

# Further development of the reflective practice questionnaire

Shane L Rogers<sup>Corresp., 1</sup>, Lon Van Winkle<sup>2</sup>, Nicole Michels<sup>2</sup>, Cherie Lucas<sup>3</sup>, Hassan Ziada<sup>4</sup>, Eduardo Jorge Da Silva<sup>5</sup>, Amit Jotangia<sup>6</sup>, Sebastian Gabrielsson<sup>7</sup>, Silje Gustafsson<sup>7</sup>, Lynn Priddis<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Psychology, Edith Cowan University, Perth, Western Australia, Australia

<sup>2</sup> Medical Humanities, Rocky Vista University, Denver, Colorado, United States of America

<sup>3</sup> Pharmacy, University of Technology Sydney, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

<sup>4</sup> Dental Medicine, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Nevada, United States of America

<sup>5</sup> Physical Education and Sport, University of Lusofona, Lisbon, Portugal

<sup>6</sup> Cygnet Health Care, Stevenage, United Kingdom

<sup>7</sup> Health, Education and Technology, Lulea University of Technology, Lulea, Sweden

<sup>8</sup> Law School, The University of Western Australia, Perth, Western Australia, Australia

Corresponding Author: Shane L Rogers

Email address: shane.rogers@ecu.edu.au

**Background.** This paper provides an update of the Reflective Practice Questionnaire (RPQ). The original RPQ consisted of 40-items with 10-sub-scales. In this paper, the RPQ is streamlined into a 10-item single reflective practice construct, and a 30-item extended version that includes additional sub-scales of confidence, uncertainty/stress, and work satisfaction.

**Methods.** 501 university students filled out an online questionnaire that contained the original Reflective Practice Questionnaire, and two general measures of reflection: The Self-Reflection and Insight Scale, and the Rumination-Reflection Questionnaire.

**Results.** Based on factor analysis, the RPQ was streamlined into a brief 10-item version, and an extended 30-item version. Small positive correlations were found between the RPQ reflective practice measure and the measures of general reflection, providing discriminant validity evidence for the RPQ. The RPQ was found to be sensitive to differences among industries, whereas the general measures of reflection were not. The reflective practice means for the updated RPQ were found to be higher for health and education industries where reflective practice is more commonplace, when compared to retail and food/accommodation industries.

# 1 Further development of the reflective practice 2 questionnaire

3

4 Shane L Rogers<sup>1</sup>, Lon Van Winkle<sup>2</sup>, Nicole Michels<sup>2</sup>, Cherie Lucas<sup>3</sup>, Hassan Ziada<sup>4</sup>, Eduardo  
5 Jorge Da Silva<sup>5</sup>, Amit Jotangia<sup>6</sup>, Sebastian Gabrielsson<sup>7</sup>, Silje Gustafsson<sup>7</sup>, Lynn Priddis<sup>8</sup>

6

7 <sup>1</sup> Psychology, Edith Cowan University, Perth, Western Australia, Australia

8 <sup>2</sup> Medical Humanities, Ricky Vista University, Denver, Colorado, U.S.A.

9 <sup>3</sup> Pharmacy, University of Technology Sydney, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

10 <sup>4</sup> Dental Medicine, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Nevada, U.S.A.

11 <sup>5</sup> Physical Education and Sport, University of Lusofona, Lisbon, Portugal

12 <sup>6</sup> Cygnet Health Care, Stevenage, U.K.

13 <sup>7</sup> Health, Education and Technology, Lulea University of Technology, Lulea, Sweden

14 <sup>8</sup> Law School, The University of Western Australia, Perth, Western Australia, Australia

15

16 Corresponding Author:

17 Shane L Rogers<sup>1</sup>

18 270 Joondalup Drive, Perth, Western Australia, 6027, Australia

19 Email address: shane.rogers@ecu.edu.au

20

21

## 22 Abstract

23

24 **Background.** This paper provides an update of the Reflective Practice Questionnaire (RPQ). The  
25 original RPQ consisted of 40-items with 10-sub-scales. In this paper, the RPQ is streamlined into  
26 a 10-item single reflective practice construct, and a 30-item extended version that includes  
27 additional sub-scales of confidence, uncertainty/stress, and work satisfaction.

28 **Methods.** 501 university students filled out an online questionnaire that contained the original  
29 Reflective Practice Questionnaire, and two general measures of reflection: The Self-Reflection  
30 and Insight Scale, and the Rumination-Reflection Questionnaire.

31 **Results.** Based on factor analysis, the RPQ was streamlined into a brief 10-item version, and an  
32 extended 30-item version. Small positive correlations were found between the RPQ reflective  
33 practice measure and the measures of general reflection, providing discriminant validity evidence  
34 for the RPQ. The RPQ was found to be sensitive to differences among industries, whereas the  
35 general measures of reflection were not. The reflective practice means for the updated RPQ were  
36 found to be higher for health and education industries where reflective practice is more  
37 commonplace, when compared to retail and food/accommodation industries.

38

39

## 40 Introduction

41

42 The reflective practice questionnaire (RPQ) was first introduced to the research community as a  
43 40-item questionnaire that contains several sub-scales for assessing self-reported reflective  
44 practice and confidence, stress, and work satisfaction (Priddis & Rogers 2018). Following  
45 publication, it became apparent from emails of inquiry that many people interested in the  
46 measure were practitioners seeking to make use of the RPQ as part of reflective practice  
47 initiatives within the workplace. With 40-items across 10 subscales the original RPQ provides a  
48 broad range of information that can be useful for research studies, however in applied settings  
49 people have time and resource constraints that can make such a lengthy questionnaire unwieldy.  
50

51 Therefore, the primary aim of the current study is to conduct further refinement of the RPQ to  
52 reconceptualise the questionnaire as a brief 10-item measure of reflective practice, while also  
53 maintaining a longer version of the questionnaire which we re-label as the Reflective Practice  
54 Questionnaire - Extended version (RPQ-E). A secondary aim of the study is to examine  
55 associations between the RPQ and other general reflection measures to provide evidence that the  
56 RPQ provides measurement of reflective practice rather than more generalised reflective  
57 tendencies.  
58

