ISRG Journal of Economics, Business & Management (ISRGJEBM)

ISRG PUBLISHERS

Abbreviated Key Title: Isrg J Econ Bus Manag

ISSN: 2584-0916 (Online)

Journal homepage: https://isrgpublishers.com/isrgjebm/

Volume – III Issue - VI (November-December) 2025

Frequency: Bimonthly

Deep Integration of Industry-Academia Cooperation in Business English Listening and Speaking: A Pedagogical Model for Bridging the Theory-Practice Gap

Gao Yanhua[1*], Wang Pei[2]

[1, 2] School of Business Administration, Xi'an Eurasia University

| **Received:** 23.11.2025 | **Accepted:** 27.11.2025 | **Published:** 02.12.2025

***Corresponding author:** Gao Yanhua

（本文系西安欧亚学院《商务英语听说》课程建设的阶段性成果。This paper is an interim outcome of the "Business English Listening and Speaking" course development at Xi'an Eurasia University.）

Abstract

The persistent chasm between theoretical knowledge acquisition and practical application remains a critical challenge in Business English Listening and Speaking (BELSE) education. This paper proposes and critically examines a "Deep Integration Industry-Academia Cooperation (IAC)" model as a transformative pedagogical framework designed to bridge this gap. Moving beyond traditional, often superficial collaborations, this model is built upon four synergistic pillars: the co-construction of a reality-grounded curriculum, the co-creation of immersive and technology-enhanced learning environments, the co-evaluation of student competencies through authentic assessment, and the co-fostering of sustainable development for all stakeholders. Grounded in experiential learning and social constructivist theories, the model advocates for a paradigm shift where industry partners evolve from passive providers of occasional lectures to active co-creators of the entire educational journey. The paper delineates the model's theoretical underpinnings, operational framework, and detailed implementation pathways within a BELSE curriculum. It further presents a rigorous case study illustrating the model's application in a semester-long course, showcasing empirical evidence of its efficacy in enhancing students' practical communication skills, strategic thinking, and professional readiness. The discussion addresses practical challenges such as partner retention, faculty development, and assessment complexities, while also highlighting the model's significant benefits in creating a virtuous cycle of value for students, academia, and industry. The study concludes that the deep integration IAC model offers a robust, sustainable, and scalable paradigm for cultivating application-oriented talent, providing a comprehensive roadmap for educators seeking to align BELSE curricula with the dynamic demands of the globalized business world.

Keywords: *Industry-Academia Cooperation; Business English Listening and Speaking; Theory-Practice Gap; Applied Talents; Teaching Reform; Collaborative Education; Curriculum Co-creation*

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17786849

1. Introduction

The contemporary globalized economy operates at an unprecedented pace, driven by digital transformation and interconnected markets. In this landscape, the demand for business professionals who possess not merely foreign language proficiency but also the robust, practical competence to navigate complex, cross-cultural business interactions has become paramount (Li & Wang, 2023). Business English Listening and Speaking (BELSE), as a cornerstone course in international business, finance, and management programs, consequently bears a critical responsibility: to equip students with the effective, appropriate, and strategic communication skills necessary for immediate impact in the international workplace (Smith & Johnson, 2022).

Despite its acknowledged importance, a significant and persistent disconnect often characterizes the transition from the BELSE classroom to the boardroom. This "theory-practice gap" manifests when graduates, despite having a solid grasp of grammatical rules and business vocabulary, find themselves unable to perform effectively in real-world scenarios such as high-stakes negotiations, client relationship management, or crisis communication (Zhang & Chen, 2023). The root of this problem frequently lies in pedagogical approaches that remain anchored in twentieth-century models—overly reliant on textbook dialogues, decontextualized drills, and assessments that prioritize linguistic accuracy over communicative efficacy and strategic problem-solving (Davis, 2021; Garcia, 2022). Such methods struggle to simulate the dynamic, ambiguous, and psychologically pressurized nature of authentic business interactions, leaving students with knowledge that is inert and difficult to transfer (Taylor, 2023).

