The 'wicked problem' of reflective practice: a critical literature review

Louise Platt

School of Education, Leisure and Sports Studies, Liverpool John Moores University, I.M.Marsh Campus, Barkhill Road, Aigburth, Liverpool. L17 6BD.

Contact : L.C.Platt@ljmu.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper tackles the 'wicked problem' of reflective practice. Reflection is encouraged by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) through Personal Development Planning (PDP) and is at the heart of many employability agendas. Yet, it has been identified as a higher-level skill which should not be forced as this can lead to inauthentic or 'faked' reflection. The paper questions, using recent literature, whether 'good' reflective practice can be embedded or indeed should be embedded. This is further complicated by differences in disciplinary contexts and generic institution-wide interventions. The employability agenda pursued by universities, the policies on PDP and developing reflective graduates, and the Key Performance Indicators are here in their current form for the moment and we must work within those when developing effective practice in teaching and learning. This literature review suggests that to focus too heavily on outcomes results in poor reflection, lack of engagement from students and low-confidence and apathy from staff. The review will include a brief case study of an institutional intervention relating to reflective practice and then conclude to suggest that reflective practice needs to be a process embedded within disciplines (specific to that discipline and not generic) rather than an isolated practice.

1.1   Introduction

The introduction of a minimum requirement for Personal Development Planning first recommended in the Dearing Report in 1997 and introduced by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) (Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2001, updated in 2009), provides evidence that students are being required to reflect on their learning and universities are required to support them in this. A recent report from the Association of Graduate and Careers Advisory Service (AGCAS, 2011) shows how Skills Awards Schemes are now becoming the norm, predicting that by 2015 all universities would have some form of scheme. It shows that 67% of these are administered by central services, and almost 40% have different levels of awards. These initiatives provide the rationale for this critical literature review.

The review focuses on the value, function, and, efficacy of reflective practice and writing, drawing on research literature, reports of current trends and policy, and conceptualised in relation to my own experiences of an institutional scheme. The aim is to illuminate the challenges and most effective strategies for incorporating quality student reflection into the curriculum.

1.2 Conceptualising reflection

How the notion of reflection is conceptualised has been explored elsewhere (see for example: Moon, 1999). In the introduction to a special issue on reflective practice in managerial development, a succinct description of reflection is offered:

> *'Reflection as a process or act refers to the means by which the human mind has knowing of itself and its thinking.*

Such a process is deeply embedded in the continuous relationship between actions and reflection.'
(Higgins 2011, p. 583).

Yet, despite this seemingly simple definition, reflection and reflective writing as an act of reflection is critiqued and interrogated throughout the literature and often described as, "a higher level meta-cognitive skill" (Clegg & Bradley, 2006, p. 479) which, when considered alongside the classic models of cognition within the educational setting such as Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Goals (Bloom, 1956), it would seem that to request 'real' reflective skills starting at level 4 to be incongruous. This notion of 'real' reflection can link to Mezirow's levels of reflective actions (1991) and the shift from 'content reflection' to the more advanced skill of 'premise reflection.' This suggests that 'real' reflection is achieved as an ongoing process rather than a singular task. Due to the complexities inherent in reflective practice I am therefore placing the notion of reflective practice as a 'wicked problem' (Rittel & Webber, 1973) as it evades coherent resolution and any attempts at resolution will result in further issues.

This review asks whether this higher-level critical reflection can be something that is developed over time if facilitated effectively? It is not simply a skill based in writing, although it can contribute to the development of critical writing skills (see for example: Rusche & Jason 2011), but it also has an affective dimension for the student (see for example: Beard et al., 2007). The study then begins with the following research questions which will frame the review of the literature:

- what are the key debates around reflective practice?
- how is reflective practice being incorporated into policy and practice?
- based on insights from the literature and practice, what are the primary challenges for effective development of students' reflectivity.