### 59 *Measuring self-reported reflective practice*

60

61 The notion of reflective practice is broad, and conceptualisations can vary based on the focus of  
62 reflection (e.g., task-focused and/or relational-focused), the context of reflection (e.g., work  
63 context versus learning context), when it occurs (e.g., during action versus after action), with  
64 who it occurs (e.g., self-reflection versus reflection with others), and how it occurs (e.g.,  
65 meditative versus critical reflection) (Greenberger 2020; Hebert 2015; Mezirow 1991; Ooi et al.  
66 2021; Schon 1995; Thompson & Pascal 2012; Tsingos et al. 2014). In this paper our  
67 conceptualisation of reflective practice as measured by the reflective practice questionnaire can  
68 be described as the tendency to actively reflect upon the thoughts and actions that occur when  
69 working with clients. These reflections might be about relational aspects of working with clients  
70 (e.g., Are they or I frustrated?), or more task focused (e.g., Are we making good progress?).  
71 Reflections can potentially occur in-the-moment during interaction (i.e., reflection-in-action) or  
72 sometime after the interaction has occurred (i.e., reflection-on-action). Reflections can be about  
73 one's own thoughts/actions and/or those of the client/s. The reflections can be either more  
74 meditative in nature (i.e., wondering with simple curiosity) or more critical (i.e., critically  
75 questioning ways of thinking/doing).  
76

### 77 *The Reflective Practice Questionnaire (RPQ)*

78

79 The RPQ was originally designed as an instrument to measure both self-reported reflective  
80 practice alongside several other variables that have relevance for reflective practice: Desire for  
81 improvement, general confidence, communication confidence, uncertainty, stress, and work  
82 satisfaction (Priddis & Rogers 2018). The RPQ sets itself apart from other self-report reflection  
83 measures by predominately focusing on working with clients, and by utilising broad phrasing so  
84 that the measure can be used across a wide range of professions where reflective practice is

85 relevant (For a discussion, see: Priddis & Rogers 2018). For example, doctors and nurses  
86 interacting with patients, or teachers interacting with students, among others.

87  
88 Studies have been conducted utilising the RPQ with medical students (Bari et al. 2021; Horst et  
89 al. 2019; Khoshgoftar & Barkhordari-Sharifabad 2023; Lee et al. 2023; Rogers et al. 2019;  
90 Schwartz et al. 2020; Van Winkle et al. 2021; Van Winkle et al. 2022), surgeons/physicians  
91 (Aitken et al. 2021; Whelehan et al. 2021), nurses (Aitken et al. 2021; Al-Osaimi 2022;  
92 Gabrielsson et al. 2022; Gustafsson et al. 2020; Khalil & Hashish 2022), psychologists (Sadusky  
93 & Spinks 2022), allied health professionals (Aurora et al. 2023; Or & Golba 2023; Parrott et al.  
94 2023), pre-service teachers (Day et al. 2022; Fuertes-Camacho et al. 2021), qualified teachers  
95 (Chen & Chen 2022; Gross 2020; Moeder-Chandler 2020), and sport coaches (Da Silva et al.  
96 2022). In these studies the RPQ has been used for a range of purposes, such as assessment of the  
97 reliability of the RPQ scales (e.g., Gustafsson et al. 2020), comparison between different sub-  
98 groups of participants (e.g., Day et al. 2022), and comparison across different time points to  
99 explore student development (e.g., Van Winkle et al. 2021).

100  
101 Van Winkle and colleagues have published work that demonstrates how the RPQ can be used as  
102 part of evaluation of teaching methods (Horst et al. 2019; Schwartz et al. 2020; Van Winkle et al.  
103 2021; Van Winkle et al. 2022). For example, Van Winkle et al. (2021) found that self-reported  
104 reflective practice and a self-report empathy measure significantly increased for most medical  
105 students enrolled in a 4-month online course that included activities designed to facilitate the  
106 development of reflective practice. In another example, Van Winkle et al. (2022) found that the  
107 magnitude of increase in self-reported reflective practice and empathy was higher for prospective  
108 medical students who completed a course that included reflection specifically on their service-  
109 learning activities compared to students that completed a similar course with reflection only on  
110 other broader activities.

111  
112 Several other scholars have also made use of the RPQ when evaluating learning activities (Da  
113 Silva et al. 2022; Khalil & Hashish 2022). Da Silva et al. (2022) found that self-reported  
114 reflective practice was higher for a group of sport coaches that underwent a reflective journalling  
115 intervention compared with a control group. Khalil and Hashish (2022) found that average self-  
116 reported reflective practice increased after reflective practice training, and that self-reported  
117 reflective practice was positively associated with self-reported critical thinking tendencies.

118  
119 *The present study - Considerations for further development of the reflective practice*  
120 *questionnaire*

121  
122 Since the initial publication of the RPQ in 2018, correspondence received from researchers and  
123 practitioners has informed our reflections on how the RPQ might best serve the community that  
124 uses it. In our initial development of the RPQ we were interested in developing a comprehensive  
125 questionnaire. The RPQ was published with ten sub-scales, five that were focused on elements of  
126 reflective practice (i.e., reflection in action, reflection on action, self-appraisal, and reflection  
127 with others) with the remaining six sub-scales focused on other constructs of relevance to  
128 reflective practice (i.e., desire for improvement, general confidence, confidence in  
129 communication, uncertainty, stress interacting with clients, and job satisfaction).

130

131 Something that became apparent to us was that perhaps the RPQ contained too many sub-scales.  
132 Both researchers and practitioners were most interested in a simple and clear measure of self-  
133 reported reflective practice. In response to this we published a follow up paper in 2019 proposing  
134 a single reflective practice score by averaging across the four reflective practice sub-scales of the  
135 RPQ (Rogers et al. 2019). We were not surprised to see most of the subsequent studies utilising  
136 the RPQ made use of this more simplified conceptualisation of the reflective practice measure  
137 (Al-Osaimi 2022; Bari et al. 2021; Da Silva et al. 2022; Day et al. 2022; Gabrielsson et al. 2022;  
138 Gross 2020; Gustafsson et al. 2020; Horst et al. 2019; Khalil & Hashish 2022; Or & Golba 2023;  
139 Schwartz et al. 2020; Van Winkle et al. 2021; Van Winkle et al. 2022; Whelehan et al. 2021).

140  
141 Considering that the use of an overall single reflective practice score has emerged as the most  
142 popular usage for the RPQ, we felt that it would be worthwhile investigating the scope for a  
143 shorter version of the combined RPQ reflective sub-scales. We also felt it was desirable to revisit  
144 the other sub-scales within the original RPQ to explore if some aggregation across the sub-scales  
145 might be statistically justifiable. Therefore, a primary aim of the present study was to explore if  
146 the RPQ structure could be simplified. We utilised factor analytic techniques to achieve this aim.

