Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

Team-based learning in social work law education: a practitioner enquiry

Journal Item

How to cite:

Hanley, Joe (2021). Team-based learning in social work law education: a practitioner enquiry. Social Work Education, 40(8) pp. 1038–1050.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2020 Informa UK Limited

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Version: Accepted Manuscript

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:

<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1080/02615479.2020.1770720>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

Title: Team-based learning in social work law education: A practitioner enquiry

Author: Joe Hanley^{a*}

^aSchool of Health, Wellbeing and Social Care, The Open University, UK.

*joe.hanley@open.ac.uk @joeehanley

Disclosure of Interest: The author reports no conflict of interest. There is no funding associated.

Biographical Note:

Joe Hanley is a social work lecturer at The Open University with an interest in social work education, educational technology and social work policy. He is also currently undertaking a Doctorate of Education at Brunel University London.

Abstract:

Team-based learning (TBL) as a model of teaching boasts a robust and growing evidence base, showing that it is both preferred by students and leads to better educational outcomes. Despite this evidence base, there is limited research into the use of TBL in social work education, and no research into the use of TBL in social work law. This article presents the results of a practitioner enquiry undertaken into the use of TBL with a first-year Master's cohort of students undertaking a social work law module. Results are based on anonymous questionnaires, student evaluations of teaching, and the observations and reflections of the researcher. Student responses are shown to be overwhelmingly positive, recognising TBL to be a more effective model of teaching content, as well as enhancing team working skills, student confidence and promoting friendships. Students also raised some concerns related to group tensions and dynamics. These findings have implications for teaching the practical application of social work law, an area where social workers and social work students have been shown to struggle, as well as having implications for social work education more broadly.

Keywords: Team-based learning, social work, social work education, group work, social work law, practitioner enquiry, higher education, law, evaluation.

Introduction

This article presents the findings of a practitioner enquiry into the use of Team-Based Learning (TBL) in social work law seminars with students at master's level in an English university. Practitioner enquiry as a methodology involves a practitioner taking on the role of researcher in order to find out about or investigate a professional activity, in this case a model of teaching, in a way that can be explained, shared, repeated and defended (Menter, Elliot, Hulme, Lewin & Lowden, 2011). The professional activity that was the focus of this practitioner enquiry was TBL, a model of teaching with a substantial and growing evidence base showing benefits in relation to student outcomes and preference (Reimschisel, Herring, Huang & Minor, 2017; Dearnley, Rhodes, Roberts, Williams & Prenton, 2018). Existing research shows this model of teaching generates positive outcomes for students in professional educational programmes, including nursing students (Clark, Nguye, Bray & Levine, 2008; Dearnley et al., 2018), medical students (Nieder, Parmelee, Stolfi & Hudes, 2005; Reimschisel et al., 2017) and pharmacy students (Frame et al., 2015).

Despite this strong evidence base, several studies make explicit reference to the lack of research into TBL in social work education (Reimschisel et al., 2017; Watkins et al., 2018). This practitioner enquiry seeks to augment the few existing studies that do exist with an evaluation of the key issues involved in implementing TBL in law seminars on a Master's social work programme. Data were primarily gathered through individual student evaluations of the teaching model, and supplemented by the researcher's observations and reflections, as well as the Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET) completed by students following completion of a module. While not an explicit goal of the convenience sampling that was utilised here, the majority of the students in this study self-described themselves as being Black, Asian or Minority Ethnic (BAME). Therefore, this study also provides valuable findings related to the effectiveness of TBL with a cohort of majority BAME students, an area that has received limited research attention (Hunn, 2014).

