

May 2017

Faculty Inter - Rater Reliability of a Reflective Journaling Rubric -- RESEARCH

Mari Alschuler
Youngstown State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://encompass.eku.edu/kjectl>



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Alschuler, Mari (2017) "Faculty Inter - Rater Reliability of a Reflective Journaling Rubric -- RESEARCH," *Kentucky Journal of Excellence in College Teaching and Learning*: Vol. 14 , Article 1.
Available at: <https://encompass.eku.edu/kjectl/vol14/iss/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Education at Encompass. It has been accepted for inclusion in Kentucky Journal of Excellence in College Teaching and Learning by an authorized editor of Encompass. For more information, please contact Linda.Sizemore@eku.edu.

Faculty Inter-Rater Reliability of a Reflective Journaling Rubric RESEARCH

Mari Alschuler • Youngstown State University

Abstract

There has been a lack of research regarding faculty training in the grading of student reflective journals (RJs). Whether or how one should evaluate RJs remains contentious. This quasi-experimental study assessed whether providing faculty in-service training on scoring RJs using a rubric would result in statistically significant inter-rater reliability. Prior to the study, faculty raters received training on reflective practice and scoring RJs with a rubric based on five levels of reflection. Percent agreement between rater pairs, with 80% set as the inter-rater reliability benchmark, was utilized. Faculty raters scored anonymous BSW and MSW RJs assigned in cultural diversity and oppression courses. Expected learning outcomes included critical and reflective thinking; social justice; application and synthesis of classroom learning to social work practice; ethical awareness; and self-awareness. Fifty percent of RJs collected twice over one term were selected randomly. One faculty pair was selected by chance and assigned under blinded conditions to score either BSW or MSW RJs. Inter-rater reliability of BSW RJ scores ranged from 86% for the first set to 98% for the second set. For the MSW RJs, scores ranged from 85.5% to 83.2%. These findings were all statistically significant and indicated that, with prior training on the purpose of RJs and in using a rubric, faculty may be better able to evaluate RJs fairly.

Keywords: rubrics, social work education, reflective journals, diversity

Clinical educators have their feet in two worlds: professional practice and teaching the next generation of practitioners. Schön (1987) proposed that students in pre-professional programs need to place their learning squarely in the experiential schema, reflecting upon client incidents in order to learn how to function in complex, ever-changing environments.

Students in field placements are expected to apply critical and reflective thinking skills, to develop self-awareness, and begin to work with diverse client populations. These students learn to reflect on action (Freire, 1970/2008; Schön, 1983, 1987) as they begin to assess their underlying beliefs, values, and assumptions about course content, their interactions with clients, and their use of self (Bay & Macfarlane, 2010; Bogo, Regehr, Katz, Logie & Mylopoulos, 2011; Lay & McGuire, 2010; Levine, Kern, & Wright, 2008; McCoy & Kerson, 2013; Urdang, 2010).

It has been reported that students who reflect on a deeper level may be better able to consider their use of self and develop a keener self-awareness (Larrivee, 2008;

Marchel, 2004). Urdang (2010) stressed “the importance of incorporating self-reflectiveness into social work education” (p. 525). Learning transferred from the classroom to the practice setting benefits both clinicians and their clients.

Social work educators can benefit from an improved understanding of how to develop, assign, and evaluate reflective writing assignments, and in particular how to create meaningful reflective journal (RJ) assignments that help students integrate course content and apply learning to field practice (Campbell, Schwier, & Kenny, 2009; Cohen, 2010; Taylor & Cheung, 2010). There is a need for critical reflection as students struggle with issues related to discrimination and oppression while they learn about cultural humility and self-awareness.

However, if faculty members have not been trained in reflective practice or RJ, they might not be as well-prepared to foster deeper levels of critical reflection in students (Alschuler, 2012; Dymont & O’Connell, 2010; Hubbs & Brand, 2010). The assignments may feel like busywork or may

not meet their intended goals. Further, faculty may not know how to objectively grade such subjective assignments. Faculty training in reflective practice and journaling is recommended, which led to the development of this study.

