



Anna Perkowska-Klejman

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4601-9877>

The Maria Grzegorzewska University, Warsaw, Poland; email: aperkowska@aps.edu.pl

Anna Odrowąż-Coates

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2112-8711>

The Maria Grzegorzewska University, Warsaw, Poland; email: acoates@aps.edu.pl; unescochair@aps.edu.pl

Polish Perspective on the Reflective Judgement Level Amongst Students of the Erasmus Programme

<http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/PBE.2021.002>

Abstract

Erasmus is the largest programme in history that supports student mobility in Europe. It improves foreign language skills and the soft skills of participants, enabling immersion in diverse cultures. Moreover, it is viewed as a driver for innovation and social inclusion in higher education, contributing to a rise in the self-esteem, independence and openness of participants. These features are the integral ingredients for high levels of reflective judgment, understood as self-referencing to one's own knowledge production, understanding the sources of knowledge, the contexts and the relativity of one's experience. In the empirical study presented in this paper, international Erasmus exchange students were subjected to standardised assessment of their reflective judgement level. Educational, social and familial experiences, connected to the latter were taken into account. The basic theoretical framing is derived from King and Kitchener's (1994) Reflective Judgment Model, based on 7 cognitive stages, characteristic of 3 different levels of reflectivity: pre-reflective, quasi-reflective and reflective. The results of presented study indicate that international Erasmus exchange students display high levels of reflective judgment and the authors argue that it may be due to several socio-educational factors including an ideal activating learning environment created by the programme.

Keywords: reflectivity, activating learning environment, higher education, Erasmus.

Introduction

In our view international Erasmus exchange programme offers ideal conditions for immersion in an activating learning environment that includes constant impulses from formal and informal settings, engaging students in the process of learning at all times. The issue of student engagement, as crucial for successful progress, was identified by Sharkness and DeAngelo (2011) and by Holmes (2018), who draws from Astin's work on 'involvement' in the nineteen-eighties, defined as 'the amount of physical and psychological energy that the student devotes to the academic experience' (Holmes, 2018, p. 23). Through the ongoing process of self-evaluation and being constantly evaluated by others in a wider context than usual, and in the majority of cases, in a foreign language environment, students are constantly engaged with the process of learning new skills. At the same time, Erasmus students find their exchange experiences exceptionally rewarding and therefore student satisfaction and the quality of the student experience is high, additionally motivating them to be engaged in this learning process. Student engagement has been already noted to be 'a useful proxy for what happens in the learning environment' by Zepke (2013, p. 99), which goes hand in hand with our research findings.

Reflective judgment is built on several important competencies that require independence and immersion in an authentic context, which is not possible to create in a laboratory or an ordinary classroom. These competencies are best developed by being confronted with ambiguity and a multitude of meanings, points of view and cultural differences. Authentic learning is critical, rational, and transformative (Serrano et al., 2018). Authentic learning may be aided by participating in Erasmus exchanges. It may combat learning burnout (Lin & Huang, 2012) by providing a stimulating and challenging new learning environment, reinvigorating reflective approaches.

Erasmus exchange programme in a bullet

Erasmus is the largest programme for student mobility in Europe, to exchange experiences, knowledge, information, world views, and values. Since 1987, 5 million students have taken part in the programme (EC, 2019). 300 thousand students participate in the programme every year. The largest study (involving 75 thousand students and graduates from 43 countries) of measurable effects of the Erasmus programme was carried out by "CHE Consult" in cooperation with organizations such as: "Brussels Education Services", "Compostela Group of

Universities” and “Erasmus Student Network” (ESN, 2012). 55 thousand were able to study or participate in traineeship abroad. Using qualitative methods, it was established that amongst diverse groups of students from Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, Lithuania, Portugal, Spain and the UK, participants emphasised shared personal traits: a sense of competence and trust in one’s own skills, openness to new challenges, curiosity, tolerance towards the values and behaviours of others, a sense of awareness of one’s strengths and weaknesses, awareness of goals and ease in making decisions and finally, the ability to solve problems in the context of a future career. This survey captured increased development of entrepreneurship, creativity, interpersonal and organizational skills as well as personal characteristics such as curiosity, decision-making, trust, determination, openness to ambiguity and vitality (EACEA, 2014).

