Midwifery education in practice

Group marking and peer assessment during a group poster presentation: The experiences and views of midwifery students

Magdalena Ohaja*, Margaret Dunlea [1], Kathryn Muldoon [2]

School of Nursing and Midwifery, Trinity College Dublin, 24 D'Olier Street, Dublin 2, Ireland

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Traditionally, written examination and clinical practice assessments are the main ways of deeming midwifery students fit and competent for practice. Contemporary academics in an effort to engage the students in the learning process have employed alternative teaching and assessment strategies. Among the alternative strategies are group projects after which members of the group are awarded the same grade, and peer assessment. With the purpose of informing the midwifery curricular, we utilised a qualitative descriptive approach to explore midwifery students' experiences and views on the use of group poster presentation for learning and assessment. The participants consisted of a purposive sample of 14 higher diploma midwifery students who were registered in a third level institution in Ireland. Semi-structured individual interviews were conducted following the completion of the poster presentation assessment. Permission to undertake the study was obtained from the college ethics committee. In this paper, we focus on the participants' views of group marking and peer assessment which are among the key elements that emerged in this study. While awarding a group mark was overall accepted, peer assessment proved a more contentious issue. Most of the participants found it challenging marking their friends. Reactions to group marks were very much influenced by the group dynamics.

Introduction

Traditionally, written examination and clinical practice assessments form the main strategies of deeming midwifery students fit and competent for practice. Contemporary academics in an effort to engage the students in the learning process have employed alternative teaching and assessment strategies (Morris, 2001; Swaray, 2012). Such methods include the use of poster presentation, which is also popularly used as a method of disseminating research findings at conferences (Moule et al., 1998; Akister et al., 2000; Conyers, 2003), group work, and peer assessment (Nordberg, 2008; Shiu et al., 2012). Group marks and peer assessment have been used in various disciplines in higher education including nursing (Shiu et al., 2012), business (Nordberg, 2008), and media studies (Vu and Dall'Alba, 2007) among others.

This paper presents the higher diploma midwifery students' experiences and views of these methods of assessment during a group poster presentation. The study was carried out with the aim of informing the midwifery curricular. In the institution where this study was conducted, group work is also used to assess students learning within the undergraduate and post-graduate midwifery programmes. Group poster presentation is one of the assessment strategies used within one of the higher diploma midwifery modules. For the purpose of this assessment, students worked in groups of 4—5. Each group was randomly allocated a topic from a list of practical midwifery and health promotion subjects. All group members within the same group were awarded the same mark at the end of the poster presentation. Each group had the opportunity to view and assess other groups. Given that students tend to be nice to their colleagues (Papinczak et al., 2007; Vu and Dall'Alba, 2007), the peer assessment accounted for 20% while the teacher assessment was worth 80% of the mark. Prior to the assessment, students were given written guidelines and set criteria for peer assessment. On the day of the poster presentation, each group reviewed other group posters and asked questions on the topic as they deemed relevant, following which they award a mark to the group using a marking guide. It was envisaged that peer assessment would create the opportunity for the students to learn about the various topics explored by their colleagues. Such exercise could also be beneficial in helping the students develop a deeper understanding of what makes a good poster presentation, thereby enhancing their critical analysis ability (Osmond and Merry, 1996). In other words, it enhances the students' ability to take on a more active role and to objectively critique other peoples work.

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +353 87 9193834.
E-mail addresses: ohajam@tcd.ie (M. Ohaja), mdunlea@tcd.ie (M. Dunlea), kmuldoon@tcd.ie (K. Muldoon).
[1] Tel.: +353 1 8964080.
[2] Tel.: +353 1 8962073.

Literature

Assessment is a crucial and core element of students learning experience (Race et al., 2005). Assessing students' performance is complex with multiple purposes and its importance in the learning process is well documented (Boud et al., 1999; Lejk and Wyvill, 2001; Race, 2001; Johnston and Miles, 2004; Harris, 2011; Shiu et al., 2012; Swaray, 2012). As noted by Price et al. (2011, p. 482) "the assessment practice is multifaceted requiring a range of skills such as design, student support, communication, clarification and application of standard, stimulating and enhancing students engagement with the task …"