Theoretical Framework

This faculty development study drew on the theoretical work of Mezirow (1991), Dewey (1933), and Schön (1983, 1987) regarding the roles of transformational learning theory and reflective practice in the context of social work education. Dewey (1933) stated that we learn both from experience and from our reflection on experience—events and the meaning we make of them. Schön (1983) viewed reflection as how one acquires knowledge based on experience.

Transformational Learning

Constructionist assumptions about how people create stories about their lives underlie transformational learning theory. We are born into a constructed society with its own set of received meanings. What is transformed is the re-interpretation of past events and behaviors and their accompanying meanings.

Mezirow (1991) posited that transformational learning occurs through critical reflection to address cultural biases and assumptions, misunderstandings, or distortions (Bay & Macfarlane, 2011). In transformational learning theory, the events that occur in people's lives are less important than how people interpret them (Mezirow, 1991). If a new experience does not fit any prior schema, we may become confused as to how to label, narrate, or categorize it. Through interpretation, we make meaning out of experience (Hoshmand, 2004; Mezirow, 1991).

In clinical education, the process of learning about oneself is central (Hoshmand, 2004). Critical reflection of what is taught in the classroom permits transformation to occur in students. Hoshmand credited critical reflection as one of three elements in transformational counselor education; the other two elements were “critical dialogue and the exercise of critical thinking” (p. 83). Duggan (2005) described the transformational education of adult students as often occurring when a critical incident triggered the identification of differences between the actuality and the ideal.

A sense of disequilibrium may create what Freire (1970/2008) termed *conscientization* and which Mezirow (1991) called a “disorienting dilemma.” Freire posited that conscientization involves three processes: naming, reflecting, and acting. Plack et al. (2007) described this ‘disorientation’ as a common problem because practitioners and interns regularly “encounter ambiguous, undifferentiated clinical problems that require higher order thinking, not simply recall of knowledge and skills” (p. 286). Meaning-making is involved in transformational learning theory as well as in reflective practice (Fiddler & Marienau, 2008). Through transformational learning practices, including thinking and writing reflectively, students can learn to foster their awareness of the disorienting dilemma as they work to become authentic, reflective practitioners.

Reflection

Through reflection, one is able to transform the problem, discover innovative solutions, and develop new skills one might call upon should a future similar circumstance occur (Schön, 1983). Sandars (2009) created a hybrid, transformational definition of reflection which highlights the importance of context:

Reflection is a metacognitive process that occurs before, during and after situations with the purpose of developing greater understanding of both the self and the situation so that future encounters with the situation are informed from previous encounters. (p. 685)

Schön (1983) differentiated between *reflection-in-action* and *reflection-on-action*. Reflection-in-action occurs during a situation in which the learner experiences something novel or in states of uncertainty or value conflict. Loughran (2002) differentiated among the different times at which students may write reflectively: anticipatory, retrospective, and contemporaneous. For example, one might use mental rehearsal or role playing with a peer prior to an anticipated event. Because it may be impossible to write in the midst of an event, Loughran highlighted whether there is still time to reflect quickly and change one's intervention.

Reflection-on-action is a post-hoc review of an event that already occurred (Schön, 1983, 1987). Through a reconsideration of past events, we develop new ways of knowing (Dewey, 1933). Post-hoc journaling might occur through reminiscence, either emotionally or viscerally, by focusing on vivid details or on feelings. Writing after an event also allows one to re-evaluate what happened, what one's role was, and what one might have done differently (Fiddler & Marienau, 2008).

Reflection can be part of one's teaching strategy, according to Mann, Gordon, and MacLeod (2009). In a meta-analysis of 29 articles on reflective practice, they summarized that: students benefited from teachers who modeled reflective practice; reflective thinking could be taught or at least encouraged through guided writing prompts and teacher feedback; and that reflection helped students understand both course

content and how to integrate new information.

Critical reflection on experiences with different people is one way to increase self-awareness. RJs can also help students develop professional identities as they become acculturated into a new profession (Lay & McGuire, 2010; McGlamery & Harrington, 2007). Student interns are regularly confronted by issues they have never dealt with previously (Fiddler & Marienau, 2008; Sandars, 2009), and they make decisions and use interventions based on what they have previously learned (Mezirow, 1991; Schön, 1983). Clinical educators are appropriately positioned to assist their students in developing these important skills (Balen & White, 2007; Fritschler & Smith, 2009).

