentoring strategies are used to attract, retain, and promote employees, ultimately improving individual and corporate performance and effectiveness (Luna and Cullen, 1995). In the compulsory education and health sectors mentoring has long been acknowledged an integral part of professional learning and development. For example, in teacher education and nursing practicums student teachers learn skills and techniques from either experienced classroom teachers or registered nurses. In the first years of their profession newly-qualified teachers learn professional skills and strategies from experienced colleagues (Scottish Government, 2011). In higher education, while it is not always been easy for staff themselves to access, mentoring has long been regarded as an important adjunct to teaching and learning, (Darwin & Palmer, 2009). Through sustained feedback and follow-up mentors create environments that encourage greater autonomy, personal transformation and deeper self-reflection (Galbraith, M. 2003: Basile, Olson, & Nathenson-Mejia, 2003). As such mentors should be regarded as a critical aspect of the self-reflective process.

3.4 Portfolios

Historically speaking, in artistic circles, portfolios not only summarised an artist's creative achievements but they also illustrated those achievements in a physical form. As portfolios encourage the accumulation of physical evidence to illustrate achievement, they are seen to be a valuable tool for the formal assessment of competencies and are used in many professions such as nursing, medicine, and teaching (McColgan, & Blackwood, 2009). Similarly, in formal accreditation environments, systematically compiled digital portfolios provide a protected shared space where learner evidence of competencies can be rigorously controlled and systematically evaluated (Fiedler, Mullen, & Finnegan, 2009). Portfolios can be regarded as the purposeful collection of a learner's work structured to exhibit and illustrate the learners' efforts and achievements over time (Kim, Ng, & Lim, 2010). Portfolios should be viewed as a personal learning management tool encouraging individual improvement, personal growth and development, and a commitment to life-long learning by encouraging on-going reflection (Abrami & Barrett 2005).

3.5 Mass Customisation and Reflective Frameworks

Using the four building blocks outlined above, (reflective frameworks, assessment rubrics, mentors and portfolios) a model for the customisation of learning, part human and part automated, can be produced. This process model involves four identified "actors", learners, mentors, designers and assessors that engage with each other in a common virtual space. How these four actors interact with each other is described below.

1. Firstly, the learner engages with the environment through an intuitive user interface. The interface uses an interactive self-reflective questionnaire, based on a discipline specific assessment rubric, to gather data on the learners' current capabilities and existing knowledge.
2. Secondly, the data gathered from the self-reflective questionnaire is firstly, sent to a mentor appointed to facilitate learner progression to identified goals and secondly, aligned with industry accepted standards and gaps in learners current competencies and industry accepted standards are automatically identified.

3. Thirdly, the gaps identified between the learners current knowledge and industry requirements are used as filters to interact with a complex learning object database, (containing all learning activities to meet standards identified) to automatically generate a customised learning module. This learning module is delivered to the learner for action and to the mentor for information.
4. Fourthly, the learner, (in their own time, at their own pace and in a place of their own choice), works through the individualised learning module and simultaneously creates evidence to demonstrate their newly acquired competencies. During this stage of the process the learners, guided by their mentor, provide evidence of their previously stated capabilities and knowledge. All the evidence generated is systematically stored in a structured digital portfolio with categories aligned to an identified assessment rubric.
5. Finally, when the learner and mentor agree the evidence gathered meets all requirements of the assessment rubric the portfolio is sent to an independent assessor. The independent assessor reviews the evidence presented and once more aligns this evidence with the assessment rubric. The assessor's judgement is then passed onto the learner.

A schematic diagram of this engagement and interaction is illustrated in Figure 2 below




Figure 2: Conceptual model of mass customised learning module delivery.

4. Mass Customised Courses: A New Zealand Example

In 2010 the Waikato Institute of Technology recognised the need to provide professional development (PD) in Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) for staff to meet the needs of its increasingly culturally diverse and technologically experienced student population. *The Certificate in*

Open, Flexible and Networked Learning (COFNL) consists of 5 modules based on identifiable Unit Standards registered with the New Zealand Qualification Authority (NZQA, 2011). Basing the modules on these registered standards ensured the institute was following best national practice and it aligned institutional PD delivery with national goals.