Peer assessment can be done individually within a group with the intention of measuring the contribution of each members of the group, or done in groups whereby each group is assessed by their peers in other groups (Lejk et al., 1996; Race, 2001). The students can grade themselves and their peers, the group mark can be distributed by the students as they deem fit and extra marks could be awarded or deducted according to individual contribution (Lejk et al., 1996). Nordberg (2008) maintained that the term peer assessment can become ambiguous and loses its "meaning when more than one person is assessed for the same piece of work" (p. 482). In fact, some research on peer assessment of a group project have focussed on individual contribution to the group work, and on the validity and reliability of the scores (Lejk and Wyvill, 2001; Johnston and Miles, 2004; Zhang et al., 2008). When planned in a proper manner, this method of assessment can serve as an intellectual as well as a social activity which provides the students with independent learning opportunities (Vu and Dall'Alba, 2007). Simply put, it influences the students' professional development (Vu and Dall'Alba, 2007; Beylefeld et al., 2003). Leach et al. (2001) noted that this assessment strategy enhances student–teacher collaboration. However, peer assessment is also fraught with challenges. In many cases, students find it a difficult task to fulfil given that there are elements of bias in relation to the marks awarded making its validity doubtful (Papinczak et al., 2007). The process can become more controversial due to possible friction and feelings of hurt that may arise amongst peers (Vu and Dall'Alba, 2007).

Despite the documented benefits of group work, such as enhancing students' ability to develop leadership and interpersonal skills (Wharrad et al., 1995; Swaray, 2012), assessment of such projects is complex and challenging. Awarding the same grade to all members of the group is a contentious issue given that the group mark may not be a true reflection of individual effort (Alkaslassy, 2011). The free-riders (those who contribute little to the end product) may hide under the wing of the hard working members of the group and at the end get a mark they do not deserve, while the intelligent students may receive a lesser mark than their usual average marks (Nordberg, 2008). Consequently, students have not only questioned the authenticity of this assessment method, they have often described it as unjust (Lejk and Wyvill, 2002; Nordberg, 2008). Peer evaluation within the group have been noted to reduce the problem of free-riders, thereby encouraging active participation of each member of the group and ensuring that everyone contributes a fair share (Brooks and Ammons, 2003; Swaray, 2012). However, the extant literature contains very little information on the experiences and views of midwifery students in relation to group marking and peer assessment.

Methods

The overall aim of the study was to explore and describe the experiences and views of higher diploma midwifery students on the use of group poster presentation as a form of learning and assessment. As already indicated, the views of the participants in relation to group marking and peer assessment are reported in this paper. The study site was a third level institution in the Republic of Ireland. A qualitative descriptive method commonly used when there is deficiency in the information available about a phenomenon (Burns and Grove, 2011; Streubert-Speziale and Carpenter, 2011) was considered appropriate for the study.

Ethical consideration

Permission to undertake this study was obtained from the college ethics committee. Access to the participant was gained through the director of midwifery programmes, and the executive officer of the programme was the gatekeeper. The director of midwifery programmes granted the permission for the students to be approached for the study. The role of the gatekeeper was to distribute the information pack to the class. This meant that the students were not pressurised to take part. Expression of interest slips were placed in a post box left in the reception area so that only the researchers knew who participated in the study. Informed consent was obtained from each of the participants prior to participation. The study was conducted within a week after the poster presentation. While it was fitting to conduct such investigation at the end of the poster presentation, it had the added advantage of reassuring the students that their marks would be in no way affected by their decision to participate or not in the study. It is also important to mention that none of the researchers were involved in the assessment process. This was clearly stated in the participants information leaflet.

Data collection and analysis

All 2010 higher diploma midwifery students cohort ($n = 45$) were invited to participate. A total of 18 students expressed their interest and gave permission to be contacted on their mobile telephone numbers, which they provided. Semi-structured individual interviews were conducted with the 14 participants who were available following the completion of the group poster presentation assessment. The interviews which lasted approximately 30–45 min were tape-recorded and transcribed verbatim. This method allowed the participants to voice their experiences in their own words. Prior to the interviews the three researchers met to develop an interview guide with open-ended questions based on existing literature. The questions centred on preparing and presenting a poster, skills learnt from the process if any and their relevance to future practice, working in groups, and the assessment process. The use of interview guide was beneficial in ensuring that all these aspects were covered, given that there were three researchers involved in the study. That said, there was no rigid rule in the sequence of using the interview guide. However, in order to improve the quality of the information gathered, the researchers had discussion after conducting two interviews each during which the emerging themes and style of questioning among others were reviewed to ensure some sort of consistency. Thematic analysis (Burnard, 1991) was used to search for key elements that represent the reality of the participants' experiences of group marking and peer assessment during the poster presentation. This involved a careful reading and re-reading of the transcripts and discussions by the three researchers.