Reflective Journaling

The effective, intentional use of RJs requires faculty to be familiar with their purpose and how to construct meaningful assignments, and to come to a measured decision about whether and how to evaluate RJ content (Hume, 2009; Larrivee, 2008; Marchel, 2004; O'Connell & Dymont, 2011). Pavlovich (2007) outlined four dimensions of the reflective process as it helps students develop self-awareness: (a) how learning through reflection-in action occurs within an experience; (b) metacognitive awareness to think about what occurred; (c) mindful awareness about one's discomfort, uncertainty, or anxiety surrounding the experience, requiring reconsideration of one's actions and responses; and (d) planned action in response to the experience and one's reflection through changing one's behavior or stance.

In one of the few studies of reflective practice among faculty, Larrivee (2008) assessed faculty who reviewed RJs of pre-service teachers. She drew parallels between reflective thinking and *conscientization*

(Freire, 1970/2008), as both situate the teacher in a moral and ethical social environment. She maintained that only through self-reflection—questioning one’s own values, and the broader sociopolitical environment—could one become a reflective teacher. Larrivee focused on how teachers can assist students along a four-level reflective thinking continuum, which she based on Mezirow (1991): (a) *pre-reflection or non-reflection*; (b) *surface reflection*; (c) *pedagogical reflection*; and (d) *critical reflection*.

Levels of Student Reflective Writing

Many studies on the use of RJs have focused on categorizing levels of written reflections, with most including rubrics with three to seven levels (Aukes, Geertsma, Cohen-Schotanus, Zwierstra, & Slaets, 2007; Alschuler, 2012; Bogo et al., 2011; Grossman, 2009; Kember, McKay, Sinclair, & Wong, 2008; Larrivee, 2008; McGlamery & Harrington, 2007; O’Connell & Dymont, 2011; Pavlovich, 2007). Klenowski and Lunt (2008) pointed out that levels of reflection are seen by some as static entities, when they are anything but rigid. They recommended differentiating between “productive and unproductive reflection,” (p. 206) wherein the latter would be superficial and the former would involve higher cognitive skills such as synthesis (Bloom, 1956).

In revising Bloom’s (1956) taxonomy Pintrich (2002) added metacognitive knowledge as a fourth category. Metacognition includes self-reflection and an awareness of one’s own learning style, cognitive strengths and areas for improvement, and how to select certain learning strategies in order to master content and apply theory to practice. Pintrich highlighted the importance of teachers helping “students make accurate assessments of their self-knowledge” (p. 222). As it pertains to reflective practice and self-

awareness, metacognitive knowledge has also been posited as related to learning transfer (Pintrich, 2002).

For the purposes of this study, the researcher created a five-level rubric (see Appendix A) for evaluating student RJs to be written at the beginning and end of two diversity courses, one at the BSW and one at the MSW level. The content for the rubric related directly to course content.

The five levels used in this study were: 0=*Responding*; 1=*Reconsidering*; 2=*Re-evaluating*; 3=*Reframing*; and 4=*Reintegrating* (Alschuler, 2012). Students who write at the lowest level (Responding) do so superficially; they give the teacher the minimum expected content. Concrete facts are stated, but with no real evidence of reflective or critical thinking.

At the next level, Reconsidering, students are able to step back from events to think about what occurred. They evidence budding awareness that biases and assumptions may have been received from their sociocultural and political milieu. Their writing is somewhat less superficial and displays beginning awareness of self (Alschuler, 2012).

At the Re-evaluating level, students consider the sociocultural and political context in more depth. They display an understanding of how their own and others’ biases, values, beliefs, and assumptions have been received from their environments. Their RJs may show tentative questioning of authority, self-analysis, and inspection of their own beliefs (Alschuler, 2012).

Students writing at the next level, Reframing, explore social justice issues in the context of theory, personal and professional experience, and the sociocultural and political milieu. They are able to consider other points of view. They may openly question authority or the role of their environment in shaping their values and assumptions. There is an awareness of use of

self in professional practice; these students consider how they might act in the future (Alschuler, 2012).