4.1 The CAT: A Reflective Practice Framework

As noted previously the concept of reflection, deep-learning occurs as individuals make meaning from their experiences through reflection, has been widely debated in educational circles for a number of decades. To engage participants in reflective practice and to aid them in making connections between identified pedagogical standards in ICT and their previous experiences a self-reflective competency assessment tool (The CAT) was created for COFNL learners. The CAT was designed to enable learners to assess their current competencies against nationally defined standards.

The CAT interface provides the learner with a series of statements relating to each of the five modules within the COFNL. The statements within each module are classified within three categories, understanding, evidence and moderation.

- Understanding: This category prompts the learner to reflect on their personal knowledge of the aspect being investigated
- Evidence: This category asks the learner if they can provide evidence of their understanding
- Moderation: This category asks the learner how the evidence provided has been evaluated.

Learners are asked to reflect upon and then respond to individual statements using a ‘drop-down’ menu. Categories, statements and example responses are illustrated in figure 3 below.

Examine the relationships between participants in OFNL.	
Understanding	
I have a good understanding of the relationships (such as direct, indirect, active, passive, interactive, independent, and interdependent) that exist in open, flexible and networked learning environments.	Partially agree ▼
I have evaluated the impact different relationships between participants in OFNL (such as direct, indirect, active, passive, interactive, independent, and interdependent) have on student learning in different contexts.	Strongly agree ▼
Evidence	
I can provide digital evidence of my understanding of the relationships (such as direct, indirect, active, passive, interactive, independent, and interdependent) in open, flexible and networked learning environments.	Partially agree ▼
I can provide digital evidence of how my understanding of the relationships between participants in OFNL (such as direct, indirect, active, passive, interactive, independent, and interdependent) has been used in my practice in different contexts.	Agree ▼
Moderation	
My understanding of the relationships (such as direct, indirect, active, passive, interactive, independent, and interdependent) in open, flexible and networked learning environments has been peer reviewed.	Select ▼
Practical application of my understanding of the relationships between participants in OFNL (such as direct, indirect, active, passive, interactive, independent, and interdependent) has been peer reviewed and assessed.	Select ▼

Figure 3: Categories, statements and responses

As learners progress through the CAT their answers affect the indicator colour on the index page. The indicator colours are based on the familiar “traffic light” theme;

- Red: This indicates to the learner they have limited knowledge and/or experience of the identified standards. It also indicates how these limitations can be addressed.
- Yellow: This indicates the learner has some knowledge and/or experience of the identified standard. It also indicates how this existing knowledge/experience can be built upon.
- Green: This indicates to the learner they meet the requirements of the identified standard. It also indicates to the learner they can now build knowledge and experience in other areas.

As the learner progress through the modules, categories and statements, their responses provide a pictorial reflective framework carpet. This reflective process and visual carpet enables individuals to select which module(s) they need to review, which competencies they need to develop, what evidence they need to provide and how they should evaluate their practice.

The visual carpet produced from learner engagement provides the learner with;

- An initial assessment of their current knowledge, experience and understanding of individual aspects of this domain.
- An indication of potential starting points to begin a learning journey, and
- Navigational tips to map a learning route from starting points to intended achievements.

In essence engaging with The CAT assists the learner in the creation of a personalised learning plan empowering them to become self-regulated learners.

This visual carpet

This reflective visual carpet is illustrated in figure 5 below.