A report on the influence of student mobility for the European Commission (FRSE, 2017) reveals the high social and cognitive skills of Erasmus exchange students (Krupnik & Krzaklewska, 2006). The latter confirms that students return more confident and prepared to solve problems better and faster. They are more efficiently organized and adapt more easily to new circumstances. Conclusions published in the reports by the European Commission are grounded in solid research, independent of any political establishment. For instance, Maiworm and Teichler (2002) confirmed that participation in the program enhances foreign language acquisition and gives advantage to participants of the program in the labour market. Similar conclusions were reported by Fombona et al. (2013). In his study, the percentage of students assessing their own foreign language skills as ‘poor’ decreased from 22 to 1 per cent after taking part in the exchange program, whilst the number of students reporting ‘solid knowledge’ of a foreign language increased from 25 to 50%. They also claimed that their CV gained an international character and therefore became good or excellent according to 78% of program participants. Moreover, according to Bryla (2015) approximately 68% of program participants gained foreign work experience 5–6 years after the Erasmus exchange. Multiple cross-cultural studies from the last 30 years show that international exchanges develop positive intergroup relations (Pettigrew, 1998; Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000; Kennworthy et al., 2005), decreasing national stereotypes and prejudice against the ‘other’ (Stroebe et al., 1988; Stangor et al., 1996; Ward et al., 2001), therefore supporting integration. Amongst the challenges connected to the programme, participants list: personal-psychological and social costs of adjustment, feeling alienated and missing home (Ward et al., 2001; Murphy-Lejeune, 2002).

Sigalas (2010) in a study carried out amongst British beneficiaries of the Erasmus programme and students who did not participate in the programme (“The Role of Personal Benefits ...”), tested if: it helps students develop a more positive attitude towards the EU and European integration; Erasmus students’ previous experiences abroad and personal background condition the outcome of the Erasmus experience.

The results confirmed a temporary pro-EU effect. Most participants in this study displayed greater flexibility in adjustment to new and changeable conditions. Those who had previously travelled internationally or lived abroad, found adaptation to the host country particularly smooth.

Theoretical framework

The theoretical context for the empirical study is anchored in the model of reflective judgment (RJ) by King and Kitchener (1994; 2002). This model was born out of curiosity as to what students think about ill-structured problems, those distinguished by a lack of a certain or commonly shared solution (nuclear power, euthanasia or abortion). People may look at these issues reflectively or non-reflectively. Reflectivity in such cases means auto-referencing to one’s own knowledge and to the ways it is produced. Reflective judgement is an advanced metacognitive process, initiated to monitor one’s own learning and thinking and to gauge the limitations of one’s knowledge, being aware of one’s own core value system, expectations and biases, which may affect one’s thinking process and behaviour. The model of reflective judgement is built in a gradual manner, where each stage reflects a slightly more complex and more sophisticated form of gaining knowledge and the ways of justifying one’s opinion about it. The seven stages of reflective judgment are divided into 3 levels of thinking: pre-reflective, quasi reflective and finally, the most advanced level: the reflective thinking (King & Kitchener, 2002). In Polish context, the RJ model was first empirically explored by Perkowska-Klejman (2014) as a reaction to a heavy criticism of this theory by Białecka-Pikul (2012). Further applicability of this theory to diverse pedagogical studies of reflectivity in higher education in Poland (Perkowska-Klejman, 2019a) led to the development of the one presented here.

Research design

The main aim of the empirical study was to establish the level of reflective judgment (RJ) amongst Erasmus exchange students. An additional matter of interest

for this study was to consider educational and socio-cultural issues that could diversify the overall average level of reflective judgement amongst them. Educational factors included: the field of study, level of study and foreign language acquisition. Socio-cultural issues taken into account were: the country of origin, parents and grandparents' education, parents' profession and holidays abroad. Age and gender were also tested as a potential factor. The authors did not find any previous attempts to study reflectivity of Erasmus students, therefore they withheld from formulating a hypothesis. King and Kitchener (1994) suggested that formal operations, academic ability, critical thinking and verbal aptitude are directly connected to the level of reflective judgement, whilst Guthrie, King and Palmer (2000) found that development of reflective judgement is a strong predictor of tolerance for diversity and identity development. Therefore, it is tempting to believe that Erasmus exchange students should display a high level of reflective judgement activated by the activating learning environment.