At the deepest level, Reintegrating, students evaluate their received assumptions. They synthesize course material, personal experience, and sociopolitical realities into a developing sense of self. The content displays professional future plans; character or personal growth; and increased self-awareness (Alschuler, 2012).

To grade or not to grade? Identifying, describing, and labeling levels of reflection have been a main concern; however, others have explored the use of questionnaires, templates, or rubrics to evaluate or grade students' level of reflection (Aukes et al., 2007; Bogo et al., 2011; Grossman 2009; Hume, 2009; Kember et al., 2008; Lay & McGuire, 2010). Yet, a controversy remains: whether or not, and how, to evaluate student RJs (Creame, 2005; Kennison, 2006; Levine et al., 2008; O'Connell & Dymont, 2011; Plack et al., 2007; Sandars, 2009).

Mann et al. (2009) raised the concern that if a teacher does not evaluate RJs, students may not see any value or purpose in taking the time to write them in a thoughtful manner. Dymont and O'Connell (2010) opined that ungraded assignments may be left unwritten, or viewed as unimportant or busywork, and thus completed superficially. Creame (2005) stated that some colleges force faculty to grade all assignments, tying the hands of instructors who may have preferred some latitude in regard to grading RJs; she recommended grading RJs.

Hubbs and Brand (2010) argued about the necessity to grade RJs. They maintained that if these assignments are seen as data—like exams or academic essays—then how the RJ contents will be graded needs to be made explicit. By so doing, instructors may then establish measurable criteria linked to learning outcomes. The authors suggested that a lack of inter-rater reliability may

hamper teachers from grading RJs, as there would be concerns about subjectivity. Without effective measures of observable criteria, they argued, assessment and evaluation may be compromised.

Rationale for the Study

Faculty can benefit from learning how to develop, assign, and grade or evaluate RJs that help students integrate content and apply learning to field practice (Campbell et al., 2009; Cohen, 2010; Taylor & Cheung, 2010). However, there has been an overall lack of research regarding faculty training in the use of RJs (Alschuler, 2012; Dymont & O'Connell, 2010; Larrivee, 2008). The present study considered how faculty might score student RJs using a five-level rubric to evaluate inter-rater reliability of the instrument.

The study took place over one semester at one Midwestern state university. Two RJ assignments were created and integrated into the syllabi for a BSW course on Cultural Diversity and an MSW course on Oppression and Cultural Competence. The study focused specifically on inter-rater reliability in the use of a scoring rubric to add to the literature on faculty's ability to fairly evaluate subjective student RJs on diversity-related themes.

Methodology

Research Design

This quasi-experimental study looked at faculty evaluation of student RJs as they related to course content on oppression, cultural competence, and diverse populations, using a rubric. The research hypothesis was that there would be statistically significant inter-rater reliability among reader/raters' RJ scores at both the BSW and the MSW level. Fifty percent of RJs were selected randomly twice over one semester, using an Internet-based random

number generator (www.stattrek.com), and scored blindly by faculty who were not instructors for the two courses. Raters were selected using chance (coin flip) to ascertain whether they would read undergraduate or graduate RJs.

Procedures

The researcher (PI) received approval from the university's Institutional Review Board (IRB). Instructors who would be teaching Cultural Diversity and Oppression and Cultural Competence in the fall were informed about the study in advance by the department chair. During this fall term, Cultural Diversity enrolled 27 undergraduates in one section. Oppression and Cultural Competence was held in three sections, for a total of 44 graduate students. The PI emailed the rubric and insert for the syllabi to the instructors.

On the first day that each class section met, the PI personally introduced the purpose of the study to students and informed them that their RJs would be graded by their instructor using the same rubric, and that the external raters' scores would not be shared with their instructor. The PI emphasized that the outside raters would not know their identity and instructed them on how to create a unique individual identifier, which they were told to place on their RJs.

Sampling and Recruitment

The population of faculty raters for this study was drawn from all full- and part-time faculty members teaching in one social work department accredited by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) at one Midwestern public university. Faculty members were informed of the study during earlier faculty meetings. The inclusion criterion was their volunteering to participate in an in-service training and agreeing to read and score RJs with the rubric.