Figure 4: The visual carpet

4.2 The Supervised Mode

Whilst designing individualised personal learning plans are focused on enabling the individual to take ownership of the learning process, the regulations of COFNL recognise individuals cannot achieve their intended professional goals in isolation. When the participant enrolls in the certificate they are allocated a mentor. The mentor will use the results of the CAT and generated learning plan to guide

learners by providing appropriate links to educational theory and practical demonstrations. However, mentorship is not a one-way process. COFNL identifies both the responsibilities of the mentor and learner. The responsibilities of the mentor include:

- Being available at predetermined times throughout the duration of the learners' enrolment in the course.
- Providing ongoing guidance, encouragement and support, and assist students to achieve their identified learning outcomes.
- Ensuring learners' receive timely and appropriate feedback on course progress and on outcomes of specific requests.
- Monitoring the individual learner to ensure completion of a comprehensive record of achievement in a personal online e-portfolio

The responsibilities of the learner include

- Acting in an ethical and responsible way in all communications associated with the course.
- Submitting evidence of achievement of individual outcomes on a regular basis.
- Submitting evidence of achievement of learning outcomes in the format outlined by their mentor.
- Abiding by any response timeframe set by mentors to ensure appropriate and timely feedback is received.

Digital Portfolios

In accreditation environments like COFNL, digital portfolios can provide a protected space where learner evidence of competencies can be rigorously controlled and systematically evaluated. In COFNL learners are shown how to structure their portfolio around the assessment rubric created for each of the five modules. The assessment rubric provides a measure of quality of performance based on established practice in open, flexible and networked learning environments as identified by the New Zealand National Qualifications Authority (NZQA, 2011). In essence the rubric is based upon what the participant can demonstrate they have learnt, rather than what has been taught. As such it should be regarded as an authentic competency assessment tool. Crucially the evidence provided will be the learners own creation showing how their experiences have met the identified standard. An example of this structure is illustrated in Table 1 below.

Main Category	Sub-category
Demonstrate knowledge of theoretical models of adult learning	Apply sound knowledge and understanding of adult learning theories and epistemological principles to the effective design of learning objectives, curriculum and application of OFNL technologies in learning and teaching.
	Contribute to the development of the knowledge base of the OFNL community.

Table 1: Portfolio Structure

5. Discussion and Conclusion

This paper has argued recent educational reforms and the growing need for higher education institutions to remain globally competitive and internationally relevant has seen institutions aggressively market their educational course offerings. The result is the creation of diverse economic and cultural learning cohorts and the increased integration of e-learning applications in course delivery. As a consequence, educators are now engaging with increased numbers of distributed and diverse learners in unfamiliar ICT based learning environments. There is an expectation educators

will be able to design learning modules to meet multi-cultural student needs, in a range of contexts, with the same resources. In essence it is anticipated learners will participate in learning events, individually customised to meet their specific needs, at a cost similar to “face-2-face”, traditional delivery. This requires a fundamental shift in educators and learners conceptions on the provision of education. The traditional restrictions of time, place and pace are removed as educators begin to mass customise learning modules.

Mass customisation fundamentally alters educational delivery. The traditional pattern of subject discipline experts creating logically structured and sequenced learning events specifically addressing the knowledge deficiencies of participants is not agile enough to meet divergent needs. This approach fails to acknowledge learners existing knowledge, level of skill or their economic or cultural background and learning style. Mass customised approaches are ultimately based upon learner reflection. Learners are asked to reflect upon their existing knowledge and level of skill. Using a reflective framework, based upon an industry accepted assessment rubric, critical gaps in their competencies are identified. These identified gaps automate a process that determines the construction and delivery of individualised learning modules and the appointment of a mentor. This part human, part automated process model involves four identified “actors”, learners, mentors, designers and assessors that engage with each other, following pre-determined rules, in a common virtual space. This approach enables learners to both make meaning from their learning experiences and provides them the reflective skills to be life-long learners.

This mass customised approach provides firstly, institutions with the agility to respond to divergent learner needs and secondly, empowers individuals to develop personal learning plans ensuring they take ownership of their own learning. This customisation of courses to meet individual needs of learners allows institutions to extend their reach and educators to broaden their repertoire of teaching skills. This improves not only the quality and relevance of courses offered but also the experiences of learners.