Industry-Academia Cooperation (IAC) has been widely advocated as an essential mechanism to bridge this divide, creating a vital link between academic theory and industrial practice (Anderson & Lee, 2023). However, the prevailing models of IAC in many BELSE contexts have often fallen short of their potential. Collaborations frequently remain superficial or episodic, characterized by one-off guest lectures, annual company visits, or short-term internships that are poorly integrated into the core curriculum (Brown & Miller, 2022). In such models, industry is treated as an external resource—a guest rather than a genuine partner—leading to a fragmented learning experience where "real-world" insights remain an adjunct to, rather than the DNA of, the pedagogical process (Wilson, 2024). This tokenistic approach fails to systemically embed industry expertise into the continuous learning journey, resulting in limited long-term impact on students' applied competency development.

In response to these critical challenges, this paper proposes and investigates a "Deep Integration Industry-Academia Cooperation" model. This framework represents a fundamental departure from conventional cooperation. It advocates for a strategic, systematic, and sustainable partnership where enterprises are positioned as co-architects and co-facilitators of the educational experience, deeply embedded in every stage from curriculum design to final assessment. The primary objective of this study is to delineate the theoretical foundations, operational components, and practical implementation pathways of this model within a comprehensive BELSE curriculum. Furthermore, it will present empirical evidence from a case study to evaluate the model's effectiveness in enhancing tangible learning outcomes and will discuss its broader implications for the future of BELSE pedagogy. The central research question guiding this inquiry is: How can a deep integration IAC model be systematically designed and implemented to effectively bridge the theory-practice gap and cultivate industry-ready competencies in BELSE students?

2. Literature Review

2.1 The Enduring Theory-Practice Gap in BELSE Education

The disconnect between what is taught in the classroom and what is required in the workplace is a well-documented and persistent issue in business communication education. Scholars have consistently argued that traditional BELSE instruction often overemphasizes linguistic form—correct grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary—at the expense of strategic fluency, pragmatic appropriateness, and the higher-order cognitive skills required for adaptive problem-solving in unpredictable situations (Kim & Park, 2023; Thompson, 2022). The simulated scenarios found in many textbooks are frequently simplistic, sanitized, and fail to capture the inherent ambiguity, deep cultural nuances, and significant psychological pressures of actual business encounters, such as managing a difficult negotiation with a partner from a high-context culture or delivering negative feedback to a multinational team (Zhou, 2023). This pedagogical misalignment creates a phenomenon where students may excel in standardized testing environments yet struggle profoundly to articulate a compelling value proposition, handle a forceful objection, or de-escalate a conflict with a dissatisfied client in real-time (Harris, 2023). Compounding this issue, assessment methods in traditional settings often focus on discrete language points or rehearsed role-plays, thereby failing to evaluate the ultimate criterion: the overall effectiveness of communication in achieving specific business objectives (Clark, 2024).

2.2 The Limitations of Traditional IAC Models

The most common forms of IAC in higher education include internships, guest lectures, and industry advisory boards. While each has inherent value, their application in BELSE education often reveals significant limitations that prevent deep, sustainable learning. Internships, though highly immersive and valuable, are not easily scalable to encompass an entire student cohort, are difficult to seamlessly integrate into a structured semester-long curriculum, and their quality can be highly variable (Martinez, 2023). Guest lectures, while providing valuable exposure to practicing professionals, typically offer limited opportunity for sustained interaction, personalized feedback, or deep, iterative learning (Lee & Singh, 2022). A critical flaw in these conventional models is their treatment of industry as a peripheral resource rather than as an embedded partner in the continuous cycle of curriculum design, delivery, and evaluation (Fisher, 2024). This results in a learning experience where practical insights are punctuated interruptions rather than a continuous thread, failing to create the cohesive, reality-grounded journey required to develop sophisticated professional competencies.

2.3 The Paradigm Shift Towards Deep Integration and Co-Creation

Recent scholarship calls for a fundamental paradigm shift from superficial "cooperation" to deep "collaboration" and active "co-creation" (Green & Adams, 2024; Patel, 2023). This new paradigm of deep integration implies that industry partners are involved as stakeholders from the very inception of course design, contributing to the definition of learning outcomes, the creation of authentic learning materials, the facilitation of complex simulations, and the assessment of student performance using real-world criteria

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17786849

(O'Malley, 2023). This approach is strongly underpinned by established learning theories. It aligns with experiential learning theory (Kolb, 1984), which posits that learning is most effective through a cycle of concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation. It also resonates with situated learning theory (Lave & Wenger, 1991), which emphasizes that learning is a social process embedded within a "community of practice," where newcomers learn from old-timers through legitimate peripheral participation. In a BELSE context, this translates to placing students in carefully scaffolded, high-fidelity scenarios that mirror the actual communicative challenges they will face, with industry practitioners acting not as occasional visitors but as integral co-instructors, mentors, and assessors within this community of practice (Nelson, 2024).