Four faculty members agreed to participate: two tenured, full-time professors who had taught undergraduates for an average of 22 years (range 20-24 years), and who had taught graduates for an average of nine years (range 6-12); and two adjunct instructors who had taught undergraduates for an average of 21 years (range 11-31). One part-time instructor had not taught at the graduate level, while the other had taught at the graduate level for nine years.

Under direction of the IRB and due to confidentiality concerns, no other demographic data was collected from raters. The reason for this is that the reader/raters work in a small department and their identities could be revealed should more demographic information be obtained.

The PI paired one full-time and one part-time faculty to read either the BSW or the MSW RJs. A chance method (coin flip) was utilized to select which pair would read which level of RJ; the same pair read the same level both times, and did not know which level they were scoring.

Faculty In-Service Training

After signing informed consent forms, raters received a two-hour in-service training by the PI that covered reflective practice, RJs, and the rubric based on five levels of reflection (Alschuler, 2012). They were given sample RJ entries to practice rating using the rubric, and then discussed their perceptions of how they had rated the samples. They requested and received permission to score in-between levels using ".5" (e.g., 2.5, 3.5). Raters were reminded not to discuss their ratings with one another.

Data Collection

Reflective Journal #1

The first set of RJs (17 of 27 BSW and 37 of 44 MSW RJs) was collected three weeks into the fall term. Some had not been handed

in on time or were missing a student's identifier code. Students' names and individual identifiers were entered into a confidential research log, separated by educational level (BSW or MSW). Online random sampling was used to select 50% of the RJs (www.stattek.com). Nine BSW and 18 MSW RJs were selected for scoring. Blank rubrics were tagged with the students' identifiers and stapled to the RJs for the raters.

When reading the first set of BSW-level RJs, one of the two BSW raters recognized the writing of one student, did not score it, and returned it to the PI, who also pulled the score for that student from the other rater. Thus, eight, rather than nine, initial BSW RJs were rated. This also had the unintended consequence of making the rater aware that she was grading undergraduate RJs.

Reflective Journal #2

The second set of RJs was collected three weeks before the end of fall term. A total of 38 MSW and 21 BSW RJs were collected for the second set. Using the same procedure, 50% were randomly selected ($n=19$, MSW; $n=10$, BSW). RJs were disseminated to the same faculty pairs, who rated them using the attached rubrics.

Findings

Descriptive Information

Time Spent Rating. The faculty members reported that they spent an average of 1.75 hours (range: 1.0 to 2.5 hours) reading and scoring the first set of RJs. The average amount of time spent reading and scoring the second set of RJs was reported to be 1.8 hours (range, 1.2 to 2.5 hours).

Rubric Scoring. Each rubric contained five relevant content areas that students were to include in their RJs: critical and reflective thinking; social justice themes; apply and synthesize classroom learning or theory to

social work practice; ethical awareness; and self-awareness. Each of the five items could be scored in a range from 0 to 4 points, for a total score of 20 points. No points were given if the student did not write any content in that area. One point was given for substandard content in each area. Two points were given for adequate content. Three points were given for good content. Four points were given for exemplary content.

Data for all items on a student-by-student, item-by-item, and rater-by-rater was entered into Microsoft Excel. Percent agreement was separately calculated for the BSW-level pairs of ratings and for the MSW-level pairs of ratings. Inter-rater reliability was calculated through the percent agreement method. For the purposes of this study, 60% agreement was considered acceptable and 80% was considered statistically significant (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2011). Less than one point apart for each of the five items on the rubric was considered "agreement" for this study.

BSW RJs

First Set. There were eight pairs of ratings for five items, for a total of 40 items. Of those, seven pairs of items were more than one point apart (33 of 40 agreed). Percent agreement between the two raters of the first RJ for the BSW class was calculated at 86%.

Second Set. There were 10 pairs of ratings, for a total of 50 items. Only one pair of items was more than one point apart (49 of 50 agreed). Percent agreement between the raters of the second RJ was calculated at 98%. Both findings were thus statistically significant.

MSW RJs

First Set. Eighteen pairs of ratings were reviewed, for a total of 90 items. Thirteen pairs of items were more than one point apart (77 of 90 agreed). Percent agreement between the two raters of the first RJ for the

three MSW sections was thus calculated at 85.5%.

