Assessment and Practice in Educational Sciences

Assessment Strategies for Promoting Critical Reflection in Graduate-Level Programs

1. Omid. Sheybani[ID]: Department of Educational Planning, University of Lorestan, Khorramabad, Iran
2. Nasrin. Jalilvand[ID]*: Department of Educational Counseling, University of Lorestan, Khorramabad, Iran. (Email: nasrin.jalilvaand@yahoo.com)

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to explore the assessment strategies employed by graduate-level instructors to promote critical reflection in academic programs. A qualitative research design was employed, using semi-structured interviews to gather data from 19 university instructors in Tehran with experience teaching at the graduate level. Participants were purposively selected from a range of disciplines, ensuring variation in assessment practices and pedagogical approaches. Data collection continued until theoretical saturation was reached. All interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim, and analyzed using thematic analysis supported by NVivo software. Open coding was followed by axial and selective coding to identify major themes, subthemes, and emergent concepts. Three primary themes emerged from the analysis: (1) Reflective Assessment Design, including the use of journals, structured prompts, rubrics, multimodal formats, and iterative reflection cycles; (2) Instructor Facilitation Strategies, such as dialogic feedback, emotional safety, peer-based reflection, and scaffolding techniques; and (3) Institutional Support Mechanisms, involving flexible assessment policies, professional development, technological resources, and interdepartmental collaboration. Participants emphasized that critical reflection was best supported when assessment design was intentional, reflection was scaffolded over time, and institutional structures were responsive to innovative pedagogy. Cultural responsiveness and emotional safety were also found to be critical enablers of deep student reflection. The study highlights the multidimensional nature of reflective assessment and underscores the need for deliberate instructional design, faculty facilitation, and institutional alignment to support critical reflection in graduate education. Findings suggest that effective reflective practices are context-sensitive, requiring cultural awareness, iterative design, and sustained institutional support. The insights contribute to the global discourse on reflective pedagogy by offering evidence from a non-Western academic setting.

Keywords: Critical reflection, graduate education, assessment strategies, reflective pedagogy, qualitative research, higher education, faculty development, Tehran.

Introduction

The development of critical reflection is widely recognized as a cornerstone of transformative learning in higher education, particularly in graduate-level programs where learners are expected to move beyond content acquisition toward deeper engagement with knowledge, self, and context (Mezirow, 1997). As global academic discourse increasingly emphasizes 21st-century skills—critical thinking, metacognition, and self-regulated learning—graduate education must prioritize the design of assessments that cultivate these capabilities (Brookfield, 2017; Boud & Molloy, 2013). Among these pedagogical priorities, reflective assessment has emerged as a strategic instructional approach to foster deeper learning and professional identity formation in postgraduate students (Moon, 2004). Yet, despite its acknowledged value, reflective assessment often remains

unevenly implemented, conceptually ambiguous, and unsupported at the institutional level (Ryan, 2013). This study seeks to investigate how graduate-level educators design and enact assessment strategies that meaningfully promote critical reflection.

Critical reflection, distinct from mere self-evaluation, involves a process of questioning underlying assumptions, analyzing personal and contextual influences, and generating transformative insights (Fook & Gardner, 2007). In graduate programs—ranging from education and social work to health sciences and business—reflection is not simply a pedagogical technique but a critical developmental function that supports students' capacity to navigate complexity, ambiguity, and ethical decision-making in professional practice (Schön, 1983; Larrivee, 2000). Moreover, reflection supports integration of disciplinary knowledge with lived experience, thereby enhancing adaptive expertise (Hatton & Smith, 1995). However, the challenge lies in ensuring that reflection is not relegated to a perfunctory exercise but is instead embedded through well-structured assessment strategies that include intentional design, explicit criteria, and meaningful feedback (Boud, Keogh, & Walker, 1985).