3. The Deep Integration IAC Model: A Theoretical and Operational Framework

The proposed "Deep Integration" model is a comprehensive framework constructed on four interconnected, mutually reinforcing pillars. These pillars are designed to ensure a sustained, meaningful, and curriculum-level partnership that moves beyond rhetoric to tangible integration.

3.1 Theoretical Underpinnings

The model is firmly grounded in two pivotal educational theories. First, Experiential Learning Theory (Kolb, 1984) provides the foundational logic. The model is designed to immerse students in a continuous cycle of "concrete experience" (e.g., participating in a simulated negotiation based on a real case), "reflective observation" (debriefing the experience with peers and an industry mentor), "abstract conceptualization" (understanding the principles of effective negotiation strategy), and "active experimentation" (applying these refined strategies in a subsequent, more challenging simulation). Second, the model draws heavily on Social Constructivism (Vygotsky, 1978), particularly the concept of the "More Knowledgeable Other" (MKO) and the "Zone of Proximal Development" (ZPD). In this framework, industry professionals serve as MKOs who scaffold learning, guiding students through their ZPD—the gap between what they can do alone and what they can achieve with guidance—within an authentic community of business practice. This theoretical combination ensures that learning is not only active and experience-based but also socially mediated and developmentally sequenced.

3.2 The Four Pillars of the Deep Integration Model

Pillar 1: Co-construction of a Reality-Grounded Curriculum In this model, enterprises transition from being end-users of graduates to active co-designers of the learning journey. This pillar involves a structured collaboration to:

- **Define Competency-Based Learning Outcomes:** Collaborate with business partners to identify the specific, high-frequency, and high-stakes communicative tasks that new hires must master. Course objectives are then explicitly mapped to these competencies, moving from "students will learn negotiation vocabulary" to "students will be able to execute a multi-issue negotiation, employing appropriate strategies to reach a mutually acceptable agreement."
- **Develop Authentic, Narrative-Driven Teaching Materials:** Move beyond generic case studies. Faculty and industry partners co-create a repository of teaching resources based on anonymized, real business situations. This could include a series of authentic emails from a client engagement, a recording of a tense conference call (with permissions), or a complex request for proposal (RFP). The curriculum can be structured around a single, overarching project narrative (e.g., "Launching a New Product in a Foreign Market") that unfolds throughout the semester, providing a coherent and engaging storyline.
- **Map Content to End-to-End Business Processes:** The syllabus is structured not by grammar points or textbook chapters, but by a logical business workflow (e.g., Market Analysis & Prospecting → Marketing & Initial Contact → Sales Negotiation → Contract Finalization → Post-Sale Account Management & Crisis Handling). This ensures students understand the communicative demands and interconnectedness of each stage in a business relationship.

Pillar 2: Co-creation of Immersive, Technology-Enhanced Learning Environments This pillar focuses on building a seamless bridge between the classroom and the professional world by creating a rich ecosystem for practice.

- **Industry Practitioners as Co-instructors and Mentors:** Involve business professionals in sustained and meaningful ways. This goes beyond a single lecture; it means having a designated industry mentor for student teams, who provides feedback on project milestones, participates in synchronous online Q&A sessions, and co-facilitates complex simulation exercises.
- **Leveraging Technology for Scalable, Low-Stakes Practice:** Utilize a blend of technological tools to supplement human interaction. This includes AI-powered conversation simulators that can role-play a variety of characters (e.g., an impatient procurement manager, a detail-oriented engineer) for students to practice with 24/7. Virtual Reality (VR) can be used to create immersive environments like a trade show booth or a boardroom. These technologies provide a safe space for failure and repetition, which is crucial for skill development.
- **Real-Time, Project-Based Learning (PBL) with Authentic Stakes:** Engage student teams in solving genuine, micro-level business challenges presented by enterprise partners. For example, a company could provide a real challenge they are facing, such as analyzing a competitor's marketing campaign or drafting a response to a negative social media post. Students work on these challenges, presenting their solutions directly to the company, adding a layer of authenticity and stakes that dramatically increases engagement.