2. Methodological approach

This paper will be a narrative review of the literature (Bryman, 2004). This style of review is more suited to a study based on an interpretivist epistemology, which, in agreement with Hammersley, "will require the reviewer to draw on

his or her tacit knowledge, derived from experience […]" (2001, p. 549). This approach is preferred to a systematic review based on a positivist epistemology as it draws on knowledge of professional practice and institutional processes in a reflexive manner. Indeed, it is worth noting that the impetus to conduct this study arose from personal experiences and difficulties faced in delivering and supporting reflective practice with BA (Hons) Events Management students. Thus the reflexive nature of the study cannot be ignored. The reflexive stance, and the acknowledgment of such a stance, is essential in the appreciating the validity of the argument presented (Creswell & Miller, 2000).

The strategy employed for this literature review began with initial searches using electronic databases in order to get a 'feel' for the subject and the scope of literature. It was decided to focus the search on material published after the introduction of a minimum requirement for PDP by the QAA (2001, updated in 2009). Whilst this is useful in that it creates a timeframe to search within, reflection and reflective practice did not just suddenly come into use at this time. Consequently, this review, whilst focusing on work published since the 2001 introduction of 'progress files', will also draw on further literature in setting a broader context of reflective practice in higher education, and in particular the recent explosion of awards and certificates that recognize reflection (AGCAS, 2011 and QAA, 2013).

3. Reflective practice

3.1. An overview

The work of Moon (1999) provides a rich explanation of the philosophies of reflection and I will not go into details of that here. The work of Dewey and reflective thinking ([1910]1997), and Habermas and reflection as emancipatory (1971), are the starting points for Moon in her in-depth study. Dewey's work encourages educators to train 'thinkers' and to embrace imagination as: "imagination supplements and deepens observations" ([1910],1997, p. 224). This valuing of creativity in facilitating reflective practice is a notion that will be returned to throughout this literature review. Turning to Habermas' emancipatory vision for reflection, it is useful to draw on the work of Barnett (1997) who finds

Habemas' philosophy lacking and calls for not just critical thought, but 'critical being' (ibid, p. 7). He comments, and as relevant today as in 1997, that, "the fulfilment of extramural agendas dictates the formation of a self only at low levels of self-reflection (ibid, p. 100). He states that self-reflection that could lead to emancipation and self-empowerment make way for "self-censorship and self-surveillance" (ibid, p. 101) in the confines of the formal education/placement environment. This further suggests that reflective writing as an act is problematic and needs attention if to be considered valuable by staff, students and, employers.

Much of the research literature around reflective writing (as an act) centres on subjects that embed critical reflection as part of the formal training, for example, teacher training (See for example: Bain, Ballantyne et al., 1999; Spilková, 2001; Maloney & Campbell-Evans, 2002; Margaret, 2005; Mills, 2008; Hume, 2009; McGarr & Moody, 2010; Chetcuti et al., 2011), and medical profession training (see for example: Wellard & Bethune, 1996; Beylefeld et al., 2005; Jack, 2005; Kennison, 2006; McMullan, 2006; Shapiro et al., 2006; Head et al., 2012). This should not mean that these works are unhelpful in other academic disciplines, particularly in light of the reasons outlined in the introduction of this paper.

There have also been moves for other, social science disciplines to begin to consider the value of reflective writing for students since the introduction of 'progress files'. For example, geography (McGuinness, 2009), sociology (Rusche & Jason, 2011), and, psychology (Pithouse-Morgan et al., 2012). There is limited work that considers the area that I teach, that of events, tourism and leisure studies. Lashley, (1999) and Lashley & Barron, (2006) are exceptions, although these studies do not focus on reflective writing *per se* but more broadly at reflection and personal development (Beard et al., 2007). Yet the multi-disciplinary nature of these fields mean that much research is transferable.

3.2 Reflective practice, national policy and current trends

Attention has been paid to the discourse of policy on reflection and reflective writing in the aftermath of the introduction of the 'Progress

Files'. Whilst the QAA guidelines do not refer explicitly to reflective writing there is an implicit focus on reflection,

> *'PDP helps learners […] evaluate and recognise their own strengths and weaknesses and identify ways in which perceived weaknesses might be improved and strengths enhanced […] develop a vocabulary to communicate their development and achievement'*
> (QAA, 2009, p. 6-7).