Findings

The themes explored include: poster presentation as a form of learning and assessment, group work, group marking and peer assessment during group poster presentation. The focus here is on the participants' experiences and views about group marking and peer assessment. Most of the participants found the whole process of preparing and presenting a poster interesting and enjoyable.

Group marking

The participants gave mixed views about group score. Their reactions were very much influenced by the group dynamics. The quotes below represent the views of participants who worked well in their group:

"*I did like working with people because you knew what comes out is a group thing, if you are on your own you feel under pressure whereas as a group you are in one boat, you get the same mark, that helps*"

"*I feel we all put something into it, I didn't feel anyone was going to get mark for what they didn't do, I am happy with my group*"

Some felt secured being marked as a group. It allowed some sense of collegiality in terms of addressing the questions on their topic as demonstrated in the quote below.

"*I enjoyed being assessed for the poster … the fact that you were working as a team you can kind of back each other up … there were four of us, between the four of us our knowledge together was good, it was good for us to be assessed when we were all there together*"

Free-riding issue

It was not surprising that the participants who had 'free riders' in their group, which resulted to some sort of conflict, were upset about their marks. They described getting the same mark with people who did not contribute equally to designing the poster as unfair:

"*If there is one person who did lots of work and others didn't it is not fair and it is hard that way*"

"*There is another girl who didn't do much, we had to continuously chase her, our poster got a low mark, and we were very upset about that*"

Some of the participants had sympathy for their colleagues whose group did not work well together acknowledging that such experience can be frustrating.

"*I can imagine in other groups if everyone isn't pulling their weight … it mightn't seem fair to people that did the work … so I can see why it might come across as being unfair as such to give an equal mark*"

"*I was very happy with my group, we all worked well … but I would be frustrated if someone in the group wasn't doing the work*"

There are some participants who were of the opinion that individual groups should accept responsibility for whatever mark they got, asserting that conflict should be managed as soon as it arise.

"*Yea there were teething problems, but I don't think it would be fair to get different marks, at the end of the day it is a group thing and you have to take on board whatever happens in the group*"

"*I feel it was okay, I'm a type of person that would say look you need to pull your socks. You can help out more when it's a group mark*"

Peer assessment

For the majority of participants, assessing their peers was one of the most challenging aspects of the day. Challenging in the sense that they didn't feel prepared for this role. It was a horrible experience for some who felt reluctant to give a realistic mark, and being constructive to their friends.

"*… you are going to give your friends good marks no matter what*"

"*You are marking your friends, you want your friends to do well at this early stage of the programme, you want to give them a boost to keep them going …*"

"*I didn't like judging anybody because it is horrible … you don't want to make anybody feel bad, I didn't like it*"

Some participants were constructive in deciding what mark was appropriate. Being friends or not did not affect the mark they gave other groups.

"*… just because we were friends with people doesn't mean we gave them brilliant mark … we were fair in terms of being realistic about their leaflets and their presentation of the poster*"

"*… I think it was fair enough assessment I marked on what I saw, it wasn't personal*"

"*We just said at the end of the day it's not about friendship we have to do this, so we tried our best to be as critical*"

Peer assessment: a joke

Apart from feeling reluctant to criticise their friend's work, the exercise was described as a joke by some participants who felt pressurised by their colleagues to allocate the maximum marks.

"*It was an absolute joke, because when we were going round the groups, I was getting pressure about it from my peers …*"

It was reported by some of the participants that previous grievance may have influenced some of the marks.

"*I don't think people marked fairly, I think other things can get in the way of what mark you can give to people*"

"*There is so much rivalry between certain groups so they are going to get negative marks and maybe they don't deserve it*"

Assessment was seen as the lecturers' job by some of the participants who felt that the students should not be asked to undertake such a task. The following remarks represent this feeling.