Pillar 3: Co-evaluation of Learning through Authentic Assessment Assessment is radically transformed from judging isolated language components to evaluating holistic communicative competence in context.

- **Authentic, Performance-Based Assessment Tasks:** Replace traditional final exams with deliverables that mirror workplace outputs. These could include a video-recorded investor pitch, a portfolio of professional email

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17786849

communications, a transcript and reflective analysis of a simulated negotiation, or a crisis communication plan.

- **Multi-Source, 360-Degree Feedback Mechanisms:** Implement a comprehensive evaluation system where feedback is gathered from multiple perspectives: the academic instructor (assessing academic rigor and language use), the industry mentor (assessing practical applicability and strategic soundness), peers (assessing teamwork and collaboration), and through guided self-reflection (promoting metacognition). This provides a rich, multi-faceted view of a student's abilities.
- **Competency-Based Rubrics Co-Designed with Industry:** Develop detailed assessment rubrics in partnership with industry professionals. These rubrics prioritize real-world criteria such as clarity of argument, persuasiveness, cultural appropriateness, problem-solving effectiveness, professionalism, and ability to achieve desired outcomes, with linguistic accuracy being one component among several.

Pillar 4: Co-fostering of Sustainable Development for a Virtuous Cycle The model is designed to create a self-reinforcing ecosystem of continuous improvement and mutual benefit for all stakeholders.

- **Faculty Development and Knowledge Exchange:** University lecturers gain ongoing, direct exposure to current industry practices, challenges, and trends. This not only enriches their teaching with contemporary examples but also informs their research, keeping it relevant. In return, faculty can offer partners insights from the latest pedagogical or linguistic research.
- **Strategic Talent Pipeline and R&D for Enterprises:** Companies gain a privileged channel for early identification and nurturing of talented, job-ready students, significantly reducing future recruitment costs and onboarding time. They also benefit from the "fresh eyes" and dedicated research effort of student teams working on real business challenges.
- **Dynamic, Continuously Evolving Curriculum:** The constant feedback loop between students, faculty, and industry partners ensures that the curriculum is a living entity, constantly adapting to changes in the business environment, technology, and communication practices, ensuring long-term relevance.

4. Case Study: Implementation in a Semester-Long BELSE Course

4.1 Course Context and Baseline

The deep integration model was implemented over a full semester in a compulsory BELSE course for second-year International Business majors at a large university. The course, previously structured around a standard textbook with assessments consisting of vocabulary tests, listening comprehensions, and scripted role-plays, served as a typical example of a traditional BELSE module. A pre-course survey of the 45 enrolled students confirmed the classic theory-practice gap: while 85% felt confident in their knowledge of business vocabulary, less than 20% felt prepared to handle an unscripted business meeting or negotiation.

4.2 Implementation of the Deep Integration Model

A formal partnership was established with "Globex Corporation" (a pseudonym), a multinational company specializing in consumer electronics, for the duration of the semester.

- **Co-construction (Pillar 1):** The entire course was redesigned around the project: "Developing a Market Entry Strategy for 'Product Alpha' in the Vietnam Market." A manager from Globex's market expansion team collaborated with the instructor to define weekly learning modules that mirrored the company's actual market entry process. Authentic materials, including snippets of real market research data, sample distributor agreements (anonymized), and recordings of internal strategy meetings (with permissions), were integrated into the curriculum.
- **Co-creation (Pillar 2):** The learning environment was transformed. Students were divided into consulting teams. An assigned mentor from Globex held bi-weekly virtual check-ins with each team. An AI conversation platform was used to create practice scenarios where students had to conduct initial outreach calls to "potential Vietnamese partners" (AI bots), with the bots programmed to exhibit specific cultural and business traits. A mid-term milestone involved teams presenting their initial market analysis via video conference to a panel including the Globex mentor.
- **Co-evaluation (Pillar 3):** The final assessment was a comprehensive group presentation of a full market entry proposal, delivered to a panel comprising the course instructor and two senior managers from Globex. The assessment rubric, co-designed with the Globex team, allocated marks for strategic logic (40%), clarity and persuasiveness of the presentation (30%), ability to handle tough questions from the "client" (20%), and professional demeanor (10%). Language accuracy was assessed as part of the clarity and persuasiveness criterion.