Second Set. Nineteen pairs of ratings were reviewed, for a total of 95 items. Sixteen pairs of items were more than one point apart (76 of 95 agreed). For the second set of RJs, the percent agreement was 83.2%. Both findings were thus statistically significant.

Discussion

The faculty raters were in agreement the majority of the time, with more variation among those rating the MSW-level student RJs compared to those reading the BSW RJs. The findings were all statistically significant in terms of inter-rater reliability. At times, reader/raters used the .5 to indicate their hesitance in firmly selecting one category over another. For the most part, the difference between “good” and “exemplary” or between “acceptable” and “good” appeared to be fairly clearly delineated. These findings indicated that, with prior training and practice in using a rubric to grade student journals, faculty may be able to evaluate RJs more fairly.

Limitations

Validity may be compromised with all self-reported instruments (Gay et al., 2011). It was expected that faculty members rated RJs independently and without consulting with one another. Because randomization was used to select RJs twice during the term, there was no intention of comparing students’ content from the start to the end of the term, which might be a topic for future study. Faculty self-selected to participate, which may have caused a threat of differential selection. However, the researcher used a coin flip to mitigate any potential bias. The range of time each person reported they spent reading and rating RJs indicated that some spent more time and possibly more effort

than others; this may have affected differences in pairs of scores.

Implications for Social Work Educators

Social work educators serve not only as professors, but as mentors who have the additional task of preparing students for entering the profession. Reflective practitioners who are also educators may serve as role models and mentors to the students they are socializing into the profession. Training in the helping professions includes clinical internships in the field. The courses selected for this study related to the social work profession’s ethical standards and education goals, including social justice, diversity, and cultural competence. These are suggested as suitable topics for the development of RJs into the curricula.

Conclusion

Learning to become a social worker entails acculturation into a profession. McGuire, Lay, and Peters (2009) imparted that clinical educators need to help students learn how to manage complexity, relate theory to practice, and use higher-order cognitive skills in making clinical decisions. Social work practice entails encountering unique, difficult, and unfamiliar situations on a regular basis, clinical social workers need to develop their flexibility, adaptability, and use of self in working with others (Levine et al., 2008). Through RJs, students can learn to reframe their clinical and field experiences to foster self-awareness, empathy, and empowerment (Balen & White, 2007; Fritschler & Smith, 2009). As shown in this study, faculty may learn how to develop, assign, and evaluate RJ assignments through in-service training to help students achieve these learning outcomes.