"*… when we talked to some girls going round it was like this is useless …, leave the assessment for the lecturers, this isn't our job*"

"*We didn't want to be too hard either …, It should be left for the lecturers …*"

Peer assessment creates tension

The majority of the participants voiced their concern stating that assessing their peers created a lot of tension, hostile and competitive atmosphere to the extent that the division within the class was obvious on the day.

"*The whole thing about marking ourselves I didn't really agree with because there was a lot of tension …*"

"*It was kind of promoting a hostile environment, a kind of competition …*"

For some participants, it was intimidating having to assess their peers; others felt their colleagues were there to test their knowledge or to catch them.

"*There are people trying to catch you out, nick picky and that wasn't very nice, you expect your friends to be very nice*"

"*I felt that it was a little bit intimidating to be honest because I knew people in my class so well … I didn't feel it was my right to criticize their work*"

Most of the participants suggested that peer assessment need to be removed from the process.

"*The only thing I would change if I had a chance to change anything will be lecturers only marking it rather than students because it was biased and unfair*"

"*That just needs to be done away with. It's very hard to mark your friends, you are not going to give your best friends a bad mark, and you can't have students marking each other …*"

Discussion

All the participants of this study acknowledged that poster presentation is a good form of learning and assessment. Most of them enjoyed working in a group as it helped them to develop their communication and leadership skills amongst others. Group marking and peer assessment are among the key elements of interest to the students that were explored in the study. While the majority of participants reacted positively about working in groups, when it comes to group marking, their views were heavily dependent on the group dynamics. The groups that worked well together were much happier with their marks and had no issues with being awarded the same mark. It was natural though for some participants with low marks to feel punished or unfairly assessed, because some members (the free-riders) of their group did not equally contribute to the work. The issue of a fair assessment during group work have been highlighted in the literature as major cause of concern (Lejk and Wyvill, 2002; Nordberg, 2008). Central here is whether all those in the group contributed to the same extent (Race et al., 2005; Nordberg, 2008). Even though assessment is the key driver for learning for most students, if it does not reflect the individual contributions as in most group projects, it will remain open to misuse by free-riders who possibly have the ability but strategically refused to put in the effort. This raises issues of validity and reliability of the assessment process; given that what is measured at the end is the final output of the group project not the individual performance. The group members are in a better position in terms of providing a detail account of individual contribution (Race et al., 2005). Falchikov (2000) argued that fear about the validity and reliability of peer assessment may inhibit its use by academics, thereby denying students of its potential benefits. There was a sign of regret amongst a small number of the participants for not being assertive enough during the process, which they felt contributed to their getting a lower mark. Some participants of this study reported that they had to keep chasing other members of their group in an effort to get them to participate actively on the poster design. This notwithstanding, the experience was all in all a learning curve for most of the participants. This was demonstrated in some of the participants' acceptance to take responsibility for the allocated marks acknowledging the need to deal with issues as they arise when working in a group. Race et al. (2005) suggest letting the students distribute the total mark allocated to the group among the group members depending on level of participation. Awarding or deducting marks according to individual contribution can help to address this issue (Lejk et al., 1996). However, while such strategies are worth considering, it is important to acknowledge that it may result to more friction among the group and could have potential long term consequences. Because

the interpersonal relationship amongst peers might affect the successful completion of a given task (Shiu et al., 2012), helping students to maintain a cordial relationship amongst them is crucial.

Conyers (2003) suggested that peer assessment may be appropriate for poster presentation if they offer an opportunity to foster constructive criticism and collaborative learning. We noted a somewhat inappropriate use of peer assessment by a good number of the participants. A majority of the participants felt unease with, and inadequately prepared for assessing their peers. This indicates that the participants of the study need further development and confidence in giving their peers a constructive criticism as most of them reported the need to "be nice to their friends". In some previous studies students gave similar evaluation of peer assessment and expressed that it is a challenging task which lacks objectivity (Topping et al., 2000). This is thought to be due to fear of damaging the relationship with their colleagues (Hanrahan and Isaacs, 2001; Vu and Dall'Alba, 2007). Consistent with previous findings, we noted that the participants were mostly biased towards giving a good grade (Sluijmans et al., 2001; Papinczak et al., 2007). Some described the assessment of their colleagues as unfair hence not reliable. In other words, the accuracy of the marks is questionable. The majority of our participants also felt that it was not within their remit to criticise the work of their colleagues and that such responsibility should be left for the lecturers. Other studies reported that students were doubtful of their ability to assess their peers (Vu and Dall'Alba, 2007; Shiu et al., 2012).