Recent scholarship underscores the importance of scaffolding reflective practices through assessment mechanisms such as structured prompts, rubrics, and dialogic feedback (Yan, 2020; Spalding & Wilson, 2002). Research indicates that when students are provided with explicit criteria for what constitutes high-quality reflection, their cognitive engagement increases, and their responses exhibit greater depth, criticality, and personal insight (Driessen et al., 2005). Additionally, assessment strategies that include formative feedback loops, multimodal expression, and peer-based reflection have been shown to cultivate reflective habits and support metacognitive development (Carless & Boud, 2018). Despite these promising insights, studies also suggest that institutional constraints, lack of faculty training, and insufficient clarity in reflective expectations often undermine implementation efforts (Ryan & Ryan, 2015; Clegg, 2004).

The pedagogical function of reflective assessment in graduate education extends beyond academic outcomes to influence students' professional identity formation and emotional resilience. In fields like nursing, teaching, and counseling, reflective assessment is integral to fostering dispositions such as empathy, ethical sensitivity, and cultural competence (Mann, Gordon, & MacLeod, 2009). Moreover, reflection encourages learners to evaluate their positionality and bias—capacities essential for equitable and socially just professional practice (Brookfield, 2017). In this context, assessment must move beyond the traditional testing paradigm toward approaches that value personal narrative, subjective interpretation, and emotional labor—elements historically marginalized in academic evaluation (Bolton, 2010). However, this shift requires institutional courage and innovation, particularly in academic cultures that prioritize standardization and objectivity.

A growing body of qualitative research has explored how reflective assessment is experienced by both instructors and students across different disciplines. For instance, Wald and Reis (2010) examined structured reflective writing in medical education and found that students were better able to process emotionally intense clinical experiences. Similarly, Loughran (2002) highlighted the value of reflective portfolios in teacher education as a space for integrating theory with classroom realities. Yet, what remains underexplored is how instructors conceptualize and enact assessment strategies that deliberately promote reflection within the constraints and affordances of their institutional contexts. Particularly in non-Western contexts, such as Iran, where cultural and educational traditions may shape different orientations to reflection and assessment, empirical research is still limited (Khodabandelou, 2016).

Assessment strategies that promote reflection must be contextually situated, acknowledging cultural values, institutional norms, and disciplinary epistemologies. In collectivist contexts, for example, students may be less accustomed to individualistic forms of reflection and more inclined toward communal or dialogic forms of learning (Hofstede, 2001). Therefore, effective reflective assessment must be adaptable—employing diverse modes of engagement such as collaborative reflection, digital storytelling, and visual metaphors to accommodate varied learning identities and preferences (Lee & Chiu, 2021). Instructors

must also attend to the emotional and relational dynamics of reflective work, creating safe spaces for vulnerability and uncertainty, both of which are often suppressed in academic environments (Zembylas & Michaelides, 2004).

Moreover, critical reflection is not a spontaneous act but a skill that requires developmental support. This involves scaffolding students' reflective capacities over time through cycles of feedback, metacognitive training, and increasing levels of complexity (Moon, 2004; Kember et al., 2008). To that end, effective assessment design includes specific pedagogical strategies such as the use of staged reflections, rubrics that define levels of criticality, and exemplars that illustrate reflective sophistication. Faculty play a pivotal role in modeling reflective inquiry and in creating opportunities for dialogic engagement where reflection is not merely written but spoken, contested, and socially co-constructed (Rodgers, 2002).

However, facilitating critical reflection through assessment is not without challenges. Instructors often report difficulties in evaluating subjective content, maintaining consistency across assessors, and allocating sufficient time within curriculum constraints (Ryan, 2011). Additionally, some students may resist reflection if they perceive it as irrelevant, overly emotional, or incompatible with disciplinary conventions (Ash & Clayton, 2009). These challenges highlight the need for faculty development programs that equip instructors with practical tools, theoretical frameworks, and peer support networks to design and assess reflection meaningfully (Jay & Johnson, 2002).

The present study responds to these concerns by exploring the assessment strategies that instructors use to foster critical reflection in graduate-level programs in Tehran. By adopting a qualitative design and engaging instructors across disciplines, the study aims to illuminate the pedagogical principles, design features, and institutional supports that underpin effective reflective assessment. It also examines the tensions and constraints faced by educators as they navigate institutional expectations and cultural norms while trying to promote critical reflection. In doing so, the study contributes to the growing scholarship on reflective pedagogy by offering context-sensitive insights and practical implications for curriculum design, faculty development, and policy reform.