Literature Review

Team-Based Learning

TBL is an active learning and small group teaching model based on three core stages. The first of these is the individual advance student preparation, whereby students are required to undertake learning activities prior to attending the TBL session, usually through readings, videos, tutorials, labs or lectures. Once students are in the TBL session, they undertake an

individual readiness assurance test (IRAT) to test their acquired knowledge. Following this they undertake a team readiness assurance test (TRAT) within assigned teams. The TRAT replicates the questions of the IRAT, and students are encouraged to share their answers and insights and come to a joint decision. The rest of the session is taken up with team application, whereby students are provided with case scenarios to apply their knowledge as a team. The case scenarios require specific choices, as opposed to lengthy responses, mandating that teams work collaboratively to come to a decision through sharing their collective knowledge and insights. However, students and teams are also afforded opportunities to seek clarification and appeal answers with the instructor throughout the process. A more comprehensive account of the TBL process and stages can be found elsewhere (Parmelee & Michaelson, 2010; Parmelee, Michaelsen, Cook & Hudes, 2012).

There are a number of significant studies that show the value of TBL as a model of instruction and learning according to a wide range of metrics. Reimschisel et al. (2017) undertook a systematic literature review of research into the use of TBL in health professions education, with 118 studies meeting their inclusion criteria. It was shown consistently that students preferred TBL over traditional models of instruction, attendance in TBL sessions was higher and that TBL can help students achieve higher grades, in particular for academically weaker students. In a meta-analysis of 30 studies, Swanson, McCulley, Osman, Lewis & Solis (2019) showed that TBL has a positive impact on content knowledge compared to traditional instructional methods. A systematic review of TBL in nursing and midwifery qualifying higher education also found that there was a tentative but growing body of research showing that TBL can positively impact on student engagement, student satisfaction, attainment and practice development (Dearnley et al., 2018). This study similarly showed that the most positive impacts of TBL were for students who had previously struggled academically.

There are some clear limitations in the existing evidence base related to TBL. The majority of studies continue to come from the USA, and there is a noted lack of knowledge about the impact of cultural differences on the experience of TBL (Reimschisel et al., 2017). The rapidly growing and overwhelmingly positive evidence base in this area has also led some researchers to urge caution. Dearnley et al. (2017), for example, recognise that research is likely to be carried out by advocates of TBL as an approach. They further noted that despite the strong evidence for the effectiveness of TBL in nursing and midwifery education, there remained minimal engagement with the model from academic staff, potentially indicating other concerns that have not been highlighted effectively in the research literature. There are also some studies

showing that students from certain disciplines may be less amenable to the model. For example, Zachry, Nash & Nolen (2017) found that the occupational therapy students had a clear preference for traditional lectures over TBL. These points make it all the more important for a practitioner enquiry approach to be utilised, whereby a specific context can be studied in depth.

Team-Based Learning and Social Work

The limited studies that are available do tentatively show that TBL can improve educational outcomes and student experiences in social work education. For example, in a study of 44 social work students Robinson, Robinson & McCaskill (2013) found that they preferred TBL as a process and were receptive to it in future. The researchers in that study came to the conclusion that the collaborative and group working elements that are inherent in both social work education and TBL as a process make the two a 'natural fit' (p.774). In another study, Macke, Averitt, Taylor, Tapp & Canfield (2015) explored social work student perceptions of TBL across a programme, engaging 154 Master and Degree level students. They found that the majority of students felt that TBL was effective at providing course content, and also in teaching higher order thinking skills. Similar positive results of TBL were found in relation to social work research (Macke & Tapp, 2012), an introductory social work course (Taylor & McLendon, 2013) and in a human behavioural module for social work students (Watkins et al., 2018).

These studies all took place in the USA and involved small single case study research, potentially limiting their relevance to the context being examined here. In addition, none of these studies specifically addressed the application of TBL to the teaching of social work law. Despite this, there are several factors about social work law that suggest that TBL could potentially be advantageous. Of most significance, social workers and social work students have both been shown to struggle to apply the law to their practice, meaning that a model that has a greater focus on practical application could improve learning and practice in this area (Braye, Preston-Shoot & Thorpe, 2007; Braye. Preston-Shoot & Wigley, 2013). In addition, the law and policy that is relevant to social work tends to be in a constant state of change (Dickens, 2010). Therefore, in the long term, it may be more valuable for students to learn how to critically engage with legal and policy contexts, as opposed to rote learning of the current statutory and policy frameworks. In their systematic review of TBL, Reimschisel et al. (2017) recognised the potential role that TBL could play in this regard, noting that 'the unprecedented rise of available information on the internet makes strict memorization less valuable, leaving

room in the curriculum for activities that reinforce the application of knowledge rather than the restatement of it' (p. 1233).

