RCR reflection model to stimulate RCR
Mariëtte vd Hoven, Miriam van Loon, Margarita Poškutè
(alphabetical order)

NERQ
NETWORK FOR EDUCATION AND RESEARCH QUALITY

INTEGRITY

RCR reflection model: case deliberation method

RQ: Is case deliberation using the RCR reflection model different in voluntary and mandatory contexts?

RCR Reflection model

Steps	Questions to address
1 Explore the context	✓ Explain the situation ✓ What options do you have at first sight? ✓ Who is involved and what is their view?
2 Analyze	✓ Use the code of conduct to determine if relevant values are at stake (and how) ✓ What (other) regulations (institutional, national, international) are relevant and why? ✓ What other reasons/ considerations seem relevant in this case?
3 Balancing /Decide	✓ Can you decide what will be best to do? ✓ Consider the consequences. ✓ Who can help you/who needs to know?
4 Conclude/act	What do you decide and why? ✓ What step(s) to take next?

What to do when confronted with an RCR issue?
How to determine a responsible course of action?
The RCR reflection model helps to analyze and decide in a reasoned way, paying attention to relevant values and regulations. This easy-to-use step-by-step approach can be used with simple instructions.

Developed by Mariëtte v.d Hoven, Roald Verhoeff, Bert Theunissen
Funded by H2020 INTEGRITY, project number: 824 586

iNTEGRITY

Method

Data **collected** and **compared** from 3 studies on small private online courses (SPOCs).

1. Voluntary online module on a generic topical SPOC
2. Voluntary 3 online topical modules on RCR
3. Mandatory 3 online topical modules on RCR (same as in study 2).

Design: case reflection submitted as assignment in the online module were downloaded, translated to English (VU), and coded (see figure 1). Coding done by one researcher (MvdH), checked by another researcher (ML and MP). Conclusions drawn and discussed.

Ethics approval for this study was given by the FETC-HUM in 2020, all participants gave active consent in the online module.

Results

	Length (L)	Perspective taking P)	Average no of conside-rations	CoC Principles	Reasoned decision?	Action described?	RCR model used?
Study 1 (n= 47)	0:6/13% 1:23/49% 2:18/38%	0:20/42% 1: 21/45% 2: 6/13%	4.47	0:5/11% 1:30/64% 2: 12/25%	N: 31/66% Y: 15/32%	N: 3/6% Y, s: 8/17% Y, f: 36/76%	N: 3/6% S: 8/17% Th: 36/76%
Study 2 (n= 40)	0:1/2,5% 1:16/40% 2:21/53%	0:12/30% 1:17/43% 2:11/28%	4.48	0:6/15% 1:17/43% 2:17/43%	N:24/60% Y:16/40%	N: 4/10% Y,s: 7/68% Y, f: 9/23%	N: 7/18% S:12/30% Th:23/ 58%
Study 3 (n= 24)	0:0/0% 1: 9/37,5 2:15/62,5%	0:10/42% 1:5/21% 2:9/37%	3,71	0:7/29% 1:10/42% 2: 7/29%	N: 9/37,5% Y: 15/63%	N: 7/29% Y,s: 11/46% Y, f: 6/25%	N:6/25% S:2/8% Th:16/67%

L0= staccato words only, 1= short sentences, 2=full sentences;
P0= no, 1= few other perspectives, not well explained/only mentioned, 2= multiple perspectives described;
CoC 0=not mentioned, 1=mentioned, not explained, 2= mentioned and explained;
Reasoned action: Y=yes, N=no; Action described N=no, Y s = superficially, Yf = fully: more in depth;
RCR model used N= no, S= superficial, Th= thoroughly.

Conclusions/discussion

Mandatory vs voluntary participation

- Lower number of considerations (average) in mandatory context than in voluntary context
- Lengthier responses in the mandatory context
- Perspective taking slightly increases towards a more elaborate stance in mandatory courses
- Use of code of conduct does not improve tremendously in mandatory courses, is best done in study 2
- Decisionmaking: in mandatory courses most participants reach a reasoned decision compared to voluntary studies (1 and 2).
- Use of the scheme of the model was most used in the first study and least used (25%) in the mandatory courses.

Visit us at **h2020integrity.eu**