Ultimately, if reflection is to serve as a transformative force in graduate education, it must be deeply embedded in assessment practices that are intentional, inclusive, and pedagogically sound. This study offers a nuanced understanding of how such strategies are conceived and enacted by instructors working within the socio-cultural and institutional landscape of Iranian higher education. It builds on global insights while contributing locally grounded evidence to inform future efforts in curriculum innovation and assessment reform.

Methods and Materials

Study Design and Participants

This study employed a qualitative research design aimed at exploring assessment strategies that foster critical reflection among graduate-level students. The interpretive nature of qualitative inquiry was particularly suitable for examining participants' lived experiences, beliefs, and contextual understandings related to reflective assessment practices. A purposive sampling strategy was used to recruit participants with direct experience in teaching or designing assessment in graduate programs, ensuring rich and relevant data aligned with the study's objectives.

A total of 19 participants, all residing and working in Tehran, were involved in the study. Participants included university professors, curriculum designers, and assessment coordinators from various public and private higher education institutions. Inclusion criteria required that participants had at least three years of teaching or assessment experience at the graduate level. Data collection continued until theoretical saturation was achieved, meaning no new themes emerged in the final rounds of interviews.

Data Collection

Data were collected through semi-structured, in-depth interviews conducted in face-to-face sessions. An interview guide was developed based on a review of relevant literature and was structured to elicit participants' views on assessment strategies, their implementation, and their perceived effectiveness in encouraging critical reflection. The interviews included open-ended questions such as "What assessment methods do you use to promote critical thinking and reflection in your graduate courses?" and "Can you describe a specific example where a reflective assessment strategy was particularly successful or unsuccessful?"

Each interview lasted between 45 and 75 minutes and was audio-recorded with the participants' informed consent. The recordings were transcribed verbatim to ensure accuracy and preserve the richness of the data.

Data analysis

Thematic analysis was used to analyze the qualitative data. The analysis followed Braun and Clarke's six-phase framework, including familiarization with data, initial code generation, theme identification, theme review, theme definition and naming, and report writing. The qualitative data analysis software NVivo was employed to assist in organizing, coding, and retrieving data systematically. Open coding was applied to the initial data, followed by axial and selective coding to refine and categorize emergent themes.

To ensure the trustworthiness of the study, strategies such as member checking, peer debriefing, and maintaining an audit trail were utilized. Member checking involved presenting selected findings to a subset of participants for validation, while peer debriefing sessions with fellow researchers helped reduce bias and enhance interpretive accuracy.

Findings and Results

Theme 1: Reflective Assessment Design

Integration of Reflective Tasks

Participants consistently emphasized the importance of integrating structured reflective tasks into assessment design. Commonly mentioned tools included reflective journals, self-assessment forms, and project-based inquiries. These formats helped students move beyond surface-level responses to analyze their assumptions and learning processes. One participant shared, "When I ask students to write a critical incident journal after a field activity, they begin to see the gap between theory and real-world application." Reflective assignments were also seen as fostering double-loop learning and deeper critical engagement.

Structured Reflection Prompts

Another key strategy involved using guided prompts to scaffold student reflection. These prompts often revolved around thematic reflection questions and metacognitive framing, allowing students to move from description to interpretation and judgment. A faculty member noted, "We provide reflection stems like 'I realized that...' or 'Initially I thought...' to nudge deeper analysis. Otherwise, students just describe what happened."

Alignment with Learning Outcomes

Participants highlighted the need to align reflective assessments with intended learning outcomes, especially those that required cognitive complexity. Reflection was most effective when it was intentionally mapped to goals such as ethical reasoning or integration of theory into practice. As one interviewee put it, "Reflection must not be a stand-alone activity. It should connect to what we are trying to achieve in the course cognitively and professionally."

Use of Rubrics for Reflection

Rubrics were commonly used to clarify expectations and evaluate depth of reflection. Participants used criteria such as insightfulness, connection to theory, and evolution of thinking. Rubrics helped shift reflection from a subjective to a developmental practice. A respondent remarked, "Without a rubric, students feel lost—when they see examples of levels of reflection, they aim higher."