Methodology

Practitioner Enquiry

Practitioner enquiry involves the investigation of a professional activity, and the most significant aspect of practitioner enquiry is that the practitioner is also the researcher (Menter et al., 2011). Advocates for practitioner enquiry point to the valuable insight that a researcher as practitioner can bring to a context, insight that is difficult, if not impossible, to replicate through the more common researcher as outsider approaches (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009). Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the university Research Ethics Committee. A convenience sample of 34 First Year Masters students enrolled in five TBL seminars focusing on social work law was utilised. This is the total number of students who were registered on these seminars. This number of seminars was selected given the ideal number of TBL sessions suggested is 5-7 (Parmelee & Michealson, 2010; Macke et al., 2015). Differing from many other studies into TBL, these seminars were supplementary to ongoing lectures in social work law, provided by a different facilitator. The same 34 students that make up this sample attended the lectures.

The nature of practitioner enquiry as a research methodology requires a reflexive approach, based on an ongoing awareness of the potential for ethical issues to arise (Mockler, 2014). Of particular concern in this evaluation was the potential of researcher influence. Data collection therefore was undertaken through anonymous online questionnaires provided to students following completion of their final TBL seminar. This was seen as preferable to face to face interviews or asking students to complete these questionnaires with the researcher present, where researcher influence would be more apparent. The questionnaire used was based on open ended questions, allowing for students to provide their perspectives on the experience, and raise issues that were significant to them. One of the key principles of practitioner enquiry is to prioritise the voice of the participants, and so the questionnaire focused on open ended questions, as opposed to standardised metrics of student attainment or learning outcomes (Mockler, 2014). Furthermore, Braye et al. (2007) found that while social work students could be technically proficient in legal knowledge, they could simultaneously lack the critical awareness and skills required to effectively implement and apply their knowledge. Therefore, in order to effectively understand the potential for TBL to enhance a student's ability to apply

the law to practice, a broader and more holistic understanding of how students engaged with this model of teaching, and what they gained from it, is required.

The questionnaires canvassed student expectations, experience and conclusions about the value of TBL. The findings from the questionnaires were supplemented by the recorded reflections and observations of the researcher, as well as the university SET, the evaluation all students are asked to complete at the end of each module. Reimschisel et al. (2017) have stressed the importance of drawing on a variety of data sources to measure the validity of TBL. All data collected were anonymous from the point of collection. The only demographic information that was requested was ethnicity, in order to limit the potential for the researcher to identify a specific student from their response. Gathering additional demographic data, including age and gender, may have led to richer findings; however, it may also have inadvertently led the researcher to identify specific participants by their responses. This could have dissuaded students from completing the questionnaires honestly or could have led to unconscious bias when analysing the data. Managing anonymity in this way has been shown to be an important factor in considering the use of practitioner enquiry (Clayton, 2013; Mockler, 2014). The questionnaires were analysed using thematic coding to identify key themes as they emerged from the responses (Padgett, 2016).

Stein, Colyer & Manning (2016) recognise that a common deficit in the current TBL research evidence is a lack of clear contextual information on the approach taken and barriers encountered. River, Currie, Crawford, Betihavas & Randall (2016) similarly noted that studies are rarely explicit about the use of technology in the TBL sessions they are evaluating. Therefore, before moving on to the results, some additional practical and contextual information will be provided here. Paper quizzes were utilised for the IRAT, handed out to students individually. Scratch off questionnaires were used for the TRAT, as a form of Immediate Feedback Assessment Technique Forms (IFAT). Online interactive software was then used for the practical application of the knowledge to individual case studies, with teams nominating a representative to feed back for their team through their own personal electronic devices. Small teams of five to six students were utilised, as the positive impacts of TBL have been shown to decrease the larger the teams become (Swanson et al. 2019). The primary wealth factor for this cohort was determined to be previous experience, and therefore teams were chosen based on an even distribution of pertinent experience in health and social care settings.