147  
148 A secondary aim of the present study was to examine if the measure of self-reported reflective  
149 practice obtained by the RPQ can be considered separable to broader measures of reflection. The  
150 RPQ was designed as a measure specifically targeted on the act of reflection in work practice  
151 with clients. However, it has not previously been examined if the RPQ can provide different  
152 information compared to more general trait-based measures of self-reflection. In the present  
153 study we compare the RPQ with two well-cited general measures of self-reflection, the Self-  
154 Reflection and Insight Scale (Grant et al. 2002), and the Rumination-Reflection Questionnaire  
155 (Trapnell & Campbell 1999).

156

## 157 **Materials & Methods**

158

### 159 *Participants*

160

161 Prior to conducting this research ethical approval was obtained from the Edith Cowan University  
162 ethics review board. Ethics reference number: 2019-00741-ROGERS. Five hundred and one  
163 undergraduate psychology students participated in this study for 0.5 credit points for a research  
164 participation component in a statistics unit. A requirement for participation was that the person  
165 must be currently employed in paid work in addition to their university studies. Research consent  
166 was obtained in a check box as part of the online survey. The main industries that participants  
167 indicated they worked in were Retail (25%), health care and social assistance (19%), education  
168 and training (13%), and accommodation and food services (13%). The remaining 30% worked in  
169 other miscellaneous industries. All participants indicated that they interact with clients at least  
170 once a month, with a specific breakdown: Every day (81%), every few days (14%), about once a  
171 week (3%), about once a fortnight (1%), and about once a month (1%).

172

### 173 *Measures*

174

175 Each participant answered the 40-item *Reflective Practice Questionnaire* (Priddis & Rogers  
176 2018). In this study we changed the response scale from the original 6-point Not at all –

177 Extremely scale to be a 6-point Very rarely – Almost always scale (scoring: 1. Very rarely 2.  
178 Rarely 3. Sometimes 4. Often 5. Very often 6. Almost always). Some minor modifications were  
179 made to the individual items of the questionnaire to account for the change in response scale.  
180 After sub-scales were determined via the factor analysis, sub-scale scores were calculated via  
181 averaging across relevant items. A brief evaluation study examining the change of response scale  
182 from the original RPQ can be found as document titled ‘RPQ response scale evaluation’  
183 alongside the raw data for this article at: <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.22776251.v1>.

184  
185 Two other questionnaires were used in this study: The 20-item *Self-Reflection and Insight Scale*  
186 (SRIS) (Grant et al. 2002), and the 24-item *Rumination-Reflection Questionnaire* (RRQ)  
187 (Trapnell & Campbell 1999). Prior studies have consistently reported good reliability values for  
188 both questionnaires (DaSilveira et al. 2015; Grant et al. 2002; Harrington & Loffredo 2010;  
189 Trapnell & Campbell 1999).

190  
191 The SRIS contains two sub-scales, Self-reflection sub-scale (Note, this sub-scale is comprised of  
192 two strongly correlated sub-facets: Engagement in self-reflection, for example: “I frequently take  
193 time to reflect on my thoughts”, and need for self-reflection, for example “It is important for me  
194 to evaluate the things that I do”), and Insight sub-scale, for example “I usually have a very clear  
195 idea about why I’ve behaved in a certain way” (Grant et al. 2002). When answering the SRIS  
196 participants were asked “Please rate your level of disagreement/agreement for each statement on  
197 a scale that ranges from (1) Strongly disagree to (6) Strongly agree”. In between the two poles  
198 (i.e., 1 and 6) the numbers (2), (3), (4), and (5) were presented as options. Sub-scale scores were  
199 calculated by averaging across relevant items.

200  
201 The RRQ contains two sub-scales, Rumination, for example “I often reflect on episodes of my  
202 life that I should no longer concern myself with”, and Reflection, for example “I love analysing  
203 why I do things” (Trapnell & Campbell 1999). When answering the RRQ participants were  
204 asked “Please rate your level of disagreement/agreement for each statement”. The response scale  
205 used was (1) Strongly disagree (2) Disagree (4) Neutral (5) Agree (6) Strongly agree. Sub-scale  
206 scores were calculated by averaging across relevant items.

207

## 208 **Results**

209

### 210 *Factor analysis of the updated RPQ – The reflective practice scale*

211

212 The raw data for this manuscript is available at: <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.22776251.v1>.  
213 An exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the 16-items of the RPQ that prior studies have  
214 previously combined to provide a ‘reflective capacity’ measure. These items consisted of the  
215 reflection-in-action, reflection-on-action, reflection-with-others and self-appraisal sub-scales  
216 from the original RPQ. The exploratory factor analysis was conducted using the statistical  
217 software Stata, using the principal factors method, applying an oblique Promax rotation. Two  
218 factors had an eigenvalue greater than 1 (i.e., factor 1 = 6.19, factor 2 = 1.32). The factor  
219 loadings from this analysis are presented in Table 1.

220

221 <Insert Table 1 here>

222

223 As can be seen in Table 1 the reflection-with-others (RO) items loaded onto the second factor.  
224 There are two reasons we suggest this might be the case. First, a point of difference between the  
225 RO items and all others is that the wording of the RO items lacks specific reference to working  
226 with clients, and instead refers simply to ‘work’. This may lead some participants to interpret  
227 these items in a broader sense in comparison to other items. Second, the RO items are specific to  
228 the notion of reflecting with others, whereas all other items make no explicit mention of others.  
229 Based on the factor analysis result, we made the decision to cut-down the RPQ reflection  
230 measure by removal of the RO items.

231

232 The removal of the RO items reduces the item count from 16 to 12. We felt it was desirable to  
233 attempt to reduce a little further to get the scale down to 10 items. This is simply because a 10-  
234 item scale would be more user friendly for scoring (i.e., dividing by 10 is easier than dividing by  
235 12). We noticed an item from the self-appraisal scale had a lower than ideal factor loading of  
236 0.31 (i.e., “I think about my strengths for working with clients”). We decided that removal of  
237 that item was justifiable, and we also decided on removal of the other self-appraisal item about  
238 weaknesses to leave remaining the two self-appraisal items that have more general phrasing. This  
239 results in 10 items for our proposed ‘reflective practice’ scale to represent the core scale of the  
240 reenvisioned RPQ. This revised scale is provided at the end of this article in Table 5.