Multimodal Assessment Formats

Several instructors explored diverse formats beyond traditional writing, including video logs, digital storytelling, and peer-reviewed portfolios. These formats allowed students to choose expressive modalities aligned with their learning styles. One participant explained, "One of my students created a short animation to reflect on their learning journey. It was insightful and honest—more than they would write."

Progressive Reflection Cycles

Participants noted the importance of longitudinal and cyclical reflection. Implementing checkpoints across the semester encouraged iterative thinking and self-monitoring. A professor shared, "We build in reflection after each module, so they can see how their perspectives change over time. It's about documenting a cognitive journey."

Interdisciplinary Integration

Participants described efforts to connect reflections across courses or disciplines, thereby broadening students' critical thinking and integrative capacity. For instance, one participant said, "We asked students to reflect on how leadership concepts apply in both education and health courses. That comparative thinking made their reflection more layered."

Theme 2: Instructor Facilitation Strategies

Feedback for Deeper Thinking

Participants underlined the importance of instructor feedback that challenges students to rethink their assumptions. Methods included prompting elaboration, questioning logic, and offering formative commentary. As one participant stated, "I ask follow-up questions like 'Why do you think that happened?' or 'What would you do differently?' It forces them to re-engage with their learning."

Creating a Safe Reflective Climate

A psychologically safe classroom climate was seen as essential for authentic reflection. Instructors emphasized non-evaluative feedback, emotional validation, and modeling vulnerability. One faculty member remarked, "If students think they're being judged, they'll write what they think we want to hear—not what they really believe."

Scaffolding Reflective Dialogue

Many participants reported that workshops, sentence stems, and guided group discussions were useful in scaffolding reflective conversations. These strategies supported students who were new to reflective practice. As one participant put it, "We can't expect deep reflection from day one. We have to teach them how to do it through modeling and coaching."

Encouraging Peer Reflection

Peer-based reflective activities such as dialog journals and collaborative debriefings were also reported. These created shared meaning and highlighted multiple perspectives. A participant shared, "When they see how differently others interpreted the same event, it stretches their thinking and validates their experience."

Time Allocation for Reflection

Several instructors raised concerns about time constraints and noted that deliberate scheduling of reflection periods improved the quality of student submissions. One stated, "When reflection is squeezed into the end of a session, it becomes mechanical. But if you create real time for it, students actually engage."

Encouragement of Reflexivity

Beyond structured reflection, many instructors encouraged reflexivity—awareness of one's positionality, assumptions, and cultural filters. This was often achieved through readings, class discussions, or reflective prompts. One participant noted, "I ask them to consider how their own identity shapes what they see and don't see. That's where real learning starts."

Theme 3: Institutional Support Mechanisms

Assessment Policy Flexibility

Participants identified rigid institutional policies as barriers to reflective assessment. Flexible guidelines were necessary to support innovative assessment types. A participant commented, "If the department requires uniform quizzes, there's no room for journals or portfolios. Policy must allow experimentation."

Professional Development

Ongoing training in reflective pedagogy was seen as a critical enabler. Workshops, mentoring, and faculty learning communities helped instructors refine their approaches. One participant shared, "I didn't understand how to teach reflection until I attended a training on metacognitive strategies—it changed everything."

Resource Accessibility

Access to digital platforms and reflective tools was essential for both instructors and students. Participants cited the need for centralized repositories, writing support, and audio/video reflection tools. One faculty member explained, "Our university's LMS now includes a reflection journal tool, which makes it easier to integrate into every course."

Recognition and Incentives

Recognition of reflective teaching through awards or research opportunities encouraged faculty engagement. Participants expressed that institutional acknowledgment validated their pedagogical choices. A participant said, "When my department highlighted my course's reflective design in a faculty newsletter, it motivated me to keep innovating."

Interdepartmental Collaboration

Collaboration across departments fostered the sharing of successful reflective practices and reduced instructional silos. As one instructor noted, "We created a cross-faculty committee to co-design interdisciplinary assessments. The reflections were richer because students had to link concepts from different domains."

