Increasing Transparency: Utilising Criterion-Referenced Assessment to enhance Student Learning in Public Relations

Xavier, R. (1) and Mehta, A.M. (2)
(1) Queensland University of Technology, QLD 4000,
r.xavier@qut.edu.au
(2) Queensland University of Technology, QLD 4000,
a.mehta@qut.edu.au

Abstract

The central role of assessment in the learning and teaching environment is well recognised. Educators face growing demands to improve student understanding of and performance in assessment items (Marginson, 1997; Rust, Price & O'Donovan, 2003). At an institutional level, a number of universities have responded to these demands by reviewing assessment paradigms in order to better demonstrate transparency and accountability in the setting and marking of assessment items (Neil, Wadley & Phinn, 1999; Rust et al, 2003). One of the paradigms being adopted by universities is criterion-referenced assessment (CRA). CRA involves designing assessment tasks in line with subject goals, identifying skills to be demonstrated within an assessment task, assigning relative weights to, and describing each relative skill/criterion (Carlson, MacDonald, Gorely, Hanrahan, & Burgess-Limerick, 2000).

CRA has a number of advantages including the ability for students to target their performance against pre-determined standards and be judged as an individual rather than against a normative performance (Neil et al, 1999). A United Kingdom study of CRA showed significant improvement in performance by motivated students (O'Donovan, Price & Rust, 2001; Rust et al, 2003). However, other educators suggest that CRA limits student experimentation, creativity and originality (Hay, 1995).

With the goals of increasing transparency and encouraging assessment for learning, CRA was introduced into an undergraduate introductory public relations unit with an enrolment of 290 students. Student research was undertaken to explore the success of the new assessment paradigm and to identify how students used the CRA approach to enhance their learning. The findings of this study show strong use of and support for CRA, with students using the assessment processes to identify their strengths and weaknesses and develop techniques to improve their performance in future assessment tasks.

Keywords: public relations, students, assessment

Introduction

At all levels of education, assessment plays a critical role in student learning. Assessment is formative, summative, and evaluative in nature (Hornby, 2003), and used by lecturers to certify and grade student performance (Samuelowicz & Bain, 2002, as cited in Norton, 2004). Educators are responsible for the definition of assessment in line with subject or course objectives and the provision of feedback, which students rely on to support current and future learning. In turn, assessment allows students to demonstrate their understanding and application of knowledge and evaluate their performance in a course of study.

This paper reports on the initial findings of an ongoing study of the introduction of a new assessment paradigm, CRA in an undergraduate public relations unit. The project goal was to identify how students adapted to the new

environment and how it supported the students' ability to engage with their own learning practices by identifying their strengths and weaknesses.

Literature Review

In higher education, a range of factors have contributed to greater attention being paid to assessment practices. Some of these forces are led by student concerns and others by lecturer observations or institutional decisions. For example, in 1997, the Quality Assurance Agency was established in the United Kingdom to define academic standards. One of its main contributions to higher education was the support for a standards based assessment system to ensure transparency, equity, validity and reliability.

In turn, students also seek increased transparency in and understanding of the assessment process. According to Norton (2004), a number of studies have shown limited correlation between student and tutor understanding of the same tasks. This lack of agreement affects the manner in which students approach the task as well as the range of marks awarded by tutors in a subject. Students hold assessment feedback as critical to improving understanding and performance. According to Rust, O'Donovan and Price (2005), appropriate feedback requires student and lecturer knowledge of particular standards, comparison of these standards to the student's work, and the taking of action to close the gap between these two. Without appropriate feedback, student learning outcomes are limited.

Lecturers are equally aware of the need to respond to student demands for transparency and accountability in the setting and grading of assessment tasks. In a study of honours programs, Tariq, Stefani, Butcher and Heylings (1998) showed that variation in grading was based on student performance as well as external factors including marker expertise or the level of assistance provided to students by lecturers. Biggs (2001) calls for increased reliability in assessment, a process which requires consistent judgements made by markers and clear understanding of assessment tasks. While many educators advocate transparent assessment practice, Hornby (2003) cautions its effect on markers and suggests that markers' attempts to satisfy students, external examiners and colleagues can influence the grade awarded.