241

#### 242 *Factor analysis of the updated RPQ – The extended version of the RPQ*

243

244 A follow up exploratory factor analysis was conducted to further examine consolidation of the  
245 extended form of the RPQ. In this analysis we included the 10 reflective practice items from the  
246 prior analysis alongside all other items from the original RPQ. An exception was the desire for  
247 improvement items that we left out of the analysis because since publication of the original RPQ  
248 this sub-scale has not appeared to have been of much interest/use. The same type of exploratory  
249 factor analysis was conducted as the prior analysis, using the principal factors method, applying  
250 an oblique Promax rotation. Four factors had an eigenvalue greater than 1 (i.e., factor 1 = 5.93,  
251 factor 2 = 5.48, factor 3 = 2.53, factor 4 = 1.15). The rotated factor loadings from this analysis  
252 are presented in Table 2. These factors represent reflective practice, confidence,  
253 uncertainty/stress, and work satisfaction. This revised extended scale is provided at the end of  
254 this article in Table 6.

255

256 <Insert Table 2 here>

257

#### 258 *Comparisons among industry means.*

259

260 For all measures we compared across the different industry groups by running a series of one-  
261 way ANOVAs with Follow up Bonferroni adjusted comparisons. We excluded the ‘other’  
262 category when running the analyses. An overall difference among reflective practice means was  
263 found,  $F(4,405) = 6.60, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .06$ , see Table 3. Follow up comparisons revealed that this  
264 result was due to the Health and Education profession means being significantly higher than the  
265 retail and accommodation & food means ( $ps < .05$ , although note education & retail comparison  
266  $p = .08$ ). There was no difference among the administration, retail, and accommodation & food

267 groups ( $p > .05$ ). Nor was there any difference between the health and education groups ( $p >$   
268  $.05$ ).

269  
270 There was an overall difference found among RPQ confidence means,  $F(4,405) = 2.88$ ,  $p = .02$ ,  
271  $\eta_p^2 = .03$ , however this was due to a marginally significant difference only between the retail and  
272 accommodation/food mean ( $p = .04$ ). There was no significant difference among RPQ  
273 uncertainty/stress means,  $F(4,405) = 1.20$ ,  $p = .31$ . There was an overall difference found among  
274 RPQ work satisfaction means,  $F(4,405) = 23.13$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .19$ , with follow up comparisons  
275 revealing statistical differences among means followed the pattern: Health = Education  $>$   
276 Administration  $>$  Retail = Accommodation/food.

277  
278 For SRIS self-reflection there was no difference among the industry means,  $F(4,405) = 0.99$ ,  $p =$   
279  $.41$ . There was an overall difference among means for SRIS insight,  $F(4,405) = 6.01$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  
280  $\eta_p^2 = .06$ , with follow up comparisons revealing that this result was due to the Administration  
281 industry mean higher than the retail and accommodation & food means ( $p < .001$ ), with all other  
282 comparisons non-significant. There was no difference among profession means for RRQ self-  
283 reflection ( $F(4,405) = 0.10$ ,  $p = .98$ ), or rumination,  $F(4,405) = 0.32$ ,  $p = .87$ .

284

285 <Insert Table 3 here>

286

287 *Correlations between the RPQ, SRIS, and RRQ.*

288

289 Correlations among all measures are presented below in Table 4. Of particular interest are the  
290 correlations between the RPQ reflective practice measure with the SRIS self-reflection ( $r = .32$ ,  $p$   
291  $< .05$ ) and RRQ self-reflection ( $r = .23$ ,  $p < .05$ ) measures. Both associations are of relatively  
292 weak magnitude. To double check that these associations are not the result of analysing a sample  
293 where people from different industries are lumped together, we checked the correlations after  
294 splitting the datafile by industry group. This did not change the overall result, with the  
295 correlation between RPQ reflective practice and SRIS self-reflection ranging from  $.12 - .48$ , and  
296 the correlation between RPQ reflective practice and RRQ self-reflection ranging from  $.09 - .45$ ,  
297 across the industry groups.

298

299 <Insert Table 4 here>

300

## 301 **Discussion**

302

303 In this study we propose a revision of the Reflective Practice Questionnaire (RPQ) that was  
304 originally published by Priddis and Rogers (2018). Guided by factor analysis results, we propose  
305 a revised 10-item version of the RPQ that provides a self-report measure of reflective practice.  
306 We also propose a 30-item version of the questionnaire that we call the RPQ extended (RPQ-E).  
307 This version contains the 10-item reflective practice scale along with additionally sub-scales for  
308 confidence, uncertainty/stress, and work satisfaction. A secondary aim was to compare the RPQ  
309 with two general measures of self-reflection to test if the RPQ can be considered as providing a  
310 measure of reflective practice that is distinct from general reflection measures. We found low

311 correlations between the RPQ and the general self-reflection measures that provides support for  
312 this assertion.

313

### 314 *Modification of the RPQ*

315

316 An initial overall change from the original RPQ is to change the response scale from a 6-point  
317 ‘Not at all – Extremely’ to a 6-point ‘Very rarely – Almost always’ Likert-type scale. The  
318 reasoning behind this decision is that on reflection we expect that asking participants the extent  
319 that they engage in reflective practice might be confusing for some participants. For example, a  
320 participant might not fully understand the difference between being reflective ‘moderately’  
321 versus ‘very much’. Whereas it should be easier for a participant to reflect on how often they  
322 engage in reflective thought and behaviours asked via the RPQ items. We concede there might  
323 still be some uncertainty, for example deciding between ‘sometimes’ versus ‘often’, however we  
324 believe this still constitutes an improvement over the original response scale.

325

326 Most research studies to date using the RPQ have averaged across the original RPQ sub-scales  
327 ‘reflection-in-action’, ‘reflection-on-action’, ‘reflection with others’, and ‘self-appraisal’ for a  
328 16-item measure of reflective practice (Al-Osaimi 2022; Bari et al. 2021; Da Silva et al. 2022;  
329 Day et al. 2022; Gabrielsson et al. 2022; Gross 2020; Gustafsson et al. 2020; Horst et al. 2019;  
330 Khalil & Hashish 2022; Schwartz et al. 2020; Van Winkle et al. 2021; Van Winkle et al. 2022;  
331 Whelehan et al. 2021). In the present study, an exploratory factor analysis revealed that the  
332 ‘reflection with others’ items loaded onto a separate factor, so these were dropped. We also made  
333 the decision to drop an item from the ‘self-appraisal’ items with a low loading on the reflective  
334 practice primary factor. We also dropped one more of the ‘self-appraisal’ items to bring the  
335 measure down to 10 items to make it easier for averaging items to create the overall score. We  
336 expect these changes will make using the RPQ more user friendly, especially in applied settings.