Here reflection is a tool used as a means to an end and, I would argue, does not capture the nuanced nature of the skill. The policy emphasis in recent times has been on the employability of the student once they complete their studies. The reflective process can be in danger of merely being instrumental in enabling students to find employment (which is of course essential). Clegg and Bradley suggest that, due to these policy shifts, there has been change in, "the meaning of studentship and the purpose of higher education" (2006, p. 468). Therefore, responses to the discourse of the policy on reflection is connected to the, "broader feelings about the nature and purpose of higher education" (ibid, p. 469), of those who work in HE. With the formalisation and external monitoring brought about through quality assurance processes, a barrier to the facilitation of reflective practice is created (ibid). This echoes the points made by Barnett (1997) outlined above, and suggests little progress on facilitating sustainable reflection.

Indeed, Clegg and Bradley's (2006) research found that the language of the policy on PDP and reflective practice is problematic. The idea of the 'progress file' and PDP led one participant of their study to feel that it becomes about "presentation" and not actual engagement (ibid, p. 476). The outcomes of the PDP, the reflective writing or the presentation of achievements become the focus rather the process itself, which is where the actual learning happens. Indeed, the QAA's toolkit (2013) recognises that awards and certifications that document students' achievements outside of the curriculum has grown steadily with 92% of these awards including a reflective element (QAA, 2013). The toolkit refers to reflection but does not offer detail of how students can achieve this beyond suggestions of "workshops which introduce the value of reflections and reflective practice

techniques" (ibid, p. 14). There is a disconnect between identifying the importance of reflection in documenting achievement and the facilitation of meaningful practice. What reflection means is rarely interrogated in these guidelines and toolkits.

This focus on documentation becoming problematic is supported by the work of Orland-Barak (2005). The policy and reflective practice relationship, it can be concluded, has the danger of becoming a tick-box exercise, and reflection merely becomes about recording achievement and not learning. The toolkit discussed above emerged from the introduction of the Higher Education Achievement Report (HEAR) which evidences added-value beyond the degree classification. The toolkit acknowledges that these developments are responding to calls from, "government, professional bodies, and employers" rather than pedagogic or disciplinary research. This relates to Clegg and Bradley's (2006) conclusion that universal initiatives in teaching and learning are often embedded in the higher education culture, "in counter-distinction to research" (ibid, p. 484), and despite staff appreciating the value of reflection they remain ambivalent towards it as a national policy intervention imposed from 'outside' of the academy.

If this is the case then this attitude might impact on the quality and depth of students' reflective writing. A lack of commitment and more importantly, confidence, from staff (not necessarily borne out of not recognising the importance of reflection) and a lack of engagement by students can result in poor and descriptive reflection. Clegg warns that, within national policy, to not take into consideration "the chaotic nature of the concept of PDP" (2004, p. 296) can lead to the sidelining of practitioner research and thus, "forms of reflection will mimic reflection" (ibid). She leaves us with the warning that to take onboard, uncritically, national policy on reflection, can overlook the fact that the, "reflective self has particular gendered, classed and racialised locations" (ibid, p. 296). We need to ensure that when we facilitative reflective practice in our students that we are doing so for pedagogical and not ideological functions.

This is supported by Jameson et al., (2012) who, writing in the context of criminology, argue that the measurement of employability in the UK through the Destination Leavers in Higher Education (DLHE) survey further compounds the dysfunctional relationship between academics and the employability agenda. Developing a reflective and self-aware student as a means to an end, focusing on outcomes, KPIs and league tables leads to disenchantment and lack of meaningful engagement on the part of academics. The QAA encourage "local ownership" (QAA, 2009, p. 9) yet the location of PDP and reflective practice and the responsibility for developing this within programmes is often confused (Quinton & Smallbone, 2008). As Atlay (2008) highlights, the importance of reflection varies widely across disciplinary benchmarks.