The RJ interview

Measuring of reflective judgment was carried out using The Reflective Judgment Interview (King & Kitchener, 1994). It is a semi-structured interview, containing specific descriptions of five cognitively ambiguous problems with several additional questions. Psychometric values of both orally conducted (Cronbach's alpha ranging from .75 to .96) (Wood & Kadrash, 2002) and the written version of the interview questionnaire are high (Cronbach's alpha = .85) (Perkowska-Klejman, 2018).

Every interview questionnaire filled in by the research participant was individually analysed to assess the level of reflective judgement displayed by the participant when dealing with each question on a scale 1–7. For example, an average of 3.9 means that the reflective judgment of the subject is at stage 4 (quasi-reflective level). Two independent judges (social scientists employed in the project) made this assessment to counteract any potential biases. The final level of reflective judgement was presented using the arithmetic mean, based on two expert judges' assessment for the answers given to each of five problems. The interview questionnaire also contained a short, anonymous demographic section for statistical record of educational and socio-cultural variables of each research participant.

Participants' selection and the data collection process

Table 1. Participant's details.

Variable	N	%
Gender		
Male	28	27.18
Female	75	72.82
Age (years)		
18–19	2	1.94
20–21	36	34.95
22–23	32	31.07
24–25	20	19.42
26 and above	13	12.62
Country of origin		
Albania	1	.97
Czech Republic	3	2.91
Greece	17	16.50
Spain	13	12.62
Germany	5	4.85
Poland	49	47.57
Slovenia	3	2.91
Turkey	4	3.88
Italy	8	7.76
Erasmus exchange country		
Belgium	9	8.74
Bulgaria	4	3.88
Czech Republic	3	2.91
Denmark	2	1.94
France	5	4.85
Greece	2	1.94
Spain	8	7.77
Netherlands	3	2.91
Germany	8	7.77
Poland	54	52.43
Sweden	3	2.91
Hungary	2	1.94
Level of study		
Bachelor	60	59.41
Master	33	32.67
Doctoral	8	7.92
Education profile		
Humanistic/social	49	47.57
STEM	30	29.13
Medical/biological	13	12.62
Art	11	10.68

Source: Authors' research.

As shown in table 1, 103 Erasmus students were qualified to participate in the study, 49 from Poland and 54 from other European countries who were visiting Poland on Erasmus exchange at the time of the study. The study took place between January 2018 and January 2019. The researched group was diverse in terms of nationality, age, educational level and the subject of study and there was no control group selected. Nevertheless, it was possible to make some preliminary comparisons, using the results obtained from the large Polish sample from a previous, unrelated study of reflective judgement amongst university students in Poland (Perkowska-Klejman & Odrowąż-Coates, 2019).

Research limitations

There are some reasons that pose limitations for the development of a more general theory. There was no clear indication found to show if participation in the Erasmus programme develops the competence of reflective judgment and to what extent it is already developed as a result of education in the country of origin. Doubts may be raised by the fact that the research was conducted in English, the most common language of European Erasmus exchange communication. To minimize the possible effect of insufficient language skills of the research participants, questionnaires indicating linguistic inefficiency were not considered, which is a weakness, as this language-based exclusionary practice poses problems for representation (Odrowąż-Coates, 2019). A dozen questionnaires were not suitable for analysis.

Research outcomes

The overall median amongst students, based on the model of reflective judgement was **M = 4.76 (SD = 1.01, min = 2.8; max = 6.60)**. The results placed participants on the fifth level, which is the higher level of quasi-judgement.

Kitchener, King and DeLuca (2006) distinguished an optimal level and a functional level of reflective judgement, typical to a certain age and certain socio-environmental conditions such as activating learning environment or the lack of thereof. The optimal level refers to reflective skill emergence and is the highest possible level that can be reached by an individual in favourable (stimulating to reflectivity) environmental conditions, including the possibility of experiencing different contexts first-hand. It is not related to the functional level, which is the modal educational level of reflective judgment stages, achieved by individuals bereft of activating learning environment, that would have stimu-

lated their reflective practice, but it didn't. This is analogous to the activating learning conditions of the Erasmus exchange, with diverse educational contexts evoking the reflective experience. The functional level is achieved by individuals bereft of stimulation and reflective practice, the optimal level by those immersed in an activating learning environment. The gap between the two levels was identified by Fischer (1980) as the individual's "developmental range" of functioning. In this study, the median of 4.76 for the Erasmus exchange students corresponds with the optimal level. When comparing two earlier studies on reflective judgment amongst Polish students to this research, the average level of RJ amongst the general student population in the first example was 4.22 (Perkowska-Klejman, 2014). In the second example, a preliminary pilot study on the RJ of Polish Erasmus exchange students showed an RJ level of 4.4 (Perkowska-Klejman, 2018a). This indicates a possible increase in reflective judgment due to the activating learning environment of the foreign exchange, which was further confirmed by the current study.