337

338 We also used factor analysis results to inform decision making to simplify the sub-scales of the  
339 extended version of the RPQ to include ‘confidence’, ‘uncertainty/stress’, and ‘work  
340 satisfaction’, alongside the 10-item ‘reflective practice’ component. The full extended version of  
341 the RPQ has therefore changed from the original 40-item questionnaire with 10 sub-scales to a  
342 30-item questionnaire with 4 sub-scales. We expect these changes will make the extended  
343 version of the RPQ more user friendly.

344

### 345 *Comparing the RPQ with general measures of reflection*

346

347 An additional aim of the present study was to contrast the RPQ with more general measures of  
348 self-reflection. The goal was to provide some evidence that the RPQ reflective practice measure  
349 provides a measure that can be differentiated from more general self-reflective tendencies of an  
350 individual. We therefore included two well-cited general measures of self-reflection in our study,  
351 the Self-Reflection and Insight Scale (SRIS) (Grant et al. 2002), and the Rumination-Reflection  
352 Questionnaire (RRQ) (Trapnell & Campbell 1999). As expected, the RPQ reflective practice  
353 score was found to only have weak positive associations with these measures, suggesting that it  
354 does measure a different construct.

355

356 Additionally, the RPQ reflective practice mean was found to be significantly higher for  
357 participants in the healthcare and education industries compared with other industries such as  
358 retail and food/accommodation. This is consistent with Priddis and Rogers (2018) original  
359 findings and is consistent with the intuitive notion that reflective practice would be higher in  
360 workplaces where reflective practice is encouraged and/or explicitly taught as part of  
361 qualifications. The SRIS and RRQ general self-reflection measures did not differ across the  
362 industry groups. This provides some further evidence for the validity of the RPQ as a measure of  
363 reflective practice.

364

### 365 *Limitations and future research*

366

367 An inherent limitation associated with the RPQ is the self-report nature of the measure. Just  
368 because a person thinks they are very reflective, does not guarantee this to be true. Any self-  
369 report measures of reflection should be used with this in mind, and thus used with caution.  
370 However, we argue this does not invalidate the use of such measures. As reviewed in our  
371 introduction to this paper, evidence does exist suggesting that the RPQ can be sensitive to  
372 changes in reflective practice tendencies of individuals (Aitken et al. 2021; Da Silva et al. 2022;  
373 Horst et al. 2019; Khalil & Hashish 2022; Schwartz et al. 2020; Van Winkle et al. 2021; Van  
374 Winkle et al. 2022).

375

376 Another limitation of the present study is the reliance on a convenience sample of university  
377 students. We were originally planning on having several participant groups, however the  
378 COVID-19 pandemic introduced challenges for that data collection. Regardless, we argue the  
379 sample we obtained is serviceable for the purposes of the current paper. In future research we  
380 will continue validation work of the RPQ across different samples, and for different applications  
381 of the RPQ. Introducing the more user-friendly version of the RPQ in this current paper we  
382 expect will help facilitate that process.

383

384 While we believe the refinement of the RPQ as presented in this paper is a step forward in the  
385 development of the questionnaire, we also recognise that simplifying the questionnaire may not  
386 be beneficial for all potential applications of the questionnaire. For example, Sadusky and Spinks  
387 (2022) reported that burnout was associated with the stress sub-scale of the original RPQ, but not  
388 with the uncertainty sub-scale. Therefore, research questions that dig deeper into the sub-aspects  
389 contained with the RPQ may benefit from using the original version of the RPQ or breaking  
390 down the combined sub-scales of the updated RPQ (e.g., separating the uncertainty/stress subs-  
391 scale into separate uncertainty and stress scores).

392

## 393 **Conclusions**

394

395 The purpose of the current study was to further refine the reflective practice questionnaire with  
396 the intention of making it more streamlined. In this article we provide a slightly modified version  
397 of the RPQ (see Tables 5 and 6 below) that we believe will make it a more user-friendly  
398 questionnaire for both researchers and practitioners. The RPQ is free to use and there is no  
399 requirement to obtain permission from the authors for use. However, we do enjoy hearing from  
400 people about how they are using it and are always happy to receive emails from letting us know  
401 what you are using it for, or any questions you may have.

402

403 &lt;Insert Table 5&gt;

404

405 &lt;Insert Table 6&gt;

406

407 **References**

408

409 Aitken JA, Torres EM, Kaplan SA, DiazGranados D, Su L, and Parker SH. 2021. Influence of simulation-  
410 based training on reflective practice. *BMJ Simulation & Technology Enhanced Learning* 7:1-7.  
411 10.1136/bmjstel-2021-000870

412 Al-Osaimi DN. 2022. Saudi nursing student satisfaction and evaluation of reflective practice: a cross  
413 sectional study. *Nursing Forum*:1-7. 10.1111/nuf.12707

414 Aurora M, Mawren D, and Fullam R. 2023. An exploratory evaluation of the impact and acceptability of a  
415 structured reflective practice program piloted with staff in a forensic mental health setting.  
416 *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*. 10.1080/14999013.2023.2174213

417 Bari A, Imran I, Ullah H, Arshad A, Naeem I, and Sadaqat N. 2021. Reflection as a learning tool in  
418 postgraduate medical education. *Journal of the College of Physicians and Surgeons Pakistan*  
419 31:1094-1098. 10.29271/jcpsp.2021.09.1094

420 Chen Z, and Chen R. 2022. Exploring the key influencing factors on teachers' reflective practice skill for  
421 sustainable learning: A mixed methods study. *International Journal of Environmental Research*  
422 *and Public Health* 19:11630. 10.3390/ijerph191811630

423 Da Silva EJ, Mallett CJ, Sanchez-Oliva D, Dias A, and Palmeira A. 2022. A coach development program: A  
424 guided online reflective practice intervention study. *Journal of Sports Sciences* 40:1041-1053.  
425 10.1080/02640414.2022.2045795