3.3   Considering students, audience and disciplinary variance

Moving on from the national picture, this section will explore the relationship between reflection, students and discipline, and how the audience for reflection might impact on its style, value, and quality. The notion that we are able to write higher-level reflection as part of PDP is problematic. In phenomenological philosophy, there has been a shift from thinking in terms of reflection and 'pure' consciousness (Husserl, 2002), to seeing experience as embodied (Merleau-Ponty, 1962). The process of reflection is innately difficult and complex: in order to truly reflect we need the ability to 'bracket' experience as Husserl's transcendental phenomenology suggests. This might be a skill that is possibly beyond a student starting in Level 4, so ought to be facilitated as a developmental process.

Clegg and Bufton (2008) explore the complex relationship that students entering higher education have with 'time' and their experiences and conceptualisations of managing time which leads to "faking" (ibid) reflection. The implication here is that a student's ability to write 'real' reflective work is dependent on the progession of time and the student's affective 'journey'. The study focuses on, "the time of first year as re-interpreted from third year," (ibid, p. 446) and reveals that the perceived lack of importance of the first year is based on not imagining the future but, "determined by the present and the past" (ibid). This affective relationship with time suggests further issues of 'real' reflection at Level 4 and that embedding reflective practice should be continual and developmental.

Much of the work on affect and reflective writing encompasses notions of creativity and imagination, and indeed this is where disciplinary divergences come into play. Bleakley (2000) presents an alternate view on the role of creative writing and confessional practice. Using a similar language to Barnett (1997) she considers that the "personal-confessional" (i.e. the use of a reflective journal) approach can become a, "mode of constructing identity within a specific discourse of self-surveillance" (ibid, p. 16). She suggests a 'creative' writing approach drawing on genres of narrative knowing. It is certainly a technique which could be adapted for different cognitive abilities. Indeed, the work of Pithouse-Morgan (2012) on letter-writing as reflective practice with researchers suggests a simple and effective approach that could easily be transferred to undergraduate level.

A radical approach to creativity and reflection was undertaken by Newton and Plummer (2009) with final year nursing students. A creative response to their affective journey was included in the assessed work. One student drew on her professional practice alongside her personal interest and submitted a quilt which represented the journey she felt she had been on. For staff this was evidence of 'real' reflection and an eye-opener for them as, "I felt humbled as I realised how little we really get to know our students as unique individuals" (ibid, p. 71). They found that students were excited by the assessment and wanted to engage with the reflective process more so than ever before. To return to the work of Dewey ([1910], 1997), we see that the engagement - with imagination in this case - allowed for a deeper engagement with criticality. If we contrast this with the research of Jack (2005) into reflection and student nurses and their recognition of its importance but not necessarily its impact on their practice, we can see that a creative approach may encourage deeper engagement with the process.

A key issue here however, and one raised by Newton and Plummer (2009) is once again related to the confidence of staff and so-called 'buy-in' to more novel approaches to reflection when more established methods such as journal writing or portfolios are well documented and evidenced (Wellard & Bethune, 1996, Bain et al., 1999; Maloney & Campbell-Evans, 2002; Cisero, 2006; McMullan, 2006; Hume, 2009; McGuinness, 2009;

McGarr & Moody, 2010). In disciplines where reflection is not traditionally practiced a radical creative approach may be problematic for staff and students. Thompson and Pascal (2012) highlight the need for ideas about reflection, which is often part of the definitions offered by the QAA and other national bodies, to move away from, 'technical rationality' (ibid, p. 313), a positivist epistemology of practice (that being applying a 'scientific' knowledge to practice) towards a more humanised approach to reflective practice (ibid). Yet disciplinary variances would see that many students and indeed academics may find this shift from a 'science' to a 'craft' (ibid, p. 313) more problematic. It is understandable that the QAA use generic language to explain reflective practice in order to encompass a wide range of subjects taught in univerities. One solution may be emerging from the QAA Scotland, where a more critical and complex consideration of reflection has been undertaken with disciplinary differences in mind (QAA, 2011). Yet, this toolkit does focus, I would argue, too heavily on outcomes and summative assessment of reflection.