In this study, sex and age were tested as potential diversifying factors in the Erasmus students sample and the following results were found.

Table 2. Age, gender and the level of reflective judgment.

Variable	M (SD)	Statistical test results
Gender		
Male	4.51 (1.12)	t = 1.51 (p = 0.13)
Female	4.81 (.95)	
Age (years)		
18–19	4.30 (.71)	F = 4.82 (p = 0.001)
20–21	5.08 (.89)	
22–23	4.19 (.85)	
24–25	4.84 (1.17)	
26 and above	5.20 (.90)	

Source: Authors' research.

Sex did not affect the level of reflective judgement in the sample, as displayed in the table 2. Wood (1994) found that sex differences are directly correlated to the age of the participants. He noticed that in the younger age cohorts, women are more reflective than men, whilst the men outperform women in later years, after college and over 33. Based on this study we decided to test his findings in our study, but no statistically significant correlation was found ($F = .18$, $p = .947$).

The age of the research participants was a diversifying factor, which could have corresponded with Kitchener, King and DeLuca's, (2006) opinion that the

development of reflective judgment fortifies and grows with age. However, in our study, the age factor was not so straight forward. First of all, there were not enough older participants to confirm this trend. Secondly, age could be a masking factor. In order to test if it is or it is not, we carried out analysis of regression on five age groups, where age was considered an independent variable, which resulted in $Beta = -.39$ ($p = .059$). Moreover, we did so when the age was not categorized into 5 groups, which resulted in $Beta = .48$ ($p = .021$). Based on these results, we were not able to say that reflexivity grows with age. In fact, the median score for reflective judgment was the highest amongst participants in two specific age groups: 20–21 ($n = 36$) and 26 or over ($n = 13$), when set against other age groups. Taking into account that only 2 research participants were below the age of 20, we conclude that the most reflective were the youngest and the oldest groups. The youngest group displayed positive traits, being brave, open towards new cultures, mind-independent, clever and resourceful.

Educational factors and the level of reflective judgment

Table 3. Educational factors and the level of reflective judgment.

Variable	M (SD)	Statistical test results
Level of study		
Bachelor	4.75 (1.00)	F = 4.41 (p = .01)
Master	4.59 (1.03)	
Doctoral	5.73 (.38)	
Education profile		
Humanistic/social sciences	4.58 (.95)	F = 3.44 (p = .02)
STEM	4.90 (.95)	
Medical/biological	5.43 (.98)	
Art	4.36 (1.03)	
Foreign language skills		
1 foreign language (n = 64)	4.86 (1.04)	t = 1.18 (p = .24)
2 foreign languages (n = 38)	4.62 (.93)	

Source: Authors' research.

The highest scores of reflective judgment were achieved by doctoral candidates and, to our surprise, not Master but Bachelor level students (please see table 3). The increase in the level of reflective judgement connected to progressing through the levels of studies was confirmed by many previous studies, so we were surprised to find a difference in our study. Kitchener, King and DeLuca (2006) showed following scores of reflective judgment rising with the years of study amongst college students: M = 3.63 – Freshman, M = 3.57 – Sophomore,