References

- Aukes, L. C., Geertsma, J., Cohen-Schotanus, J., Zwierstra, R. P., & Slaets, J. P. J. (2007). The development of a scale to measure personal reflection in medical practice and education. *Medical Teacher, 29*, 177-182.
- Alschuler, M. L. (2012). *Teaching perspectives and usage of journal writing by clinical faculty*. [Doctoral Dissertation]. Retrieved from <http://www.proquest.com>
- Balen, R., & White, S. (2007). Making critical minds: Nurturing “not-knowing” in students of health and social care. *Social Work Education, 26*(2), 200-206. doi:10.1080/02615470601042722
- Bay, U., & Macfarlane, S. (2011). Teaching critical reflection: A tool for transformative learning in social work? *Social Work Education, 30*(7), 745-758. doi: 10.1080/02615479.2010.516429
- Bloom, B. (Ed.). (1956). *A taxonomy of educational objectives. Handbook I: Cognitive domain*. New York: McKay.
- Bogo, M., Regehr, C., Katz, E., Logie, C., & Mylopoulos, M. (2011). Developing a tool for assessing students' reflections on their practice. *Social Work Education, 30*(2), 186-194. doi: 10.1080/02615479.2011.540392
- Campbell, K., Schwier, R. A., & Kenny, R. F. (2009). The critical, relational practice of instructional design in higher education: An emerging model of change agency. *Education Technology Research and Development, 57*(5), 645-663. doi: 10.1007/s11423-007-9061-6
- Cohen, P. (2010). Empowering reflective ethical engagement in field settings. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 124*, 47-54. doi: 10.1002/d.420
- Crene, P. (2005). Should student learning journals be assessed? *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 30*(3), 287-296. doi: 10.1080/02602930500063850
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Dyment, J. E., & O'Connell, T. S. (2010). The quality of reflection in student journals: A review of limiting and enabling factors. *Innovations in Higher Education, 35*(4), 233-244. doi: 10.1007/s10755-010-9143-y
- Fiddler, M., & Marienau, C. (2008). Developing habits of reflection for meaningful learning. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 118*, 75-85. doi: 10.1002/ace.297
- Freire, P. (1970/2008). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. London: Continuum International.
- Fritschler, A. L., & Smith, B. L. R. (2009). The new climate of timidity on campuses. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 55*(23), A80.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2011). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (10th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Grossman, R. (2009). Structures for facilitating student reflection. *College Teaching, 57*(1), 15-22.
- Hoshmand, L. T. (2004). The transformative potential of counseling education. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education, and Development, 43*(1), 82-90.
- Hubbs, D. L., & Brand, C. F. (2010). Learning from the inside out: A method for analyzing reflective journals in the college classroom. *Journal of Experiential Education, 33*(1), 56-71. doi: 10.5193/JEE33.1.56
- Hume, A. (2009). Promoting higher levels of reflective writing in student journals. *Higher Education Research & Development, 28*(3), 247-260. doi: 10.1080/07294360902839859
- Kember, D., McKay, J., Sinclair, K., & Wong, F. K. Y. (2008). A four-category scheme for coding and assessing the level of reflection in written work. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 33*(4), 369-379. doi: 10.1080/02602930701293355
- Kennison, M. M. (2006). The evaluation of students' reflective writing for evidence of critical thinking. *Nursing Education Perspectives, 27*(5), 269-273.
- Klenowski, V., & Lunt, I. (2008). Enhancing learning at doctoral level through the use of reflection? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 33*(2), 203-217. doi: 10.1080/02602930701292795
- Larrivee, B. (2008). Development of a tool to assess teachers' level of reflective practice. *Reflective Practice, 9*(3), 341-360. doi: 10.1080/14623940802207451
- Lay, K., & McGuire, L. (2010). Building a lens for critical reflection and reflexivity in social work education. *Social Work Education, 29*(5), 539-550. doi: 10.1080/02615470903159125
- Levine, R. B., Kern, D. E., & Wright, S. M. (2008). The impact of prompted narrative writing during internship on reflective practice: A qualitative study. *Advances in Health Science Education, 13*, 723-733. doi: 10.1007/s10459-007-9079-x
- Loughran, J. J. (2002). Effective reflective practice: In search of meaning in learning about teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(1), 33-43. doi:10.1177/0022487102053001004
- Mann, K., Gordon, J., & MacLeod, A. (2009). Reflection and reflective practice in health professions education: A systematic review. *Advances in Health Science Education, 14*(4), 595-621. doi: 10.007/s10459-007-9090-2
- Marchel, C. A. (2004). Evaluating reflection and sociocultural awareness in service learning classes. *Teaching of Psychology, 31*(2), 120-123.

Kentucky Journal of Excellence in College Teaching and Learning

- McCoy, J. L. M., & Kerson, T. S. (2013). Teaching reflective social work practice in healthcare: Promoting best practices. *Journal of Social Work Education, 49*(4), 674-688. doi: 10.1080/10437797.2013.812892
- McGlamery, S., & Harrington, J. (2007). Developing reflective practitioners: The importance of field experience. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, 73*(3), 33-45.
- McGuire, L., Lay, K., & Peters, J. (2009). Pedagogy of reflective writing in professional education. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 9*(1), 93-107.
- Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- O'Connell, T. S., & Dymont, J. E. (2011). The case of reflective journals: Is the jury still out? *Reflective Practice, 12*(1), 47-59. doi: 10.1080/14623943.2011.541093
- Pavlovich, K. (2007). The development of reflective practice through student journals. *Higher Education Research & Development, 26*(3), 281-295. doi: 10.1080/07294360701494302
- Pintrich, P.R. (2002). The role of metacognitive knowledge in learning, teaching, and assessing. *Theory into Practice, 41*(4), 219-225.
- Plack, M. M., Driscoll, M., Marquez, M., Cuppernull, L., Maring, J., & Greenberg, L. (2007). Assessing reflective writing on a pediatric clerkship by using a modified Bloom's taxonomy. *Ambulatory Pediatrics, 7*(4), 285-291.
- Sandars, J. (2009). The use of reflection in medical education: AMEE Guide No. 44. *Medical Teacher, 31*(8), 685-695. doi: 10.1080/01421590903050374
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Taylor, P. G., & Cheung, M. (2010). Integration of personal/professional self (IPPS) through reflective/experiential learning. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 30*(2), 159-174. doi: 10.1080/08841231003706248
- Urdang, E. (2010). Awareness of self—A critical tool. *Social Work Education, 29*(5), 523-538. doi: 10.1080/02615470903164950