Findings

Evaluation Results

The questionnaire was sent out to all 34 potential participants following their final seminar, and 17 usable responses were received, representing 50% of all potential participants. 14 of the 17 respondents described themselves as BAME, which is broadly in line with the demographics of the cohort who were majority BAME. 23 students also completed the SET; however, only some of these students made direct reference to the seminars. The feedback was overwhelmingly positive in relation to TBL as a model of teaching, and positive themes that were highlighted included effectiveness of the model, team working, friendship, and student confidence, all of which will be discussed here in more depth. While the questions asked were qualitative in nature, it is notably that 16 of the 17 respondents were positive in discussing that TBL had met their expectations, and 15 out of 17 agreed that they would be receptive to TBL again in the future.

More Effective Learning

A large proportion of the positive comments related to the perceived effectiveness of TBL as a teaching method. For example, one participant commented,

It was a way for me to learn and gain knowledge through my peers and the competitive aspects of team vs team challenges definitely aids learning (P15).

Other participants made reference to the atmosphere that is created through TBL, including one participant noting that it creates a 'very relaxed and less pressured learning atmosphere' (P8). Unprompted, participants also compared TBL to traditional lectures, with one participant stating that 'it was the most useful class during the term' (P12), and another stating that 'TBL works better and promotes learning as opposed to other traditional ways' (P9). The potential for TBL to be particularly beneficial for weaker students was also acknowledged, with one participant stating that,

This method of teaching and learning is very effective... Students are able to express themselves better. Group work brings out different skills in people. It also encourages the weaker and shy students to catch up (P8).

There was also evidence that participants valued TBL within this specific context. One participant made explicit reference to TBL being an unusual way of teaching social work law but recognised that 'although it seems an unusual approach to learning about legislation, it was very helpful' (P14). The effectiveness of TBL as a supplement to, rather than a replacement for, traditional lectures was also discussed by several participants as a positive, including on

participant stating that ‘it was a great way to explain the content from our lectures’ (P12). These positive comments were mirrored in the SET feedback, with several participants highlighting the TBL seminars as a particular strength of the module, including one student stating, ‘the seminars are very helpful as we get chance to apply the legislative to case studies and discuss in groups’ (SET response). Of interest to this study, participants also outlined in the SET the general difficulties they had in understanding law as it relates to social work, and in particular how this is applied to practice. This is in line with existing research in this area, and further emphasises the importance of finding more effective ways of supporting social work students with the practical aspects of applying law (Braye et al., 2007). One participant stated this explicitly, suggesting that ‘in order to understand the law, it should be taught through a case study to properly understand and apply it to a real case’ (SET response).

Team Working

Another common theme related to positive impact that TBL had on participant’s communication and team working skills. This shows that TBL has potential for the development of core social work skills beyond the application of specific content learning. Team cohesion was discussed as building over time, with one participant remarking that ‘once we got to know each other it worked very well, everyone worked well together’ (P17). Several participants also referenced the value of hearing the perspectives of others in their team, and one participant discussed that a key benefit of TBL was the ability to work through complexity, something that was facilitated by ‘listening to other people explain their knowledge on certain topics’ (P1). Interestingly, and without prompt, participants also compared TBL to their previous experiences of group work in an educational setting, experiences that were perceived as decidedly negative. This included one student stating in relation to TBL: ‘it’s not like group work, it’s very well organised’ (P17).

Friendship

Considering these seminars started on week one of the student’s MA social work course, it should not be surprising that friendship building was considered to be a distinct positive of the group working elements. One participant stated that TBL ‘gave the opportunity to discuss with classmates and I got to know people I wouldn’t have normally spoken to’ (P16). Participants also made note of the benefits of TBL for helping them to get outside of isolated friendship groups that had already started to develop. These findings could be particularly relevant to students who enter higher education with limited social capital, helping students to build

friendships from an early stage. Research shows that students who represent demographics that have not traditionally gone to university in large numbers, including working class students and those from certain ethnic minority populations, can struggle with isolation and marginalisation that begins in week one (Coulson et al., 2018). Therefore, TBL could be seen as an approach that mitigates this early exclusion through encouraging team interactions and friendship forming from an early stage.