426 DaSilveira A, DeSouza ML, and Gomes WB. 2015. Self-consciousness concept and assessment in self-  
427 report measures. *Frontiers in Psychology* 6:930. 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00930

428 Day SP, Webster C, and Killen A. 2022. Exploring initial teacher education student teachers' beliefs about  
429 reflective practice using a modified reflective practice questionnaire. *Reflective Practice*.  
430 10.1080/14623943.2022.2048260

431 Fuertes-Camacho MT, Dulsat-Ortiz C, and Alvarez-Canocas I. 2021. Reflective practice in times of covid-  
432 19: A tool to improve education for sustainable development in pre-service teacher training.  
433 *Sustainability* 13:6261. 10.3390/su13116261

434 Gabrielsson S, Engstrom A, Lindgren B-M, Molin J, and Gustafsson S. 2022. Self-rated reflective capacity  
435 in post-registration specialist nursing education students. *Reflective Practice*.  
436 10.1080/14623943.2022.2071245

437 Grant AM, Franklin J, and Langford P. 2002. The self-reflection and insight scale: A new measure of  
438 private self-consciousness. *Social Behavior and Personality* 30:821-836.

439 Greenberger SW. 2020. Creating a guide for reflective practice: applying Dewey's reflective thinking to  
440 document faculty scholarly engagement. *Reflective Practice* 21:458-472.  
441 10.1080/14623943.2020.1773422

442 Gross TL. 2020. Building the best: A quantitative evaluation of a state-level teacher retention strategy  
443 designed to increase self-efficacy, reflective capacity, and job satisfaction through effective  
444 professional development Doctor of Education. University of Missouri-Columbia.

445 Gustafsson S, Engstrom A, Lindgren B-M, and Gabrielsson S. 2020. Reflective capacity in nurses in  
446 specialist education: Swedish translation and psychometric evaluation of the reflective capacity  
447 scale of the reflective practice questionnaire. *Nursing Open* 8:546-552. 10.1002/nop2.659

- 448 Harrington R, and Loffredo DA. 2010. Insight, rumination, and self-reflection as predictors of well-being.  
449 *The Journal of Psychology* 145:39-57.
- 450 Hebert C. 2015. Knowing and/or experiencing: a critical examination of the reflective models of John  
451 Dewey and Donald Schon. *Reflective Practice* 16:361-371. 10.1080/14623943.2015.1023281
- 452 Horst A, Schwartz BD, Fisher JA, Michels N, and Van Winkle LJ. 2019. Selecting and performing service-  
453 learning in a team-based learning format fosters dissonance, reflective capacity, self-  
454 examination, bias mitigation, and compassionate behavior in prospective medical students.  
455 *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 16:3926.  
456 10.3390/ijerph16203926
- 457 Khalil AI, and Hashish EA. 2022. Exploring how reflective practice training affects nurse interns' critical  
458 thinking disposition and communication skills. *Nursing Management* 29.  
459 10.7748/nm.2022.e2045
- 460 Khoshgoftar Z, and Barkhordari-Sharifabad M. 2023. Medical students' reflective capacity and its role in  
461 their critical thinking disposition. *BMS Medical Education* 23:Article number 198.  
462 10.1186/s12909-023-04163-x
- 463 Lee YJ, Kim YR, Lee HH, Kyung SY, Jung SR, Park KH, and Yune SJ. 2023. Validation of the Korean version  
464 of the Reflective Practice Questionnaire in clinical clerkship of Korean medical students. *Korean*  
465 *Journal of Medical Education* 35. 10.3946/kjme.2023.256
- 466 Mezirow J. 1991. *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco, U.S.A.: Jossey-Bass.
- 467 Moeder-Chandler M. 2020. Teacher reflective practice and perceptions on overall job satisfaction  
468 Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership PhD thesis. Trident University International.
- 469 Ooi SM, Fisher P, and Coker S. 2021. A systematic review of reflective practice questionnaires and scales  
470 for the healthcare professionals: a narrative synthesis. *Reflective Practice* 22:1-15.  
471 10.1080/14623943.2020.1801406
- 472 Or J, and Golba E. 2023. A correlational study on reflective capacity and ethical engagement in adult  
473 learners of health professions. *Adult Learning*. 10.1177/10451595231178279
- 474 Parrott J, Speerhas T, Klick BD, Vazifedan T, and Guins T. 2023. Interprofessional reflective practice to  
475 improve pediatric healthcare outcomes. *Reflective Practice*. 10.1080/14623943.2023.2235585
- 476 Priddis L, and Rogers SL. 2018. Development of the reflective practice questionnaire: preliminary  
477 findings. *Reflective Practice* 19:89-104. 10.1080/14623943.2017.1379384
- 478 Rogers SL, Priddis L, Michels N, Tieman M, and Van Winkle LJ. 2019. Applications of the reflective  
479 practice questionnaire in medical education. *BMC Medical Education* 19:47. 10.1186/s12909-  
480 019-1481-6
- 481 Sadusky A, and Spinks J. 2022. Psychologists' engagement in reflective practice and experiences of  
482 burnout: a correlational analysis. *Reflective Practice* 23:593-606.  
483 10.1080/14623943.2022.2090326
- 484 Schon DA. 1995. *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. England: Bookpoint.
- 485 Schwartz BD, Horst A, Fisher JA, Michels N, and Van Winkle LJ. 2020. Fostering empathy, implicit bias  
486 mitigation, and compassionate behavior in a medical humanities course. *International Journal of*  
487 *Environmental Research and Public Health* 17. 10.3390/ijerph17072169
- 488 Thompson N, and Pascal J. 2012. Developing critically reflective practice. *Reflective Practice* 13:311-325.  
489 10.1080/14623943.2012.657795
- 490 Trapnell PD, and Campbell JD. 1999. Private self-consciousness and the five-factor model of personality:  
491 Distinguishing rumination from reflection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 76:284-  
492 304. 10.1037/0022-3514.76.2.284
- 493 Tsingos C, Bosnic-Anticevich L, and Smith L. 2014. Reflective practice and its implications for pharmacy  
494 education. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education* 78:18. 10.5688/ajpe78118

495 Van Winkle LJ, Schwartz BD, Horst A, Fisher JA, Michels N, and Thornock BO. 2021. Impact of a pandemic  
496 and remote learning on team development and elements of compassion in prospective medical  
497 students taking a medical humanities course. *International Journal of Environmental Research  
498 and Public Health* 18:4856. 10.3390/ijerph18094856

499 Van Winkle LJ, Thornock BO, Schwartz BD, Horst A, Fisher JA, and Michels N. 2022. Critical reflection on  
500 required service to the community propels prospective medical students toward higher  
501 empathy, compassion, and bias mitigation but are these gains sustainable? *Frontiers in Medicine*  
502 9. 10.3389/fmed.2022.976863

503 Whelehan DF, Conlon KC, and Ridgway PF. 2021. If in doubt don't act out! Exploring behaviours in  
504 clinical decision making by general surgeons towards surgical procedures. *World Journal of  
505 Surgery* 45:1055-1065. 10.1007/s00268-020-05888-2

506

**Table 1** (on next page)

Factor loadings from exploratory factor analysis on the reflective practice items from the original reflective practice questionnaire. Loadings less than 0.40 are omitted for clarity.