At an institutional level, a number of universities have responded to calls for transparency and equity by reviewing normative paradigms where grades are awarded based on a 'student's performance in the subject relative to their peers' performance and following a normal distribution of grades' (Carlson et al, 2000: 104). Although normative assessment is easy to administer (Carlson et al, 2000), it does not reflect the nature or quality of teaching (Dunn, Parry & Morgan, 2002). In response, adult educators have called for more participative approaches (Reynolds & Trehan, 2000). Rust et al (2005) believe that a social constructivist approach to assessment overcomes existing problems in norm-based systems by encouraging the evolution of knowledge through participation from both students and educators.

The Advantages and Disadvantages Of CRA

As an alternative to normative paradigms, CRA involves designing assessment tasks in line with subject goals, identifying skills to be demonstrated within assessment tasks, assigning relative weights to and providing detailed descriptions of each relative skill/criterion (Carlson et al, 2000). These criteria can either be developed by both students and educators or pre-set (Abbiss & Hay, 1992), and assist student understanding of what they have to do to achieve a specific grade (Hay, 1995). CRA helps shift assessment from an instrumental purpose of awarding grades to an educational purpose that allows

for feedback and student improvement (Carlson et al, 2000). This follows from Neil et al's (1999) belief that to be most effective CRA should involve content, process and skill competencies. There are two main types of CRA systems: competence- and achievement-based assessment. Competence-based assessment measures student performance against the achievement at some minimal level and achievement-based assessment evaluates performance through comparison with predefined scales (Abbiss & Hay, 1992). This paper deals primarily with achievement-based CRA. This form of CRA allows students and lecturers to evaluate performance against a range of specified standards, which benefits student learning within individual subjects and across courses.

CRA benefits both students and lecturers by increasing transparency and equity in the assessment process (Neil et al, 1999; Rust et al, 2003). From an educator perspective, CRA requires clear learning objectives and well designed assessment items (Abbiss & Hay, 1992) with alignment across all parts of the curriculum (Rust et al, 2005). The participative process of CRA builds student and lecturer understanding of assessment requirements as both parties constantly refer to criteria during a semester (Carlson et al, 2000). Carlson et al's (2000) study found that the shared understanding of criteria by staff and students was central to the success of CRA. Other authors also agree that CRA leads to stronger student learning outcomes based on a better understanding of grade and performance requirements (Abbiss & Hay, 1992; Neil et al, 1999).

CRA has the ability to improve the style and nature of feedback provided to students (Abbiss & Hay, 1992). Common in CRA systems is the use of assessment matrices or rubrics which list the criteria for the particular piece of assessment and articulate gradations of quality for each criterion to match the grading system in use (Andrade, 2005). These rubrics form a major component of student feedback, either in isolation or in conjunction with other written or oral feedback. In a major study of CRA implementation in business studies at Oxford Brookes University in the United Kingdom, O'Donovan, Price and Rust (2001) found that the rubrics in isolation were not seen as sufficient forms of feedback by students. The rubric was seen by students as of limited practical benefit unless presented as part of a multifaceted approach including more detailed written feedback and post assessment discussion.

Whilst CRA is held to be a transparent process, Sadler (2005) argues that even when assessment criteria are used, teacher judgements can be hidden from student view. For example, Hay (1995) argues that markers may assess one student's performance in different ways but reach the same overall mark. In an earlier study, Abbiss and Hay (1992) suggested that training could overcome such situations. A further criticism by Hay (1995) is that CRA's inflexibility encourages students to conform to criteria rather than experiment with creativity, which may not be rewarded by criteria descriptions. Norton (2004) concurs and argues that in some situations, students could use assessment criteria in a formulaic manner and focus on criteria descriptions rather than the macro-level task requirements. At a course level, Sizmur and Sainsbury (1997) believe that CRA has made promises it is unable to keep in relation to the demands of complex curriculum.

Whilst acknowledging the disadvantages to CRA, this study adopts the framework of Norton (2004: 689) who believes that 'assessment criteria can be used to encourage both meaningful learning and active engagement through the simple mechanism of reconceptualizing them as "learning criteria"'. For the purposes of this study, CRA is used as a learning tool for students.

Assessment Studies in Public Relations

Despite advances in the philosophies and practice of assessing student learning, research in public relations assessment is limited. According to Stacks, Botan and Turk (1999) research into public relations education has been fragmented and focused on the needs of practitioners or educators. Recent research has identified the significant gaps between desired and actual outcomes of entry-level graduates in the opinions of practitioners (Neff et al, 1999); established the desired skill sets of graduates (Brown & Fall, 2005; Motschall & Najor, 2002; Stacks et al, 1999; Van Leuven, 1999); and explored the impact of educational initiatives including problem-based learning (Slattery, 2002) and study guides (Lubbers, 2002) on student performance. Very few studies have explored in detail assessment strategies in public relations with Gregory, Yeomans and Powell (2003) as a notable exception.