M = 3.75 – Junior, M = 3.99 – Senior, and graduate students: M = 4.62 – early master's, M = 4.76 – doctoral average, M = 5.27 – doctoral advanced. King, Kitchener and Wood (1994), analysing secondary sources from 25 other studies that used reflective judgement interviews (RJI) proved that scores increased slowly but steadily across educational levels from the first year of college (M = 3.6) to the senior year of college (M = 4.0) to early graduate study (M = 4.6) to advanced doctoral study (M = 5.3). Similar differences connected to years of college study were confirmed by Wood (1997), where freshman and sophomores tended to score within level 3, whereas only seniors consistently reached level 4. With our results placing Bachelor students reflectivity level above those at Masters level, we attempted to look for intermediary variables that could affect our result. We carried out multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), using the level of reflective judgement as independent variable, level of study as a dependent variable and the country of origin and the country of destination as intermediary variables. We established that intermediary variables did not disturb the research results. A potential distortion might have come from the fact that level of study often corresponded with age. The correlation of age and the level of study was measured using Pearson coefficient, which was .82 ($p < .001$). This triggered further analysis of treating age as an intermediary variable. The result of a correlated analysis of variance, in which the reflective judgment level was treated as a differentiating factor, both the level of study and the age of the respondents were equal to $F = 1.8$ and were at the border of statistical significance $p = .051$. Therefore, it is concluded that the level of study on its own, differentiated the level of reflective judgment and the age was not a masking variable.

Amongst other factors taken into consideration was the discipline of study. The highest reflective judgment level was displayed by students of medical/biological and science students, followed by humanities and social sciences, with artistic disciplines at the lower end. In our study we were unable to capture a before and after effect, but we used the level of studies as a variable that may reveal something interesting. Mean scores in the statistical model taking into account both the level of studies and the discipline gave us results with no statistical significance: $F = 1.32$ ($p = .256$).

The final educational variable that we considered was the ability to communicate fluently in foreign languages. The participants declared very good knowledge of 1 or 2 foreign languages. One person declared solid knowledge of 3 languages but as a single case, it was not taken into account for statistical analysis. When comparing reflective judgment level and knowledge of one or

two foreign languages, it revealed no statistical correlation and therefore is not a differencing variable for reflective judgement levels.

Socio-cultural factors and the level of reflective judgement

Studying the level of reflective judgement, we considered differences in the social and individual capital of participants based on their family's cultural capital and their earlier experiences of staying abroad. We tested if these factors diversify the level of reflective judgement, as shown in the table 4.

Table 4. Country of origin, foreign experience factors and the level of reflective judgment.

Variable	M (SD)	Statistical test results
country of origin		
Albania	3.40 (N/A)	
Czech Republic	5.80 (.70)	
Greece	4.86 (.96)	
Spain	5.03 (1.11)	
Germany	5.56 (.62)	F = 1.96 (p = .06)
Poland	4.59 (1.01)	
Slovenia	5.07 (.46)	
Turkey	3.80 (.08)	
Italy	4.75 (1.15)	
Previous stays abroad		
Yes (n=89)	4.75 (1.01)	
No (n=14)	4.81 (1.02)	t = -.23 (p = .82)
Previous studies abroad		
Yes (n = 13)	4.82 (.98)	
No (n = 90)	4.32 (1.11)	t = 1.68 (p = .09)

Source: Authors' research.

Neither the country of origin, nor previous exposure to being abroad were a statistically valid factor for reflective judgement level. Although, we did not form any pre-hypothesis in this matter and there are no previous studies in this area, we were surprised to note that previous exposure to foreign countries did not have an impact on the reflective judgement. We were surprised because there is a volume of studies dedicated to the influence of travelling abroad on enhancement of personal and social competences (FRSE, 2007; Sigalas, 2010; Ballatore & Ferede, 2013; Ścigala, 2014).

In social sciences the family of origin is considered most important in the formation of children and young people and their educational achievement (Bourdieu & Passeron, 2006; Dolata & Sitek, 2015). This is a universal, worldwide, cross-culture phenomenon, regardless of the developmental level of

a country. Based on this shared relation we wanted to establish if the education level of parents and even grandparents and parents' profession may be linked to the level of reflective judgement of their adult children.

Over half of the research participants declared that their parents had higher education confirming relatively high status of Erasmus exchange students. The elitist character of the Erasmus programme was highlighted by Walczak (2007) who in her study of Erasmus exchange students found an even higher number of students: 70% whose parents had higher education. However, neither the mother's nor father's educational attainment correlated with the level of reflexivity displayed by their adult children in our research. It was interesting to see that Erasmus students whose fathers had a basic level of education, displayed equally high levels of reflectivity to those whose fathers had higher levels of education. This indicates that students studying abroad, whose parents have relatively low educational attainment, are of particular interest since they achieve educational heights despite their initial low cultural capital. This leads us to the conclusion that their high level of reflective judgement is not coincidental, but is a factor that enabled them to be where they are now.