\*Note, sub-scale items from the original RPQ: RiA = Reflection-in-action, RoA = Reflection-on-action, RO = Reflection-with-others, SA = Self-appraisal.

1

Item	Factor 1.	Factor 2.	Uniqueness.
1 (RiA). During interactions with clients I recognize when my pre-existing beliefs are influencing the interaction.	0.59		0.69
2 (RiA). During interactions with clients I consider how my personal thoughts and feelings are influencing the interaction.	0.77		0.46
3 (RiA). During interactions with clients I recognize when my client's pre-existing beliefs are influencing the interaction.	0.60		0.60
4 (RiA). During interactions with clients I consider how their personal thoughts and feelings are influencing the interaction.	0.68		0.54
5 (RoA). After interacting with clients I spend time thinking about what was said and done.	0.65		0.57
6 (RoA). After interacting with clients I wonder about the client's experience of the interaction.	0.75		0.52
7 (RoA). After interacting with clients I wonder about my own experience of the interaction.	0.71		0.47
8 (RoA). After interacting with clients I think about how things went during the interaction.	0.80		0.37
9. (RO) When reflecting with others about my work I become aware of things I had not previously considered.		0.63	0.61
10. (RO) When reflecting with others about my work I develop new perspectives.		0.79	0.42
11. (RO) Reflecting with others about my work helps me to work out problems.		0.68	0.50
12. (RO) I gain new insights when reflecting with others about my work.		0.83	0.35
13. (SA) I think about my strengths for working with clients.	0.31		0.74
14. (SA) I think about my weaknesses for working with clients.	0.56		0.61
15. (SA) I think about how I might improve my ability to work with clients.	0.44		0.52
16. (SA) I critically evaluate the strategies and techniques I use in my work with clients.	0.58		0.51

2

**Table 2** (on next page)

Exploratory factor analysis of the Reflective Practice Questionnaire - Extended (RPQ-E). Loadings less than 0.40 are omitted for clarity.

\*Note, sub-scale items from the original RPQ: RiA = Reflection-in-action, RoA = Reflection-on-action, RO = Reflection-with-others, SA = Self-appraisal, CG = Confidence-General, CC = Confidence-Communication, UNC = Uncertainty, STR = Stress, JS = Job satisfaction.

1

Item	Factor loadings				Uniqueness
	1.	2.	3.	4.	
1 (RiA). During interactions with clients I recognize when my pre-existing beliefs are influencing the interaction.	0.48				0.71
2 (RiA). During interactions with clients I consider how my personal thoughts and feelings are influencing the interaction.	0.69				0.51
3 (RiA). During interactions with clients I recognize when my client's pre-existing beliefs are influencing the interaction.	0.63				0.59
4 (RiA). During interactions with clients I consider how their personal thoughts and feelings are influencing the interaction.	0.77				0.48
5 (RoA). After interacting with clients I spend time thinking about what was said and done.	0.63				0.58
6 (RoA). After interacting with clients I wonder about the client's experience of the interaction.	0.69				0.52
7 (RoA). After interacting with clients I wonder about my own experience of the interaction.	0.72				0.48
8 (RoA). After interacting with clients I think about how things went during the interaction.	0.80				0.38
9. (SA) I think about how I might improve my ability to work with clients.	0.53				0.52
10. (SA) I critically evaluate the strategies and techniques I use in my work with clients.	0.67				0.44
11. (CG) I feel like I have all the experience I require to effectively interact with clients.		0.78			0.46
12. (CG) I feel like I have all the practical skills I require to effectively interact with clients.		0.86			0.32
13. (CG) I feel like I have learnt everything I need to know in order to effectively interact with clients.		0.66			0.61
14. (CG) I feel like I have all the theoretical knowledge I require to effectively interact with clients.		0.72			0.53
15. (CC) I feel able to communicate so that a client can understand me easily.		0.60			0.52
16. (CC) I feel confident when communicating my ideas with a client.		0.46			0.49
17. (CC) I feel that I provide clear messages to my clients.		0.58			0.48
18. (CC) I feel capable in my ability to communicate with clients.		0.63			0.35
19. (UNC) I am uncertain that my planning for a client is the best possible way to proceed.			0.47		0.75
20. (UNC) I am uncertain that I am interpreting the needs of a client correctly.			0.50		0.61
21. (UNC) I am uncertain about how to handle the needs of a client.			0.61		0.48
22. (UNC) I am uncertain that I properly understand the needs of a client.			0.51		0.64
19. (STR) After interacting with clients I feel exhausted.			0.65		0.59
20. (STR) I find interacting with a client to be stressful.			0.75		0.42
21. (STR) I feel distressed after communicating with a client.			0.70		0.52

22. (STR) The pressure to meet needs of a client can feel overwhelming.			0.62		0.58
27. (JS) My work provides me with a sense of fulfilment.				0.87	0.23
28. (JS) I feel like my work means more to me than simply earning money.				0.79	0.33
29. (JS) I enjoy my work.				0.89	0.22
30. (JS) I find my work rewarding.				0.59	0.57

2

**Table 3** (on next page)

Means (with standard deviation in brackets) for the sub-scales of the RPQ-E, SRIS, and RRQ separated by industry groups.