Discussion and Conclusion

The findings of this study reveal a rich landscape of reflective assessment practices used by graduate-level instructors in Tehran, characterized by intentional design, dynamic instructor facilitation, and varying degrees of institutional support. The results highlight three overarching themes—reflective assessment design, instructor facilitation strategies, and institutional support mechanisms—each consisting of multiple subthemes and contextualized by practical approaches and nuanced insights. These findings align with and extend the existing literature on reflective pedagogy in higher education, suggesting both convergence and culturally situated distinctions in the implementation of assessment strategies to foster critical reflection.

The first major theme—Reflective Assessment Design—emphasizes the value of structured, aligned, and multimodal assessment formats. Participants strongly advocated for integrating reflective tasks into assessment through journals, incident reports, portfolios, and project-based inquiries. This finding is consistent with Boud, Keogh, and Walker (1985), who argue that the design of reflective tasks must involve more than an invitation to write; rather, it requires a framework that scaffolds insight and personal growth. Similarly, Moon (2004) highlights the necessity of structured reflection prompts and alignment with learning outcomes to avoid superficiality. The emphasis on rubrics and clear criteria in this study reflects findings by Driessen et al. (2005), who found that students benefit significantly from having concrete evaluative tools that demystify what "critical reflection" entails. Furthermore, the use of multimodal formats such as video logs and digital storytelling resonates

with research by Lee and Chiu (2021), who advocate for culturally responsive, flexible reflective modalities that cater to diverse learning styles.

An especially salient insight from the participants was the use of progressive reflection cycles—multiple, iterative checkpoints for reflective tasks over time. This approach aligns with the metacognitive models proposed by Kember et al. (2008), where reflection deepens across temporal stages when deliberately scaffolded. Additionally, the subtheme of interdisciplinary integration illustrates how educators encourage students to connect insights across course boundaries, echoing Schön's (1983) argument that reflection-in-action flourishes when learners make sense of complex, cross-contextual experiences.

The second theme—Instructor Facilitation Strategies—highlights the active role educators play in cultivating a climate where reflection can flourish. Feedback practices were central to this theme, with participants noting that depth in student reflection is often the result of sustained instructor questioning and prompting. This reflects findings by Carless and Boud (2018), who emphasize the importance of dialogic feedback in stimulating reflective thinking. Additionally, the emphasis on psychological safety and emotional validation speaks to Zembylas and Michaelides' (2004) assertion that reflective pedagogy is as much an affective endeavor as a cognitive one. Participants in this study repeatedly stressed that students must feel safe to be vulnerable—especially when engaging in reflexivity about their own biases and assumptions. This mirrors Brookfield's (2017) work on critical reflection as a disruptive, emotionally charged process requiring instructor sensitivity.

Another significant facilitator identified by instructors was the use of structured reflection dialogue, such as sentence stems and guided discussions. These scaffolds are vital in supporting learners who may be unfamiliar with reflective discourse, especially in contexts where educational traditions emphasize content mastery over introspective engagement. This finding corresponds with research by Hatton and Smith (1995), who propose that guided reflective dialogue can gradually move students from descriptive accounts to deeper levels of criticality. Similarly, the emphasis on peer reflection in this study is aligned with Ash and Clayton (2009), who found that structured peer engagement enhances reflective depth by exposing students to alternative perspectives and interpretations.

The third theme—Institutional Support Mechanisms—provides a broader contextual lens. Participants revealed that institutional flexibility in assessment policy is crucial for reflective practices to take root. When rigid, standardized evaluation systems dominate, there is limited room for the implementation of reflective tools. This challenge has been echoed in studies by Ryan (2011) and Clegg (2004), who highlight the tensions between innovation and institutional conformity. Equally important is the role of professional development, which participants viewed as essential for equipping instructors with the pedagogical literacy required to teach and assess reflection effectively. These findings underscore the need for faculty learning communities and structured workshops focused specifically on reflective practice, as noted by Jay and Johnson (2002).

The importance of resource accessibility—such as digital platforms for journaling or visual reflection—further supports Bolton's (2010) call for integrating reflection into the digital learning ecosystem. Access to institutional tools not only reduces the logistical barriers for instructors but also encourages students to engage in continuous, technologically mediated reflection. Finally, interdepartmental collaboration emerged as a unique and powerful enabler of reflective assessment. Participants described how cross-disciplinary efforts helped them design more integrated and meaningful assessments. This supports Loughran's (2002) findings that collaborative reflective spaces enhance the authenticity and transferability of student learning.