We also considered the professions of parents, based on International Standard Classification of Occupations ISCO-88, established at the XIV International Conference for Occupational Statisticians in Geneva 1987 and updated in 1994 to address requirements posed by the EU: ISCO-88 (COM). Our intuition turned out to be correct, that the influence of mother's or father's profession on student's reflectivity level was verified in statistical analysis. Comparing median scores in reflective judgement amongst Erasmus exchange students, we found that children of fathers who were specialists or office workers and whose mothers were office workers, scored significantly higher than other groups. The two cases of parents in the military were also amongst the highest scorers.

The grandparents' education did not correlate with the level of reflective judgement amongst research participants, even if they spent a lot of time with them in childhood. In summary, we found that education level and profession of previous generations are factors that may affect reflexive judgment skills. We also found that family factors studied by us were not an obvious or straightforward source of reflective socialization of our interlocutors.

Conclusions

Erasmus students gain first-hand experience of many perspectives, different points of view, clash of cultures and opinions. They notice various controversies;

they know that the world is not black and white. These are all, specific features, and characteristic of higher levels of reflective judgement. They gain experiences that cannot be achieved by students in only one, single learning environment. They turn out to be critical thinkers, constantly expanding their views and development, updating knowledge, and acting as professionals open to the world.

The results pertain to the development of the reflective judgment category and the possible implications that an active learning environment has in the situation of foreign exchanges. Psychological theories of human development (Piaget, Erikson, Kohlberg, Flavell, Perry, Kegan), responsible for the drawing of the final model of reflective judgment used in the study, assumed that human cognitive and moral development comes with age. The same connection was established with the development of reflective judgment.

In this small empirical study we confirmed that selected factors related to education, and the basic educational experience, differentiated the level of reflective judgment amongst research participants. Secondly, the results of the study allowed us to state that the experience of studying abroad is additionally associated with high reflectivity. From the methodological point of view, the trap of this study was the issue of socio-cultural and educational capital of young people participating in the Erasmus programme. A relatively high level of reflective judgment by Erasmus students can be influenced by additional factors, partially confirmed by the results of this study. The reflectivity of Erasmus students was also diversified by the professions of their parents that may be linked to a reflective socialization at home. We also found that a foreign educational environment, may be an enabler of active learning, which nourishes the development of reflective judgement skills. To fully confirm the validity of findings the issue requires further investigation and additional studies in different countries and on a larger scale.

References

- Badanie wpływu programu Erasmus*. [A Study of Erasmus Programme Influence]. Retrived 14 October 2019 from https://issuu.com/frse/docs/erasmus_impact_study_pl.
- Ballatore, M., & Ferede, M. (2013). The Erasmus Programme in France, Italy and the United Kingdom: Student Mobility as a Signal of Distinction and Privilege. *European Educational Research Journal*, 12(4), 525–533, doi: 10.2304/eej.2013.12.4.525.
- Białecka-Pikul, M. (2012). *Narodziny i rozwój refleksji nad myśleniem*. [The Birth and the Development of Reflection About Thinking]. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.C. (1990). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London and Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Boyd, L.D. (2008). Development of Reflective Judgement in the Pre-Doctoral Dental Clinical Curriculum. *European Journal of Dental Education*, 12, 149–158, doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0579.2008.00511.x.
- Bryla, P. (2015). The Impact of International Student Mobility on Subsequent Employment and Professional Career: A Large-Scale Survey Among Polish Former Erasmus Students. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 176, 633–641, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.521.
- Dolata, R., & Sitek, M. (2015). *Raport o stanie edukacji 2014. Egzamininy zewnętrzne w polityce i praktyce edukacyjnej* [Report on Education 2013. External Exams in Policy and Practice]. Warszawa: Instytut Badań Edukacyjnych.
- EACEA (2014). *The Erasmus Impact Study*. Retrieved 14 October 2019 from https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/sites/eacea-site/files/erasmus-impact_en.pdf.
- EC (2019). *Erasmus+: A Turning Point in the Lives of 5 Million European Students*. Retrieved 11 October 2019 from https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/news/erasmus-impact-studies_en.
- ESN (2012). *The Erasmus Impact Study, Effects of Mobility on the Skills and Employability of Students and the Internationalization of Higher Education Institutions*. Retrieved 14 October 2019 from <https://esn.org/erasmus-impact-study>.
- European Commission (2013). *Report to the European Commission on Improving the Quality of Teaching and Learning in Europe's Higher Education Institutions*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Fischer, K.W., & Pruyne, E. (2002). Reflective Thinking in Adulthood: Emergence, Development, and Variation. In: J. Demick, & C. Andreoletti (Eds.), *The Handbook of Adult Development* (pp.169–198). New York: Plenum.
- Fombona, J., Rodríguez, C., & Sevillano, P. (2013). The Motivational Factor of Erasmus Students at the University. *International Education Studies*, 6(4). Retrieved 11 October 2019 from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1067594.pdf>.
- FRSE (2017). *Erasmus – co to dla mnie znaczy? 20-lecie programu Erasmus w Polsce* [Erasmus – What Does This Mean to Me? 20 Years of Erasmus in Poland]. Warszawa: Fundacja Rozwoju Systemu Edukacji.
- Gaertner, S., & Dovidio, J. (2000). *Reducing Intergroup Bias*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Guthrie, V.L., King, P.M., & Palmer, C.J. (2000). Cognitive Capabilities Underlying Toleran-