Student Confidence

Several studies have found that social workers in England are particularly lacking in confidence in the application of law to their practice, and this is linked to increasing managerialism and performance indicators that dominate the profession in contemporary contexts (Braye et al., 2013; Falconer & Shardlow, 2018). In order to create critical thinking and confident practitioners it is therefore necessary to look for models of education that can help mitigate these factors and increase social worker confidence. Participants in this study made explicit reference to the value of TBL in increasing their confidence, linking this with the team-based approach that encourages conversations that would otherwise have been avoided. One participant discussed how the group working was initially intimidating because they have a learning disability, but ultimately they found the approach to be beneficial for them:

at times I didn't like the random name calling even though it make sense because it means that you get picked at random. But due to my learning disability it can be intimidating being picked on. But I wouldn't change the experience it was a very good experience and way to learn (P17).

Groups Tensions

While the responses were overwhelmingly positive in relation to the value and effectiveness of TBL, there were some decidedly negative related to group tensions and dynamics. For example, students described frustrations with participants leaving halfway through a session, showing up late or not contributing. Others raised concerns that it was not always possible to come to a decision efficiently or effectively, including one participant who stated, 'sometimes we did not agree which delayed the process' (P10). Others described that when teams had finished the exercise the conversations in the room would turn to other things, which distracted those who were still completing the task. 'Tension' within the teams was explicitly discussed by two of the participants, and this was linked by both directly to the competitive atmosphere that TBL can foster (P5, P8).

Practitioner Reflections and Observations

As outlined in the methodology section, one of key benefits of practitioner enquiry is that the practitioner is also the researcher, and that this provides otherwise unobtainable insight into the context in which the enquiry is taking place (Menter et al., 2011). Therefore, this section will supplement the previous themes with findings and insights based on the researchers experience and observations. A key task of the instructor in TBL is to roam around the room to listen to the deliberations, using this to inform later discussions and potential alterations to the TBL approach in future (Parmelee et al., 2012). In line with the findings of the participant questionnaires, it was observed that students consistently engaged in complex and supportive discussions at all stages. There were clear indications that students were enjoying the process, including letting out distinctive cheers when their collective team efforts led to the correct answer on the TRAT. On rare occasions students were seen to be talking loudly over each other, in particular when feeding back. As the facilitator it was therefore important to be assertive, including at times loudly reminding individuals to respect the perspectives of others.

One of the requirements of TBL is that the questions that are asked of the teams at all stages involve specific choices and answers (Parmelee & Michealson, 2010; Parmelee et al., 2012). However, the level of ambiguity and complexity that is inherent in social work practice meant that participants regularly wanted to discuss the issues that were brought up in more depth, suggesting alternative answers or querying what would happen if the context were slightly different. This response from students was somewhat predictable, as research shows that understanding the application of law in social work requires a complex interplay between knowledge, confidence, organisational context and individual orientation (Braye et al., 2013). These factors give rise to a fundamental concern related to the application of TBL to social work education, in that the nature of TBL, which requires specific choices based on a confirmed *correct* answer, could suggest to students that there are always clear black and white solutions, something that is rarely the case in social work. Cornish (2011) suggested that social work is in fact characterised more by not knowing than knowing, highlighting often neglected but still vital competencies for social workers including open-mindedness, attentiveness to diversity and the suspension of the ego. TBL as a model of educating social work students could prevent these factors from being provided requisite space within the learning process. These points suggest that a level of modification may be required for the use of TBL in social work contexts, allowing for more open answers or a recognition of the complexity inherent to practice.