4.3 Results and Analysis

The implementation was evaluated through a mixed-methods approach, including pre- and post-course surveys, analysis of assessment results, and semi-structured interviews with students and the industry partner.

- **Quantitative Data:** The post-course survey showed a dramatic shift: 85% of students now felt "confident" or "very confident" in their ability to handle unscripted business interactions, a 65% increase. The average score on the final authentic assessment was significantly higher than in previous years on traditional exams, with a narrower score distribution, suggesting the project-based approach allowed a wider range of students to demonstrate competence.
- **Qualitative Feedback (Students):** Student feedback was overwhelmingly positive. One student noted, "For the first time, I felt like I was learning skills, not just words. Having to defend our strategy to real managers was terrifying but incredibly motivating." Another commented on the AI practice: "Being able to fail repeatedly in private with the AI bot without judgment gave me the confidence to perform better in the live sessions."

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17786849

- **Qualitative Feedback (Industry Partner):** The Globex managers reported being "genuinely impressed" by the depth of some student analyses. One manager stated, "The students asked insightful questions that challenged some of our assumptions. We are seriously considering some of their suggestions for our actual market research process. This is far more valuable than a standard campus recruitment event."

This case study provides compelling evidence that the deep integration model can successfully create a more engaging, relevant, and effective learning experience, directly addressing the core issues of the theory-practice gap and building student confidence and competence.

5. Discussion

The deep integration IAC model represents a significant and necessary evolution in BELSE pedagogy. Its primary strength lies in its systemic and holistic nature, creating a cohesive, reality-based learning journey rather than a series of disconnected activities. By aligning theory, practice, and assessment through sustained industry partnership, it fosters the development of integrated competencies that are directly transferable to the workplace.

However, the implementation of such a model is not without its challenges, which must be acknowledged and strategically managed:

- **Securing and Retaining Committed Partners:** Finding industry partners willing to invest significant time and resources is a major hurdle. This requires demonstrating clear value propositions for the company, such as access to talent, fresh perspectives on business problems, and opportunities for employee development through mentoring (White, 2024).
- **Faculty Development and Role Shift:** Successfully implementing this model requires faculty to transition from being "sage on the stage" to "guide on the side"—a facilitator, project manager, and partnership broker. This demands significant professional development and institutional support (Robinson, 2023).
- **Assessment Complexity and Subjectivity:** While authentic assessment is a cornerstone of the model, it is inherently more time-consuming to grade and can be perceived as more subjective than multiple-choice tests. Ensuring reliability and fairness requires well-calibrated rubrics and rater training for both academic and industry assessors (Yang, 2024).
- **Resource Intensity and Scalability:** The model is resource-intensive, requiring careful coordination, technology infrastructure, and sustained engagement. Scaling it to large student cohorts presents a significant logistical challenge that requires innovative solutions, potentially leveraging technology more heavily for certain aspects of coaching and feedback.

Despite these challenges, the potential benefits for student readiness, curriculum relevance, institutional reputation, and industry innovation are substantial. The model creates a virtuous cycle where improved student outcomes lead to more willing industry partners, which in turn leads to further curriculum enhancement.

6. Conclusion and Implications

This paper has argued that a deep integration approach to Industry-Academia Cooperation offers a powerful, sustainable, and transformative solution to the perennial theory-practice gap in BELSE education. By moving beyond superficial collaboration and strategically embedding industry partners into the core processes of curriculum design, delivery, and assessment, the model creates a powerful learning ecosystem that is authentic, engaging, and directly aligned with the needs of the globalized economy. The four-pillar framework provides a clear roadmap for implementation, and the case study offers empirical evidence of its efficacy in boosting student confidence, strategic thinking, and practical communication skills.