Mari Alschuler is Assistant Professor of Social Work and MSW Program Coordinator,
Youngstown State University.

APPENDIX A Reflective Journaling Rubric

Level of Reflection: Criteria	<i>Reintegrating</i> Exemplary 4 pts	<i>Reframing</i> Good 3 pts	<i>Re-evaluating</i> Acceptable 2 pts	<i>Reconsidering</i> Unacceptable 1 pt	<i>Responding</i> No Credit 0
<u>Critical & Reflective Thinking</u> Questioning implicit, received assumptions, values & beliefs within socio-cultural-political context	Thoroughly evaluated & questioned received or implicit assumptions, values, & beliefs, & compared them to others. Explored aspects of socio-cultural-political context in some detail.	Considered values & beliefs in context. Evidence of some questioning &/or comparing own views to those of others. Limited exploration of socio-cultural context.	Limited questioning of own beliefs. No exploration of others' points of view. Brief mention of context.	Some awareness of receiving some values from society. No exploration of others' points of view. No mention of context.	Emotional or habitual response. No reflective or critical analysis of own values, those of others, or context.
<u>Social Justice Themes</u> Oppression, Cultural Diversity & Competence; Underlying Structures of Oppression	Full exploration of social justice themes including institutional oppression or racism. Discussed structures underlying oppression.	Social justice issues explored in some depth. Mentioned various kinds of oppression, but not broad societal structures.	Vague discussion about one social justice issue. Focus on personal identity or membership rather than underlying structures.	Broad, vague, superficial mention of social justice issues without regard to context.	No exploration or mention of social justice issues.
<u>Apply & Synthesize Classroom Learning/Theory to Social Work Practice</u> (Field, Volunteer, or Personal Experiences)	Synthesis of course material/ theory & field or volunteer work (or personal experience). Identified areas needing more training or experience & described steps to do so (a plan).	Experiences were thoughtfully considered in light of classroom learning. Areas needing more training mentioned briefly or with broad, un-specific plans.	Personal or field experiences were briefly mentioned in light of classroom learning. Need for more training not mentioned or very vague.	Personal or field experiences briefly mentioned but not related to classroom learning. No evidence of synthesis. No discussion of learning needs.	Student repeated back book learning received information & opinions. No discussion of learning needs.
<u>Ethical Awareness</u> Struggle with ethical dilemmas/conflicts related to cultural differences; cognitive awareness	Described specific struggle with an ethical dilemma. Elicited self-awareness intellectually of coming to terms with oppression.	Broad exploration of an ethical dilemma or standards conflict related to cultural differences. Some self-awareness.	Minimal mention of ethical standards. Limited self-awareness at cognitive level.	Stated they have no dilemmas and no potential conflicts. Lack of self-awareness.	No mention of ethics, standards, or struggles. Lack of self-awareness.
<u>Self-Awareness:</u> Use of self. Questioning in context of diversity & oppression; personal exploration & growth; affective awareness	Specific examples of awareness of use of self. Questioning stance. Addressed emotional reaction to materials.	Broad awareness of use of self. Discusses how own values & beliefs may be changing, &	Some beginning self-awareness. Limited description of feelings as they relate to	Minimal or vague/broad personal exploration of use of self. No feeling words used.	No personal exploration of use of self. No feeling words used.

Kentucky Journal of Excellence in College Teaching and Learning

		feelings about that.	dis-crimination or difference.		
--	--	----------------------	--------------------------------	--	--

Total Points Possible = 20 Score: ____

© Alschuler, 2012