Discussion and Conclusion

Social work educators are increasingly required to identify and develop innovative ways of preparing students for the complexities of contemporary practice environments (Watkins et al., 2018). However, there is often a presumption that social work students, and students in general, will struggle with new or innovative models of teaching or instruction (Jones, Sage & Hitchcock, 2019). The findings presented here show that this is not the case in relation to TBL, with students being shown to be highly adaptable. This study also provides a unique contribution to the literature in this area through demonstrating how TBL seminars can be utilised alongside ongoing traditional lectures, as opposed to replacing them which is typically the model that is used. A common barrier that educators often experience in implementing TBL is that student's find the large amount of preparatory work difficult to adjust to (Parmalee et al., 2012). This issue is minimised through the approach taken here, whereby attendance at weekly lectures plays a central role in the preparatory stage of the TBL process. The overwhelmingly positive experiences of students in this study suggest that this dual approach of lectures and TBL seminars should be considered as an area for future research.

Hunn (2014) discussed that TBL pedagogy may need to be revised to be more inclusive of minority ethnic groups and different cultures. However, the findings in this study suggests otherwise, showing that TBL as it is currently constituted can be effective in working with students who come from minority ethnic populations. Just over 80% of the participants in this study described themselves as being BAME, and the positive responses received from participants suggest that TBL can be an effective model of education in cohorts where most of the students are not white. Existing research rarely make explicit reference to the potentially varied impact that TBL has on different ethnic groups, and even when these factors are accounted for findings remain inconsistent. For example, Hunn (2014) found that BAME students had less favourable perceptions of TBL compared to their white colleagues. However, in another study looking specifically at social work students, Macke et al. (2015) found that BAME participants had more favourable perceptions of TBL. These previous studies, however, involved cohorts where the majority of the students were white, making the positive findings here, with a cohort made up of mostly BAME students, a distinctive contribution to the evidence base.

Students found particular benefits in relation to team building and confidence raising at the TRAT stage of the process, something that was also observed by the researcher in their observations of group interactions. This was facilitated through the use of simple scratch cards IFATs, allowing students to engage effectively with each other without any technological

barrier. It is unclear whether completing the TRAT in an electronic format, as was done for the case study stage, would have facilitated similarly effective team working discussions, and indeed there is evidence to the contrary. In a meta-analysis of 35 studies using IFAT, Li & Chang (2019) compared the use of computer and scratch card facilitated IFAT approaches, and found that scratch cards were more effective in IFAT in language, arts and social sciences, while both approaches worked equally well with mathematics and science students. Looking at the use of technology in TBL more broadly, River et al. (2016) undertook a systematic literature review of blended learning approaches to TBL, and found that there was a lack of evidence that the incorporation of technology into TBL improves student learning outcomes, with students showing a clear preference for non-technology facilitated TBL. The point has been made frequently that educators can be lured by the use of technology to the point that technological innovation leads pedagogy rather than the other way around (Kirkwood & Price, 2013; Fisher, Gordon, Pattison and Brock, 2015). Therefore, in implementing TBL, educators should be cautious in relation to the use of technology assisted learning to avoid inadvertently hindering the pedagogical benefits of the approach.

Another interesting finding in this study is that students recognised the benefits that TBL can have for academically weaker students. This is in line with existing research (Reimschisel et al., 2017; Dearnley et al., 2018). This finding should be considered of relevance in contemporary social work education, where disproportionately well-funded and politically sustained fast-track education programmes threaten to siphon off the most academically strong social work students, creating a two-tier system of education (Murphy, 2016; Moriarty & Manthorpe, 2018). Within this context educators who continue to support students through non-fast track routes may need to adapt their approaches to ensure that their students continue to achieve to the highest level. If TBL can be shown to have particular benefits for academically weaker students, then this is an area that social work educators should be particularly interested in pursuing. However, it is important to also recognise that TBL can be beneficial for academically stronger students, and in particular for the development of leadership skills related to accountability, facilitating group involvement and learning how to work with difference and diversity (Stein et al. 2016). Therefore, an alternative to the increasing focus in social work on segregating students into different educational tracks based on prior academic achievement could be to support all those training to be social workers to achieve at the highest level together, an approach that TBL has the potential to make an important contribution towards.