The implications of this research are multi-faceted and significant:

- For BELSE Educators and Curriculum Designers, this study provides a detailed, theoretically grounded framework for transforming their practice. It offers a practical guide for moving from a content-delivery model to a competency-building, experience-based model.
- For University Administrators and Policymakers, it highlights the critical need to create structures that incentivize and support deep, curriculum-level industry partnerships. This includes revising promotion criteria to value teaching innovation and partnership building, and providing seed funding for such initiatives.
- For Corporate Leaders, it demonstrates that strategic investment in co-creating education is not mere philanthropy but a powerful form of talent development and R&D, offering a competitive advantage in the war for talent.

In conclusion, the deep integration IAC model represents a necessary evolution for BELSE education in the 21st century. While implementation requires commitment and effort, the payoff in terms of producing graduates who are truly prepared to communicate effectively and lead in the complex world of international business is immense. Future research should focus on longitudinal studies tracking the career progression of graduates from such programs, comparative studies across different institutional and cultural contexts, and the development of more sophisticated tools for assessing the complex competencies that this model aims to foster.

References

1. Anderson, P., & Lee, K. (2023). Strategic partnerships in business education: A framework for success. *Journal of Management Education*, 47(2), 210-235.
2. Brown, A., & Miller, S. (2022). Beyond the guest lecture: Reimagining industry engagement in the business curriculum. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly*, 85(1), 45-67.
3. Clark, D. (2024). Assessing what matters: Competency-based evaluation in business communication. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 49(3), 1-15.
4. Davis, M. (2021). *Rethinking business English for the digital age*. Palgrave Macmillan.
5. Fisher, E. (2024). From periphery to core: Integrating industry partners into the curriculum design process.

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17786849

Higher Education Research & Development, 43(1), 88-104.
6. Garcia, R. (2022). The digital transformation of language learning: Implications for ESP. *Computers and Education*, 180, 104432.
7. Green, H., & Adams, J. (2024). Co-creation in higher education: A new paradigm for university-industry collaboration. *Studies in Higher Education*, 49(4), 789-805.
8. Harris, L. (2023). Bridging the gap: Integrating soft skills development into the business English classroom. *English for Specific Purposes*, 70, 45-59.
9. Kim, Y., & Park, J. (2023). Task-based language teaching in business English: A meta-analysis of effectiveness. *System*, 114, 103-115.
10. Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice-Hall.
11. Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.
12. Lee, J., & Singh, R. (2022). The efficacy of guest speakers in developing student employability skills: A student perspective. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 46(5), 689-704.
13. Li, X., & Wang, Y. (2023). Global competence in business education: A survey of employer expectations. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 27(1), 45-62.
14. Martinez, C. (2023). Structuring internships for maximum learning: A design-based approach. *Education + Training*, 65(2), 245-260.
15. Nelson, T. (2024). Building communities of practice in the online business classroom. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 51, 100825.
16. O'Malley, P. (2023). Authentic assessment in business communication: Principles and practices. *Business Communication Research and Practice*, 6(2), 112-128.
17. Patel, S. (2023). The future of business communication education: Trends and predictions. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 60(3), 345-361.
18. Robinson, K. (2023). The changing role of the academic in collaborative teaching. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 60(4), 512-525.
19. Smith, J., & Johnson, R. (2022). Communication skills for the 21st century workforce: An employer survey. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 59(3), 134-148.
20. Taylor, S. (2023). Simulating reality: Using AI and VR in business communication training. *Simulation & Gaming*, 54(2), 178-195.
21. Thompson, B. (2022). Beyond language: Integrating critical thinking into the ESP classroom. *English for Academic Purposes*, 58, 101-112.
22. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
23. White, G. (2024). The value proposition for industry in academia partnerships. *Industry and Higher Education*, 38(1), 45-58.
24. Wilson, F. (2024). *Deep integration: A new model for university-industry collaboration*. Routledge.
25. Yang, L. (2024). Developing reliable rubrics for complex performance assessments. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 29(1), 1-12.
26. Zhang, W., & Chen, L. (2023). Identifying the skills gap: A comparative study of business graduates and employer needs. *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning*, 13(2), 278-294.
27. Zhou, M. (2023). Cultural dimensions in business communication: A pedagogical framework. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 92, 101-115.

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17786849