Collectively, these findings reinforce the multidimensional nature of reflective assessment in graduate education. They confirm that critical reflection is not an incidental outcome but a pedagogically orchestrated process requiring careful planning, sustained instructor engagement, and systemic support. The data also suggest that while many of the strategies used in Tehran

mirror global best practices, they are uniquely adapted to local cultural, institutional, and epistemological contexts—highlighting the importance of cultural responsiveness in reflective pedagogy (Hofstede, 2001; Khodabandelou, 2016).

References

Ash, S. L., & Clayton, P. H. (2009). Generating, deepening, and documenting learning: The power of critical reflection in applied learning. *Journal of Applied Learning in Higher Education, 1*(1), 25–48.

Bolton, G. (2010). *Reflective practice: Writing and professional development* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2013). *Feedback in higher and professional education: Understanding it and doing it well*. Routledge.

Boud, D., Keogh, R., & Walker, D. (1985). *Reflection: Turning experience into learning*. Kogan Page.

Brookfield, S. D. (2017). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: Enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 43*(8), 1315–1325. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354

Clegg, S. (2004). Critical readings: Progress files and the production of the autonomous learner. *Teaching in Higher Education, 9*(3), 287–298.

Driessen, E., van Tartwijk, J., van der Vleuten, C., & Wass, V. (2005). Portfolios in medical education: Why do they meet with mixed success? *Medical Education, 39*(9), 861–866.

Fook, J., & Gardner, F. (2007). *Practising critical reflection: A resource handbook*. Open University Press.

Hatton, N., & Smith, D. (1995). Reflection in teacher education: Towards definition and implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 11*(1), 33–49.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Jay, J. K., & Johnson, K. L. (2002). Capturing complexity: A typology of reflective practice for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 18*(1), 73–85.

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 & Evaluation in Higher Education, 33*(4), 369–379.

Khodabandelou, R. (2016). Reflection in Iranian higher education: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Education and Practice, 7*(36), 49–55.

Larrivee, B. (2000). Transforming teaching practice: Becoming the critically reflective teacher. *Reflective Practice, 1*(3), 293–307.

Lee, C. D., & Chiu, M. M. (2021). Engaging culturally diverse learners in reflective practice. *Educational Psychologist, 56*(3), 151–165.

Loughran, J. J. (2002). Effective reflective practice: In search of meaning in learning about teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(1), 33–43.

Mann, K., Gordon, J., & MacLeod, A. (2009). Reflection and reflective practice in health professions education: A systematic review. *Advances in Health Sciences Education, 14*(4), 595–621.

Mezirow, J. (1997). Transformative learning: Theory to practice. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 1997*(74), 5–12.

Moon, J. A. (2004). *A handbook of reflective and experiential learning: Theory and practice*. RoutledgeFalmer.

Rodgers, C. (2002). Defining reflection: Another look at John Dewey and reflective thinking. *Teachers College Record, 104*(4), 842–866.

Ryan, M. (2011). Improving reflective writing in higher education: A social semiotic perspective. *Teaching in Higher Education, 16*(1), 99–111.

Ryan, M. (2013). The pedagogical balancing act: Teaching reflection in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education, 18*(2), 144–155.

Ryan, M., & Ryan, M. (2015). A model for reflection in the pedagogic field: Linking reflective practice and transformative learning in higher education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 47*(8), 825–839.

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Basic Books.

Spalding, E., & Wilson, A. (2002). Demystifying reflection: A study of pedagogical strategies that encourage reflective journal writing. *Teachers College Record, 104*(7), 1393–1421.

Wald, H. S., & Reis, S. P. (2010). Beyond the margins: Reflective writing and development of reflective capacity in medical education. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 25*(7), 746–749.

Yan, Z. (2020). Assessing students' reflective learning in higher education: A systematic review of research outcomes. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 45*(4), 511–527.

Zembylas, M., & Michaelides, P. (2004). The sound of silence in pedagogy. *Educational Theory, 54*(2), 193–210.