Indeed, summative assessment of reflection is problematic. A reductionist view would be that students who see that their reflection is being marked as part of an assignment will merely 'play the game' and write what they think the markers want to read. Hobbs (2007) in the context of teacher education, a subject traditionally associated with reflective practice, considers her own experience of, "perfecting [her] own ability to anticipate what the professor wanted and give it to him" (ibid, p. 414). Indeed, if this is felt to be the case then it may be that the criteria that we work towards and the way that we facilitate the reflection needs reconsidering, it becomes a matter of curriculum design in a holistic sense rather than task-based and isolated in one module, an issue I will return to when examining the case study below. Ross (2011; 2012) would back this up in her work on online reflection. She considers that online reflection is often implemented without realising how 'high-stakes' this can be for students and staff. The exposition of power-relations is often ignored and the process can develop, "fragmented, performing, cautious, strategic selves" (2011, p. 124). She calls for us as educators to reconsider how we implement initiatives which involve high-stakes reflection.

4. Reflective writing and institutional practice: a case study

The World of Work scheme was introduced to Liverpool John Moores University (LJMU) in 2007 and the compulsory inclusion of a Bronze stage of this was implemented in September 2012 (although was piloted by the Centre for Tourism, Events and Food in 2011). The rationale for the scheme arises from the employability agenda which many universities are pursuing in order to differentiate themselves in a competitive marketplace (perpetuated with the introduction of higher-rate fees in 2012). The certificate is split into three stages: Bronze (Self-Awareness); Silver (Organisational Awareness); and Gold (Making Things Happen). The final stage involves an interview with an employer from the sector within which the student would like to work. The scheme is administered and supported by the central World of Work Careers Centre. Unlike many other skills awards (AGCAS, 2011) the award is integrated into the curriculum and linked to assessments. In particular the Bronze award at Level 4 is compulsory across the institution. The process does, however, respond to the need to develop reflection over a longer period of time so that students can develop their reflective practice at each level of their degree.

The Bronze stage of the certificate involves a one-thousand word reflective statement. The purpose of this is to reflect the type of personal statement that an employer may ask for. The students are given guidance on how to construct this piece of writing and the format in which to present it. Programmes are assigned time periods within which to submit statements, which links back to the issues raised by Clegg and Bufton (2008) relating to Time and affect. By constraining the students and, indeed staff to ready the students, leaves the risk that reflection is poor or "mimic reflection", (Clegg, 2004, p. 296) based on the criteria and guidelines laid out. Academic staff are not involved in the process of creating the 'assessment' or the development of the marking criteria but only integrating it into a module and discussing subsequent feedback with their students (it is this reflection on the feedback where a summative mark is awarded rather than for the 1000 word statement itself). Therefore, staff may be left feeling unprepared and ill-equipped to support students in this task.

This literature review has focused on debates around the relationship between policy intervention and the influence that this has on the development of eventual higher-level reflection. Indeed, it has been found that staff generally support PDP and reflective practice but do not feel confident to deliver it or even resent it for adding to their workload/distracting them from research praxis (Clegg & Bradley, 2006). In order for an institutional intervention such as the World of Work scheme to create higher level reflection from students, it may be that in some cases the scheme needs to be eventually de-centralised and placed at the heart of programmes, or indeed, that academic staff are involved more heavily in the development of the criteria and the feedback given to students. This then allows for the creativity which Dewey ([1910], 1997) and others have since advocated (Bleakley, 2000; Newton & Plummer, 2009). This input from academic staff may also allow for a nurturing of the reflective practice in students to avoid 'fake' reflection. Yet, for some disciplines where reflection is traditionally marginalised (not by intention but historically not part of the culture of the discipline) the Bronze certification centrally managed could be a good starting point and, an opportunity to begin discussions about reflection and how to build it into the curriculum further.

This literature review has highlighted how reflection is a higher-level skill and as Ross (2011) and Hobbs (2007) points out, by assessing it, it becomes 'high-stakes' or 'forced'. It is high-stakes for the student but also, in the case of the LJMU intervention, becomes high-stakes for academic staff and managers due to its intrinsic relation to the performative culture of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) such as graduate destinations and employability. The pressure to 'perform' reflection and to encourage students to 'perform' in order to pass (Clegg et al., 2002; Ross, 2012) can breed discontent and limit the effectiveness of reflective writing in the long-run for our students. The literature presented here and elsewhere, that evidences the value of good reflective practice, is in danger of becoming redundant within the formalised setting if too many constraints restrict the creative freedom and autonomy of students and staff.