- ce for Diversity Among College Students. Retrieved 14 Mai 2019 from www.diversity-web.org/digest/sp.sm00/tolerance.html.
- Holmes, N. (2018). Engaging With Assessment: Increasing Student Engagement Through Continuous Assessment. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 19(1), 23–34.
- Kennworthy, J., Turner R., Hewstone, M., & Voci, A. (2005). Intergroup Contact: When Does It Work, and Why? In: J.F. Dovidio, P. Glick, & L. Rudman (Eds.), *On the Nature of Prejudice* (pp. 278–92). Oxford: Blackwell.
- King, P., & Kitchener, K. (1994). *Developing Reflective Judgment*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- King, P., & Kitchener, K. (2002). The Reflective Judgment Model: Twenty Years of Research on Epistemic Cognition. In: B. Hofer, & P. Pintrich (Eds.), *Personal Epistemology: The Psychology of Beliefs About Knowledge and Knowing* (pp. 37–61). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, Publisher.
- King, P., & Kitchener, K. (2004). Reflective Judgment: Theory and Research on the Development of Epistemic Assumptions Through Adulthood. *Educational Psychologist*, 39(1), 5–18.
- Kitchener, K., King, P., & DeLuca, S. (2006). Development of Reflective Judgment in Adulthood. In: C. Hoare (Ed), *Handbook of Adult Development and Learning* (pp.73–98). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Krupnik, S., & Krzaklewska, E. (2006). *Studenci Erasmosa w Polsce, Raport z badania Erasmus Student Network* [Erasmus Students in Poland. Erasmus Student Network Study Report]. Warszawa: Fundacja Rozwoju Systemu Edukacji.
- Lin, S., & Huang, H. (2012). Investigating the Relationships Between Loneliness and Learning Burnout. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 13(3), 231–43.
- Maiworm, F., & Teichler, U. (2002). The Students' Experience. In: U. Teichler (Ed), *Erasmus in the Socrates Programme* (pp. 83–115). Bonn: Lemmens.
- Murphy-Lejeune, E. (2002). *Student Mobility and Narrative in Europe: The New Strangers*. London: Routledge.
- Odrowąż-Coates, A. (2019). *Socio-Educational Factors and the Soft Power of Language: The Deluge of English in Poland and Portugal*. New York: Lexington Books, Rowman & Littlefield.
- Odrowąż-Coates, A., & Perkowska-Klejman, A. (2017). A Preliminary Study of Polish Students' Attitude for Thinking Reflexively, Differentiated by Higher Education Faculties and the Level of Study. *Society Register*, 1, 97–106, doi: 10.14746/sr.2017.1.1.09.