Limitations

The findings of this study were limited to student reported experiences of TBL, and so only inferences can be made about content learning and long-term value TBL. The 50% participation rate is also a key limitation here, meaning that only half the students had their perspectives represented, and the reasons for the other students not responding could potentially relate to how they experienced the seminars. However, it is important to note that several additional questionnaires were completed but could not be included in the research as they failed to attach completed consent forms. The commitment to ethics that was discussed above precluded including these in the study, despite the potential that some important findings data may have been lost. The timing of sending out the questionnaires to student, which occurred immediately following the final seminar, was potentially poorly chosen, as this coincided with the submission of assignments and the university wide SET. Students could have felt overwhelmed by requests for evaluation information and feedback at this time. This limitation is mitigated to an extent through the inclusion of the SET data, allowing for additional student perspectives. However, there are also limitations related to the use of SET data, and research shows that positive results on standardised student evaluations are not consistently correlated with student learning (Uttl, White and Gonzalez, 2017; Hessler et al, 2018). It also needs to be acknowledged that the dual role of practitioner and researcher could lead to an unconscious skewing of the results in a more positive light (Bassey, 1999). Furthermore, any new model of teaching is likely to peak interest from both staff and students, and this initial enthusiasm could lead to positive findings that are not directly related to the approach but rather the enthusiasm, interest and resources that it attracted (Reimschisel et al, 2017).

References

- Bassey, M. (1999). *Case Study Research in Educational Settings*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Braye, S., Preston-Shoot, M. & Thorpe, A. (2007). Beyond the Classroom: Learning Social Work Law in Practice. *Journal of Social Work*, 7(3), 322–340.
- Braye, S., Preston-Shoot, M. & Wigley, V. (2013). Deciding to use the law in social work practice. *Journal of Social Work*, 13(1), 75-95.
- Clark, M., Nguyen, H., Bray, C. & Levine, R. (2008). Team based learning in an undergraduate nursing course. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 47(3), 111-117.

Clayton, K. (2013). Looking beneath the surface: a critical reflection on ethical issues and reflexivity in a practitioner inquiry. *Reflective Practice*, 14(4), 506-518.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S. (2009). *Inquiry as Stance: Practitioner Research for the Next Generation*. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Cornish, S. (2011). Negative capability and social work: Insights from Keats, Bion and Business. *Journal of Social Work Practice*, 25(2), 135-148.

Coulson, S., Garforth, L., Payne, G. & Wastell, E. (2018). Admissions, adaptation and anxieties: social class inside and outside the elite universities. In R. Waller, N. Ingram & M. Ward (Eds.), *Degrees of injustice: Social class inequalities in university admissions, experiences and outcomes* (pp. 2-21), Abingdon: Routledge.

Dearnley, C., Rhodes, C., Roberts, P., Williams, P. & Prenton, S. (2018). Team based learning in nursing and midwifery higher education: A systematic review of the evidence for change. *Nurse Education Today*, 60, 75-83.

Dickens, J. (2011). Social work in England at a watershed - as always: from the Seebohm report to the Social Work Task Force. *British Journal of Social Work*, 41(1), 22-39.

Falconer, R. & Shardlow, S. (2018). Comparing child protection decision-making in England and Finland: supervised or supported judgement?. *Journal of Social Work Practice*, 32(2), 111-124.

Fisher, J., Gordon, A., Pattison, J. & Brock, P. (2015). Innovating for a reason: Using new educational technologies to improve learning in geriatric medicine. *European Geriatric Medicine*, 6(1), 166-168.

Frame, T., Cailor, S., Gryka, R., Chen, A., Kiersma, M. & Sheppard, L. (2015). Student Perceptions of Team-based Learning vs Traditional Lecture-based Learning. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 79(4), 51.

Hessler, M., Popping, D., Hollstein, H., Ohlenburg, H., Arnemann, P., Massoth, C., ... Wenk, M. (2018). Availability of cookies during an academic course session affects evaluation of teaching. *Medical Education*, 52(10), 1064-1072.