In relation to the degree routes of Events Management and Tourism and Leisure

Management, the work of Lashley (1999) in particular is worth pausing over as, although an older study, it does present a longitudinal investigation into personal development and reflection. The findings are highly pertinent finding that the majority of tourism and hospitality entrants prefer concrete rather than abstract learning, which means they find reflective practice more difficult than maybe those studying traditional critical inquiry subjects. Lashley is calling for hospitality and tourism students to become reflective practitioners and therefore we should not abandon the quest. Indeed, the ability to truly reflect intrinsically relates to the ability to be critical, autonomous scholars (Thompson & Pascal, 2012) which is what academic staff hope students will become. Therefore, linking back to the LJMU World of Work Scheme, I argue that we need to consider discipline differentiation when asking students to complete a standardised task of reflective writing and increase the ownership of reflective practice within the academic schools either away from centralised units or to work more closely with them.

5. Conclusion

To return to Barnett (2000, p.40), "We are all performativists now". If universities are, as Barnett suggests, seeing an insertion of epistemological performativity (i.e. knowing as action rather than knowing as contemplation), and becoming a means to an end then the processes of reflection in a 'real' sense should be developmentally embedded in curricula for it to be meaningful. The studies explored in this literature are a drop in the ocean of the work conducted into reflective practice and it is evident that more work needs to be done within the fields of tourism and events in particular.

The employability agenda pursued by universities, the policies on PDP and developing reflective graduates, and the Key Performance Indicators are here in their current form for the moment and we must work within those when developing effective practice in teaching and learning. This does not mean that we should not critique it, not take risks in how we approach our praxis. This literature review suggests that there is not a one-sized solution for facilitating 'real' (as opposed to 'faked') reflection but it does however, imply that to focus too heavily on outcomes results in poor

reflection, lack of engagement from students and low-confidence and apathy from staff. The guidance offered by reports such as the QAA toolkit (2013) and the ACGAS (2011) review of skills awards need to offer more firm guidance on what they mean when they talk about reflective practice. Whilst a singular definition is not what I am suggesting is needed, there is trend towards encouraging reflection, and this needs to be communicated more efficiently rather than presuming all disciplines will be able to facilitate this to a similar level.

Indeed, what I would argue is that eventually, in the case study presented here, the World of Work certification process should become truly embedded at a programme level with reflection mapped out across a programme of study rather than isolated in specific modules. I suggest that this would happen quicker in some disciplines than others. Reflection should be process driven, starting early, and holistic rather than task based and driven by outputs. As the literature has suggested it is a skill to be nurtured over time. What the scheme has allowed is for programmes to talk about reflection and to bring it in from a marginalised position, and for it to be seen as a process (i.e. the development from bronze to gold). However, there still needs to be discussions around differentiating between 'good' and 'bad' reflection and maybe the next stage is to review the scheme qualitatively across disciplines to understand how reflection is being embedded. The formalised scheme has brought with it consistency in approach across the institution but to look at unique subject groups and programmes will provide a clearer picture in order to move forward.

It will bring new challenges, as all 'wicked problems' do, but to place the emphasis on a disciplinary approach rather than a generic approach will allow ownership by both academic staff and students. There is plenty more research to do in this area and this must come from within specific disciplines, supported by the careers guidance experts centrally. This will help develop a nuanced approach to reflective practice, rather than all subjects following one 'recipe' as outlined by the national bodies such as the QAA. Whilst this paper does not object to guidelines offered by the QAA (2009; 2013), it calls for an approach which considers process over outputs and a shift away

from the emphasis on employability *per se*, toward a holistic embedding throughout curricula.