One of the key aspects of the findings of the present study is that peer assessment did not only create and promote a hostile environment, but it also escalated further the rivalry that seems to already exist amongst the group. Consequently, the opportunity for developing peer review skill in a constructive manner was lost. Students in the Osmond and Merry (1996) study reported that they were not comfortable with assessing their peers. Adequate preparation through formative peer assessment followed by feedback has been found to be beneficial (Magin and Helmore, 2001). Peer formative and self-assessments when used together help the students to be proactive in their learning (Nicol and MacFarlane-Dick, 2006). Nevertheless, there are participants in this study, though few, who had no issues with peer assessment. These participants maintained that the marks they gave to their peers were based on what they saw on the day. What this suggests is that skills developed through peer assessment are valuable to graduates and necessary for midwifery teachers, leaders and supervisors of practice. Even though this is a crucial finding of this study, it is an area that calls for further exploration. Vu and Dall'Alba (2007) noted that students in their study found the process of peer assessment beneficial. For the students, the process promoted interaction between peers, and learning occurred through the way their peers approached their topics. The students also perceived the process as a means of sharing responsibility with their teachers contrary to the findings of the present study.

Conclusion and recommendations

In this paper we present the experiences and views of higher diploma midwifery students on 'group marking' and 'peer assessment' during a group poster presentation. We acknowledge that the findings of this study are not generalisable due to the fact that it was conducted in a single site with a small sample size. However, the findings created further awareness on the value of poster presentation, which is often regarded as inferior to oral presentation in the academic world. It adds to the findings of previous studies and specifically unearthed midwifery students' views of group marks and peer assessment. Overall, it would appear on one hand that most of the participants felt secured not only in working

as a group but also with group marking. This feeling was obvious when the group worked well together and the outcome was positive. On the other hand, there is the issue of the free riders who even though they contributed less to the final product were awarded the same mark as their peers. Such problems can be minimised by the use of peer assessment within the group whereby individual contribution to the group work is assessed. Conducting a peer formative assessment within the group during the process will also be helpful in addressing issues as they arise. Another way of dealing with such problem is by awarding additional or deduction of marks based on individual contribution. This means that those who failed to participate actively to the group project will receive a lesser mark. However, as interpersonal relationships amongst peers might affect the successful completion of a given task, the importance of ensuring that harmony exists amongst the students cannot be underestimated.

Peer assessment was less than not favoured by most of the participants, as it created an uncomfortable and competitive learning environment for which most felt unprepared. The participants suggested that marking should remain within the lecturers remit. The findings highlight the need for educators to prepare students intellectually as well as emotionally before employing this method of assessment. Adequate preparation can be achieved by conducting a practice run in the form of formative peer and self-assessment during the process of a group project. This may enhance the students' ability of being proactive in their learning. Most importantly it could offer them the opportunity for improving their performance prior to summative assessment. As noted above, given that the study was conducted in a single site, we call for a further in-depth exploration in this area.

References

Akister, J., Bannon, A., Mullender-Lock, H., 2000. Poster presentation in social work education assessment: a case study. Innovations in Education and Training International 37 (3), 229–233.

Alkaslassy, E., 2011. How often do students working in two-person teams report that work was shared equitably. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 36 (3), 367–375.

Beylefeld, A.A., Joubert, G., Jama, M.P., de Klerk, B., 2003. Lecturers, students and community members sharing the responsibility of assessing project-based poster presentation. South African Journal of Higher Education 17 (2), 5–12.

Boud, D., Cohen, R., Sampson, J., 1999. Peer learning and assessment. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 24 (4), 413–426.

Brooks, C.M., Ammons, J., 2003. Free riding in group projects and the effects of timing, frequency, and specificity of criteria in peer assessment. Journal of Education for Business 78 (5), 268–272.

Burnard, P., 1991. A method of analysing interview transcripts in qualitative research. Nurse Education Today 11 (6), 461–466.

Burns, N., Grove, S.K., 2011. Understanding Nursing Research: Building an Evidence Based Practice, fifth ed. Elsevier, Texas.