- OECD (2005). *The Definition and Selection of Key Competencies*. Retrieved 21 October 2019 from <https://www.oecd.org/pisa/35070367.pdf>.
- Perkowska-Klejman, A. (2014). Reflective Judgment – Assessment of Intellectual Development of Pupils, Students and Graduates. *Ruch Pedagogiczny*, 4, 69–84.
- Perkowska-Klejman, A. (2018). Studiowanie za granicą a osądzanie refleksyjne. [Studying Abroad and Reflective Judgement]. *Studia Pedagogiczne. Problemy społeczne, edukacyjne i artystyczne*, 32, 204–223.
- Perkowska-Klejman, A. (2018a). How to Solve Cognitive Problems? – Reflectiveness of Erasmus Students. *Pedagogika Szkoły Wyższej*, 1, 55–70.
- Perkowska-Klejman, A., & Odrowąż-Coates, A. (2019). Measuring the Unmeasurable? Differences in Reflexive Thinking Amongst Polish Students. *The New Educational Review*, 55 (1), 77–88.
- Perkowska-Klejman, A. (2019a). *Poszukiwanie refleksyjności w edukacji. Studium teoretyczno-empiryczne* [Searching for Reflectivity in Education. Empirical and Theoretical Study]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo APS.
- Pettigrew, T.F. (1998). Intergroup Contact Theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 65–85, doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.49.1.65.
- Serrano, M.M., O’Brien, M., Roberts, K., & Whyte, D. (2018). Critical Pedagogy and Assessment in Higher Education: The Ideal of ‘Authenticity’ in Learning. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 19(1), 9–21, doi: 10.1177/1469787417723244.
- Sharkness, J., & DeAngelo, L. (2011). Measuring Student Involvement: A Comparison of Classical Test Theory and Item Response Theory in the Construction of Scales from Student Surveys. *Research in Higher Education*, 52, 480–507, doi: 10.1007/s11162-010-9202-3.
- Sigalas, E. (2010). The Role of Personal Benefits in Public Support for the EU: Learning from the Erasmus Students. *West European Politics*, 33(6), 1341–1361.
- Stangor, C., Jonas, K., Stroebe, W., & Hewstone, M. (1996). Influence of Student Exchange on National Stereotypes, Attitudes and Perceived Group Variability. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26(4), 663–75, doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(199607)26:4<663::AID-EJSP778>3.0.CO;2-6.
- Stroebe, W., Lenkert, A., & Jonas, K. (1988). Familiarity May Breed Contempt: The Impact of Student Exchange on National Stereotypes and Attitudes. In: W. Stroebe, A. Kruglanski, D. Bar-Tal, & M. Miles Hewstone (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Conflict* (pp.167–87). London: Springer-Verlag.

- Szubert, T. (2013). *Program Erasmus w opinii polskich studentów* [Erasmus Programme in Polish Students' Opinion]. Warszawa: Fundacja Rozwoju Systemu Edukacji.
- Ścigala, O. (2014). Pokolenie Erasmusa – przykład tożsamości europejskiej w praktyce? [Erasmus Generation – Example of European Identity in Practice?]. In: J. Osiński, & Z. Popławska (Eds.), *Oblicza społeczeństwa obywatelskiego* [The Faces of Citizenship], (pp. 143–156). Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza SGH w Warszawie.
- Teichler, U. (2002). *Erasmus in the Socrates Programme*. Bonn: Lemmens.
- Walczak, D. (2017). Za i przeciw międzynarodowej mobilności studentów i naukowców [For and Against International Mobility of Students and Scientists]. In: R. Siemieńska (Ed.), *Uniwersytety, naukowcy i studenci w zglobalizowanym świecie* [Universities, Scientists and Students in the Globalized World.], (pp. 123–144). Warszawa: Scholar.
- Ward, C., Bochner, S., & Furnham, A. (2001). *The Psychology of Culture Shock*. Hove: Routledge.
- Ward, C., Bochner, S., & Furnham, A. (2001). *The Psychology of Culture Shock*. Hove: Routledge.
- Wood, P., & Kardash, C. (2002). Critical Elements in the Design and Analysis of Studies of Epistemology. In: B.K. Hofer, & P.R. Pintrich (Eds.), *Personal Epistemology: The Psychology of Beliefs About Knowledge and Knowing* (pp. 231–260). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Wood, P. (1994). *A Secondary Analysis of Claims Regarding the Reflective Judgment Interview: Internal Consistency, Sequentiality and Intra-Individual Differences in Ill-Structured Problem-Solving*. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Zepke, N. (2013). Threshold Concepts and Student Engagement: Revisiting Pedagogical Content Knowledge. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 14(2), 97–107, doi:10.1177/1469787413481127.