References:

AGCAS. (2011). *Extra-curricular awards stimulus papers: Association of Graduate Careers Advisory Services (AGCAS) perspective*. Gloucester: Quality Assurance Agency. Available at: http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Documents/extra-curricular-awards-AGCAS.pdf [accessed: 10/01/14]

Atlay, M. (2008). Subject benchmark statements and PDP: A review. Centre for Recording Achievement. Available at: http://www.recordingachievement.org/higher-education/articles/item/higher-education-articles/subject-benchmark-statements-and-pdp-a-review.html [accessed: 30/12/13]

Bain, J. D., Ballantyne, R., Packer, J., & Mills, C. (1999). Using Journal Writing to Enhance Student Teachers, Reflectivity During Field Experience Placements. *Teachers &Teaching* 5: 51-73.

Barnett, R. (1997). *Higher Education: A Critical Business*. Buckingham, The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Barnett, R. (2000). *Realizing the University in an Age of Supercomplexity*. Buckingham, The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Beard, C., Clegg, S. & Smith, K. (2007). Acknowledging the affective in higher education. *British Educational Research Journal* 33: 235-252.

Beylefeld, A. A., Nena, K.D. & Prinsloo, E.A.M. (2005). Influence of community experiences on first-year medical students' reflective writing. *Medical Teacher* 27: 150-154.

Bleakley, A. (2000). Writing With Invisible Ink: Narrative, confessionalism and reflective practice. *Reflective Practice* 1: 11-24.

Bloom, B. S., Ed. (1956). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals - Handbook* I: Cognitive Domain. New York, McKay.

Bryman, A. (2004) *Social Research Methods*, (2nd Edn). Oxford & New York.

Chetcuti, D., Buhagiar, M.A. & Cardona, A. (2011). The Professional Development Portfolio: learning through reflection in the first year of teaching. *Reflective Practice* 12: 61-72.

Cisero, C. A. (2006). Does Journal Writing Improve Course Performance? *College Teaching* 54: 231-236.

Clegg, S. (2004). Critical readings: progress files and the production of the autonomous learner. *Teaching in Higher Education* 9: 287-298.

Clegg, S. & Bradley. S. (2006). The Implementation of Progress Files in Higher Education: Reflection as National Policy. *Higher Education* 51: 465-486.

Clegg, S. & Bufton, S. (2008). Student support through personal development planning: retrospection and time. *Research Papers in* Education 23: 435-450.

Clegg, S., Tan. J. & Saeidi, S. (2002). Reflecting or Acting? Reflective Practice and Continuing Professional Development in Higher Education. *Reflective Practice* 3: 131-146.

Creswell, J.W. & Miller, D.L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry, *Theory into Practice*, 39: 124-131.

Dewey, J. ([1910] 1997). *How We Think*. (New York edn), New York: Dover Publications.

Habermas, J. (1971). *Knowledge and Human Interests.* London, Heineman.

Hammersley, M. (2001). On 'Systematic' Reviews of Research Literatures: A 'narrative' response to Evans & Benefield. *British Educational Research Journal* 27: 543-554.

Head, B. A., Earnshaw, L.A., Greenberg, R.B., Morehead, R.C., Pfeifer, M.P. & Shaw, M.A. (2012). 'I Will Never Forget': What We Learned from Medical Student Reflections on a Palliative Care Experience. *Journal of Palliative Medicine* 15: 535-541.

Higgins, D. (2011). Why reflect? Recognising the link between learning and reflection. *Reflective Practice* 12: 583-584.

Hobbs, V. (2007) Faking it or hating it: can reflective practice be forced? *Reflective Practice*: 8, 405-417.

Hume, A. (2009). Promoting higher levels of reflective writing in student journals. *Higher Education Research & Development* 28: 247-260.

Husserl, E. (2002). *Introduction to Logical Investigations. The Phenomenology Reader*. D. Moran and T. Mooney. Oxon & New York, Routledge: 65-77.

Jack, S. A. (2005). Reflective practice: a meaningful task for students. *Nursing Standard* 19: 33-37.

Jameson, J., Strudwick, K., Bond-Taylor, S. & Jones, M. (2012). Academic principles versus employability pressures: a modern struggle or a creative opportunity? *Teaching in Higher Education*, 17: 25-37.

Kennison, M. M. (2006). The Evaluation of Students' Reflective Writing for Evidence of Critical Thinking. *Nursing Education Perspectives* 27: 269-273.