Conyers, V., 2003. Posters: an assessment strategy to foster learning in nursing education. Journal of Nursing Education 42 (1), 38–41.

Falchikov, N.G., 2000. Student peer assessment in higher education: a meta-analysis comparing peer and teacher marks. Review of Educational Research 70 (3), 287–322.

Hanrahan, S.J., Isaacs, G., 2001. Assessing self and peer assessment: the students' view. Higher Education Research and Development 20 (1), 53–70.

Harris, J.R., 2011. Peer assessment in large undergraduate classes: an evaluation of a procedure for marking laboratory reports and a review of related practices. Advances in Physiology Education 35 (2), 178–187.

Johnston, L., Miles, L., 2004. Assessing contributions to group assignments. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 29 (6), 751–768.

Leach, L., Neutze, G., Zepke, N., 2001. Assessment and empowerment: some critical questions. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 26 (4), 293–305.

Lejk, M., Wyvill, M., 2001. Peer assessment of contributions to a group project: a comparison of holistic and category-base approaches. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 26 (1), 61–72.

Lejk, M., Wyvill, M., 2002. Peer assessment of contributions to a group project: students attitude to a holistic and category-base approaches. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 27, 569–577.

Lejk, M., Wyvill, M., Farrow, S., 1996. A survey of methods of deriving individual grades from group assessments. Assessments and Evaluation in Higher Education 21 (3), 267–280.

Magin, D., Helmore, P., 2001. Peer and teacher assessments of oral presentations: how reliable are they? Studies in Higher Education 26, 287–298.

Morris, J., 2001. Peer assessment: a missing link between teaching and learning? A review of the literature. Nurse Education 21, 507–515.

Moule, P., Judd, M., Girot, E., 1998. The poster presentation: what value to the teaching and assessment of pre-registration and post-registration nursing courses? Nurse Education Today 18, 237–242.

Nicol, D.J., MacFarlane-Dick, D., 2006. Formative and self-regulated: a model and seven principles of good feedback practice. Studies in Higher Education 31 (20), 199–218.

Nordberg, D., 2008. Group projects: more learning? Less fair? A conundrum in assessing postgraduate business education. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 33 (5), 481–492.

Osmond, P., Merry, S., 1996. The importance of marking criteria in peer assessment. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 21 (3), 239–250.

Papinczak, T., Young, L., Groves, M., 2007. Peer assessment in problem-based learning: a qualitative study. Advances in Health Sciences Education 12, 169–186.

Price, M., Carroll, J., O'Donovan, B., Rust, C., 2011. If I was going there I wouldn't start from here: a critical commentary on current assessment practice. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 36 (4), 479–492.

Race, P., 2001. A Briefing on Self, Peer and Group Assessment. Learning and Teaching Support Network (LTSN), York Science Park, York.

Race, P., Brown, S., Smith, B., 2005. 500 Tips on Assessment, second ed. Routledge, London.

Shiu, A.T.Y., Chan, C.W.H., Lam, P., Lee, J., Kwong, A.N.L., 2012. Baccalaureate nursing students' perceptions of peer assessment of individual contributions to a group project: a case study. Nurse Education Today 32, 214–218.

Sluijmans, D.M.A., Moerkerke, G., van Merrienboer, J.J.G., Dochy, F.J.R.C., 2001. Peer assessment in problem-based learning. Studies in Educational Evaluation 27 (2), 153–173.

Streubert-Speziale, H., Carpenter, D.R., 2011. Qualitative Research in Nursing: Advancing the Humanistic Imperative, fifth ed. Lippincott Williams and Wilkins, Philadelphia.

Swaray, R., 2012. An evaluation of group project designed to reduce free-riding and promote active learning. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 37 (2), 285–292.

Topping, K.J., Smith, E.F., Swanson, I., Elliot, A., 2000. Formative peer assessment of academic writing between postgraduate students. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 25 (2), 146–169.

Vu, T.T., Dall'Alba, G., 2007. Students' experience of peer assessment in a professional course. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 32 (5), 541–556.

Wharrad, H.J., Allcock, N., Meal, A.G., 1995. The use of posters in the teaching of biological sciences on an undergraduate nursing course. Nursing Education Today 15, 370–374.

Zhang, B., Johnston, L., Kilic, G.B., 2008. Assessing the reliability of self- and peer rating in student group work. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 33 (3), 329–340.