References

- Barboza, D. (2011). Berkeley Has Plan to Start A Program In Shanghai :[Foreign Desk]. *New York Times* (Late Edition (east Coast)), p. A.8. Retrieved December 8, 2011, from Banking Information Source. (Document ID: 2513038291).
- Ciorba, C., & Smith, N.. (2009). Measurement of Instrumental and Vocal Undergraduate Performance Juries Using a Multidimensional Assessment Rubric. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 57(1), 5-15
- Clayton, J. (2009) *Evaluating online learning environments*, Köln, Germany: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Cross, R., Seidel, R., Seidel, M. and Shahbazpour, M. (2009) ‘Design communication for mass customisation’, *Int. J. Mass Customisation*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp.146–164.
- Gaeta, A., Gaeta, M., & Ritrovato, P.. (2009). A grid based software architecture for delivery of adaptive and personalised learning experiences. *Personal and Ubiquitous Computing*, 13(3), 207-217.
- Hwang, G., Tseng, J., & Hwang, G.. (2008). Diagnosing student learning problems based on historical assessment records. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 45(1), 77-89.

- Janice L Ammons, & Sherry K Mills. (2005). Course-Embedded Assessments for Evaluating Cross-Functional Integration and Improving the Teaching-Learning Process. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 20(1), 1-19
- Kerby, D., & Romine, J.. (2010). Develop Oral Presentation Skills Through Accounting Curriculum Design and Course-Embedded Assessment. *Journal of Education for Business*, 85(3), 172-179.
- Latimer, M., Bergee, M., & Cohen, M.. (2010). Reliability and Perceived Pedagogical Utility of a Weighted Music Performance Assessment Rubric. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 58(2), 168-183.
- Learning Theories Knowledgebase (2011, December). Knowledge base and Webliography. Retrieved December 1st, 2011 from <http://www.learning-theories.com>
- Martinez, L.. (2011). The Study Abroad Advantage. *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*, 28(19), 25. Retrieved December 8, 2011, from ProQuest Education Journals. (Document ID: 2522908181).
- McIntosh, R., Matthews, J., Mullineux, G., & Medland, A.. (2010). Late customisation: issues of mass customisation in the food industry. *International Journal of Production Research*, 48(6), 1557-1585
- Michele C. Kieke, Karen Moroz, & Amy S. Gort. (2007). The transformation to a learner-centered community as a result of university-wide assessment. *On the Horizon*, 15(2), 107-117.
- S M Syed-Khuzzan, J S Goulding, & J Underwood. (2008). Personalised learning environments - Part 1: Core development issues for construction. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 40(6), 310-319.
- S.M. Syed-Khuzzan, & J.S. Goulding. (2009). Personalised learning environments (part 2): a conceptual model for construction. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 41(1), 47-56.
- Sophie E. Peter, Elizabeth Bacon, & Mohammad Dastbaz. (2010). Adaptable, personalised e-learning incorporating learning styles. *Campus - Wide Information Systems*, 27(2), 91-100.
- Teresa Carlson, & Samantha Parry. (2003). A Reflective Framework From a Preservice Teacher's Perspective. *Physical Educator*, 60(4), 208-221. Retrieved December 8, 2011, from ProQuest Education Journals. (Document ID: 533438071).
- Turner, F. (2009) The Influence of Mass Customisation on Consumer Satisfaction and Its Implications for the U.S. IPTV Television Market: An Exploratory Study. *Business Leadership Review* 6(4) Electronic Version retrieved 6 December 2011 from <http://www.mbaworld.com/blr-archive/issues-64/4/index.pdf>
- Verdouw, C., Beulens, A., Trienekens, J. & Verwaart, T. (2010) Towards dynamic reference information models: Readiness for ICT mass customisation, *Computers in Industry*, 61(9),833-844,

Wilson, A. (2011). U.S.: 2010 SAW RECORD NUMBER OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS. *Global Information Network* Retrieved December 8, 2011, from Academic Research Library. (Document ID: 2511707521).

Xia, S-S. and Wang, L-Y. (2010) 'Customer requirements mapping method based on association rules mining for mass customisation', *Int. J. Computer Applications in Technology*, Vol. 37, Nos. 3/4, pp.198–203