1

	Health	Education	Admin.	Retail	Acomm./ Food	Other	Total	Cronbach's Alpha
RPQ. Reflective Practice	4.03 (0.78)	3.98 (0.74)	3.67 (0.90)	3.65 (0.86)	3.46 (0.89)	3.77 (0.82)	3.76 (0.85)	.89
RPQ. Confidence	4.08 (0.75)	4.19 (0.74)	4.25 (0.93)	4.37 (0.84)	4.01 (0.76)	4.26 (0.78)	4.21 (0.81)	.87
RPQ. Uncertainty/ Stress	2.67 (0.77)	2.77 (0.83)	2.52 (0.73)	2.75 (0.75)	2.71 (0.75)	2.66 (0.78)	2.69 (0.77)	.83
RPQ. Work Satisfaction	4.61 (1.00)	4.72 (0.94)	4.13 (1.11)	3.61 (1.14)	3.53 (0.93)	3.92 (1.18)	4.05 (1.15)	.86
SRIS. Self- reflection	4.85 (0.82)	4.73 (0.96)	4.92 (0.88)	4.68 (0.99)	4.68 (1.03)	4.92 (0.82)	4.79 (0.92)	.93
SRIS. Insight	4.28 (0.86)	4.30 (0.94)	4.64 (0.87)	4.02 (0.92)	4.01 (0.89)	4.44 (0.89)	4.25 (0.92)	.85
RRQ. Reflection	3.58 (0.68)	3.53 (0.79)	3.61 (0.90)	3.59 (0.76)	3.57 (0.67)	3.82 (0.79)	3.62 (0.77)	.93
RRQ. Rumination	3.59 (0.68)	3.65 (0.90)	3.69 (0.81)	3.69 (0.73)	3.70 (0.74)	3.57 (0.83)	3.65 (0.77)	.93

2

3

**Table 4**(on next page)

Pearson correlations among the sub-scales of the RPQ-E, SRIS, and RRQ.

Note: \*p < .05

	RPQ. Ref. Prac.	RPQ. Conf.	RPQ. Unc./ Stress	RPQ. Work Satisfaction	SRIS. Self- reflection	SRIS. Insight	RRQ. Reflection	RRQ. Rumination
RPQ. Ref. Prac.	1							
RPQ. Conf.	.17*	1						
RPQ. Unc./Stress	.26*	-.40*	1					
RPQ. Work Satisfaction	.30*	.21*	-.22*	1				
SRIS. Self- reflection	.32*	.13*	-.06	.09*	1			
SRIS. Insight	.06	.27*	-.40*	.20*	.32*	1		
RRQ. Reflection	.23*	.03	-.03	.10*	.71*	.26*	1	
RRQ. Rumination	.14*	-.19*	.38*	-.22*	.19*	-.36*	.11*	1

1

**Table 5** (on next page)

The Reflective Practice Questionnaire (RPQ).

Note: Scoring instructions, average across all items to obtain a score that can potentially range from 1 - 6.

1 Please rate how often each statement applies to you:

	(1). Very Rarely	(2). Rarely	(3). Sometimes	(4). Often	(5). Very Often	(6). Almost Always
1. During interactions with clients I recognize when my pre-existing beliefs are influencing the interaction.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
2. During interactions with clients I consider how my personal thoughts and feelings are influencing the interaction.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
3. During interactions with clients I recognize when my client's pre-existing beliefs are influencing the interaction.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
4. During interactions with clients I consider how their personal thoughts and feelings are influencing the interaction.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
5. After interacting with clients I spend time thinking about what was said and done	<input type="checkbox"/>					
6. After interacting with clients I wonder about the client's experience of the interaction.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
7. After interacting with clients I wonder about my own experience of the interaction.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
8. After interacting with clients I think about how things went during the interaction.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
9. I think about how I might improve my ability to work with clients.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
10. I critically evaluate the strategies and techniques I use in my work with clients.	<input type="checkbox"/>					

2

3

**Table 6**(on next page)

The Reflective Practice Questionnaire Extended (RPQ-E).

Note: Scoring, all measures provide a score that can range from 1 - 6. Reflective practice score = Average across items 1 - 10. Confidence score = Average across items 11 - 18. Uncertainty/Stress score = Average across items 19 - 26. Work satisfaction score = Average across items 27 - 30. \*Also note: There is scope for the confidence sub-scale to be further broken down into "general confidence" (items 11-14) and 'communication confidence' (items 15-18) sub-scales. There is scope for the uncertainty/stress sub-scale to be further broken down into 'stress' (items 19-22) and 'uncertainty' (items 23-26) sub-scales.

1 Please rate how often each statement applies to you:

	(1). Very Rarely	(2). Rarely	(3). Sometimes	(4). Often	(5). Very Often	(6). Almost Always
1. During interactions with clients I recognize when my pre-existing beliefs are influencing the interaction.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
2. During interactions with clients I consider how my personal thoughts and feelings are influencing the interaction.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
3. During interactions with clients I recognize when my client's pre-existing beliefs are influencing the interaction.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
4. During interactions with clients I consider how their personal thoughts and feelings are influencing the interaction.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
5. After interacting with clients I spend time thinking about what was said and done	<input type="checkbox"/>					
6. After interacting with clients I wonder about the client's experience of the interaction.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
7. After interacting with clients I wonder about my own experience of the interaction.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
8. After interacting with clients I think about how things went during the interaction.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
9. I think about how I might improve my ability to work with clients.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
10. I critically evaluate the strategies and techniques I use in my work with clients.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
11. I feel like I have all the experience I require to effectively interact with clients.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
12. I feel like I have all the practical skills I require to effectively interact with clients.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
13. I feel like I have learnt everything I need to know in order to effectively interact with clients.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
14. I feel like I have all the theoretical knowledge I require to effectively interact with clients.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
15. I feel able to communicate so that a client can understand me easily.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
16. I feel confident when communicating my ideas with a client.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
17. I feel that I provide clear messages to my clients.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
18. I feel capable in my ability to communicate with clients.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
19. After interacting with clients I feel exhausted.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
20. I find interacting with a client to be stressful.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
21. I feel distressed after communicating with a client.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
22. The pressure to meet needs of a client can feel overwhelming.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
23. I am uncertain that my planning for a client is the best possible way to proceed.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
24. I am uncertain that I am interpreting the needs of a client correctly.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
25. I am uncertain about how to handle the needs of a client.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
26. I am uncertain that I properly understand the needs of a client.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
27. My work provides me with a sense of fulfilment.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
28. I feel like my work means more to me than simply earning money.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
29. I enjoy my work.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
30. I find my work rewarding.	<input type="checkbox"/>					

2