Hunn, V. (2014). African American Students, Retention, and Team-Based Learning: A Review of the Literature and Recommendations for Retention at Predominately White Institutions. *Journal of Black Studies*, 45(4), 301-314.

Jones, N., Sage, M. & Hitchcock, L. (2019). Infographics as an assignment to build digital skills in the social work classroom. *Journal of Technology in Human Services*, 37(2-3), 203-225.

Kirkwood, A. & Price, L. (2013). Missing: evidence of a scholarly approach to teaching and learning with technology in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18(3), 327-337.

Li, M. & Chang, T. (2019). A Relative Effectiveness Assessment of an Immediate Feedback Assessment Technique Employed on Computers and Scratch Cards: A Meta-analysis. *International Journal of Educational Technology*, 6(1), 12-29.

Macke, C. & Tapp, K. (2012). Teaching research to MSW students: Effectiveness of the team based learning pedagogy. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 32(2), 148-160.

Macke, C., Averitt, J., Taylor, J., Tapp, K. & Canfield, J. (2015). Social work students' perceptions of team based learning. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 35(5), 454-470.

Menter, I. Elliott, D., Hulme, M., Lewin, J. & Lowden, K. (2011). *A Guide to Practitioner Research in Education*. London: Sage.

Mockler, N. (2014). When 'research ethics' become 'everyday ethics': the intersection of inquiry and practice in practitioner research. *Educational Action Research*, 22(2), 146-158.

Moriarty, J. & Manthorpe, J. (2018) *Literature review on the social work bursary and student finance*, London: Social Care Workforce Research Unit.

Murphy, T. (2016). The Frontline Programme: Conservative ideology and the creation of a social work officer class. *Critical and Radical Social Work*, 4(2), 279-287.

Nieder, G., Parmelee, D., Stolfi, A. & Hudes, P. (2005). Team-based learning in a medical gross anatomy and embryology course. *Clinical Anatomy*, 18(1), 56-63.

Padgett, D. (2016). *Qualitative Methods in Social Work Research*. London: Sage.

Parmelee, D. & Michealsen, L. (2010). Twelve tips for doing effective Team-based learning. *Medical Teacher*, 32(2), 118-122.

Parmelee, D., Michaelson, L., Cook, S. & Hudes, P. (2012). Team based learning: A practical guide. *Medical Teacher*, 34(5), 275-287.

Reimschisel, T., Herring, A., Huang, J. & Minor, T. (2017). A systematic review of the published literature on team based learning in health professions education. *Medical Teacher*, 39(12), 1227-1237.

River, J., Currie, J., Crawford, T., Betihavas, V. & Randall, S. (2016). A systematic review examining the effectiveness of blending technology with team based learning. *Nurse Education Today*, 45, 185-192.

Robinson, M., Robinson, M. & McCaskill, G. (2013). Teaching Note - An Exploration of Team-Based Learning and Social Work Education: A Natural Fit. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 49(4), 774-781.

Stein, R., Colyer, C. & Manning, J. (2016). Student accountability in team based learning classes. *Teaching Sociology*, 44(1), 28-38.

Swanson, E., McCulley, L., Osman, D., Lewis, N. & Solis, M. (2019). The effect of team-based learning on content knowledge: A meta-analysis. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 20(1), 39-50.

Taylor, J. & McLendon, T. (2013). Using elements of team-based learning in an introductory social work course. *Journal of Baccalaureate Social Work*, 18(1), 233-240.

Uttl, B., White, C. & Gonzalez, D. (2017). Meta-analysis of faculty's teaching effectiveness: Student evaluation of teaching ratings and student learning are not related. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 54, 22-42.

Watkins, K., Forge, N., Lewinson, T. Garner, B., Carter, L. & Greenwald, L. (2018). Undergraduate social work students' perceptions of a team based learning approach to exploring adult development. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 38(2), 214-234.

Zachry, A., Nash, B. & Nolen, A. (2017). Traditional Lectures and Team-based learning in an Occupational Therapy Program: A survey of student perceptions. *Open Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.15453/2168-6408.1313>.