Lashley, C. (1999). On making silk purses: developing reflective practitioners in hospitality management education. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 11: 180-185.

Lashley, C. & Barron, P. (2006). The learning style preferences of hospitality and tourism students: Observations from an international and cross-cultural study. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 25: 552-569.

Maloney, C. & Campbell-Evans, G. (2002). Using Interactive Journal Writing as a Strategy for Professional Growth. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education* 30: 39-50.

Margaret, M. (2005). Reflection in teacher education: how can it be supported? *Educational Action Research* 13: 525-542.

McGarr, O. & Moody, J. (2010). Scaffolding or stifling? The influence of journal requirements on students' engagement in reflective practice. *Reflective Practice,* 11: 579-591.

McGuinness, M. (2009). Putting Themselves in the Picture: Using Reflective Diaries in the Teaching of Feminist Geography. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 33: 339-349.

McMullan, M. (2006). Students' perceptions on the use of portfolios in pre-registration nursing education: A questionnaire survey. *International Journal of Nursing Studies* 43: 333-343.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). The Phenomenology of Perception. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
Merizow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mills, R. (2008). "It's just a nuisance": Improving college student reflective journal writing. *College Student Journal* 42: 684-690.

Moon, J. A. (1999). *Reflection in Learning and Professional Development*. Oxford, Krogan Page.
Newton, J. M. & Plummer, V. (2009). Using creativity to encourage reflection in undergraduate education. *Reflective Practice* 10: 67-76.

Orland-Barak, L. (2005). Portfolios as evidence of reflective practice: what remains 'untold'. *Educational Research* 47: 25-44.

Pithouse-Morgan, K., Khau, M., Masinga, L. & de Ruit, C.v. (2012). Letters to Those Who Dare Feel: Using Reflective Letter-Writing to Explore the Emotionality of Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 11: 40-56.

QAA (2001). *Guidelines for the HE Progress Files*. Gloucester, Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education.
http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Pages/HE-Progress_files.aspx [accessed 30/12/13].

QAA (2009). *Personal development planning: guidance for institutional policy and practice in higher education*. Gloucestershire, Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education.
http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Documents/PDPguide.pdf [accessed 30/12/13].

QAA (2013). *Recognising achievement beyond the curriculum: a toolkit for enhancing strategy and practice*. Gloucester:
Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education.
http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Documents/Regognising-achievement-beyond-the-curriculum-toolkit-13.pdf [accessed 30/12/13].

QAA Scotland. (2011). A toolkit for enhancing personal development planning strategy, ploicy and practice in higher education institutions. Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education Scotland.
http://www.qaa.ac.uk/SCOTLAND/DEVELOPMENTANDEDEVELOPMEN/Pages/Personal-development-planning-Scotland.aspx [accessed 30/12/13].

Quinton, S. & Smallbone, T. (2008). PDP implementation at English Universities: what are the issues?, *Journal of Further & Higher Education*, 32: 99-109.

Rittel, H.W.J. & Webber, M.M. (1973) Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning, *Policy Sciences*, 4: 155-169.

Ross, J. (2011). Traces of self: online reflective practices and performances in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education* 16: 113-126.

Ross, J. (2012). Performing the reflective self: audience awareness in high-stakes reflection. *Studies in Higher Education*: 1-14.

Rusche, S. N. & Jason, K. (2011). 'You Have to Absorb Yourself in It'. *Teaching Sociology,* 39: 338-353.

Shapiro, J., Kasman, D. & Shafer, A. (2006). Words and Wards: A Model of Reflective Writing and Its Uses in Medical Education. *Journal of Medical Humanities* 27: 231-244.

Spilková, V. (2001). Professional Development of Teachers and Student Teachers through Reflection on Practice. *European Journal of Teacher Education* 24: 59-65.

Thomson, N. & Pascal, J. (2012). Developing critically reflective practice, *Reflective Practice*, 13: 311-325.

Wellard, S. J. & Bethune, E. (1996). Reflective journal writing in nurse education: whose interests does it serve. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 24: 1077-1082.