In her introduction to a special education issue of *Public Relations Review*, Badaracco (2002: 136) commented that 'if we are doing our jobs and keeping up with the pace of change, and we are doing something innovative, then the discipline of public relations can contribute to the body of literature on teaching'. Badaracco (2002) argued that in any pre-professional curriculum, educators use industry standards to evaluate class content and student performance. Public relations employers favour portfolios as assessment items whereas educators stress the need for assessment items that specifically evaluate learning objectives (Stacks et al, 1999) and could include assignments and tests (Motschall & Najor, 2002). However, despite recognition of the importance of assessment, Stacks et al's (1999) research into a range of educational factors including assessment of student outcomes and learning found that only 42.8 percent of respondents had assessment plans in place.

In the United States, several researchers have recommended the use of rubrics to support assessment practices in public relations. King (2001) suggests educators create grading rubrics to improve consistency and guide student feedback which is closely aligned to the principles of CRA. King (2001) argued that the rubrics could be shared in advance with students or used only by markers. In the United Kingdom, Gregory et al (2003) used criterion-based assessment behind the introduction of a peer assessment process into a group assignment within a public relations module at Leeds Metropolitan University. The criterion-based assessment required students to assess each other on a range of criteria that measured individual contribution (Gregory et al, 2003). The process encouraged student ownership, improved perceptions of unfairness in group marks, and increased student responsibility for learning outcomes (Gregory et al, 2003).

This study was designed to contribute to the literature on the use of criterion-based assessment in general and the use of assessment practices in public relations education in particular.

Methodology

This project is based on initial research undertaken by O'Donovan, Price and Rust (2001, 2003) who tracked the implementation of CRA in the business discipline at Oxford Brookes University in the United Kingdom.

Assessment practices in an introductory undergraduate public relations unit were redesigned to incorporate CRA practices. Three criteria were identified as relevant to the unit. These included problem identification, research and decision-making; application and evaluation; and communication and interpersonal skills. These criteria were mapped to the two major assignments for the unit: a proposal for an issue brief on a contemporary business issue and

4

a fully developed issue brief including significant media analysis. Each criterion was weighted based on its importance to the task. Students were graded on a 1 to 7 scale with 7 representing a high distinction and 1 representing a fail. Descriptive performance standards for each of the criteria at each possible grade were written and presented as an assessment rubric. Once drafted, the assessment rubric was tested by full time and sessional staff on a sample of papers representing different grades achieved in previous semesters. Based on the feedback of assessors, the descriptive performance standards were amended to ensure agreement on the appropriate standard to be reached at each level.

A multi-faceted embedding strategy was designed for the unit to ensure the transfer of both explicit and tacit knowledge through shared understanding of expectations (Nonaka, 1991). An assessment package was prepared to explain the new assessment paradigm to students. A description of CRA principles was provided as well as a detailed description of each assignment. The assessment package included the assessment rubrics for each assignment. It also provided space for the student to map their performance across the semester on each of the criteria and reflect on their performance in the assignments.

The assessment package was made available to all students through an online teaching site for the unit. The assessment processes and rubrics were discussed with students first by the lecturer and then by each of the tutors. A tutorial exercise was designed for students to complete before the submission of each assignment which involved the students marking a sample assessment piece using the assessment rubric. Students then discussed their grading structure in the tutorial session and the tutors showed the students the assessor's grades and explained any differences that appeared. Sadler (1987) suggests the combination of verbal descriptors and exemplars helps assessors and students overcome the inherent imprecision of verbal descriptors and also helps the students acquire strong evaluation skills.

Students were asked to self assess their assignments prior to submission. These self assessments were submitted with assignments and tracked by the assessors to identify where students had over or underestimated their performance. Assessors graded each assignment using the assessment rubric and this was returned to the students. A follow up tutorial session discussed students' performance on the first piece of assessment and students had the opportunity to meet with their tutors to get a more detailed explanation of the grading process.

A questionnaire was designed to capture the student perspective on the use of CRA in the unit and its impact on their learning strategies. The questionnaire allowed students to identify how they had used the assessment rubric in planning, writing and reviewing their assignment and how feedback on the assignment using the assessment rubric helped them identify their current performance and consider strategies for improvement. Likert scales were used to allow the students to demonstrate their strength of agreement or disagreement with particular statements. The questionnaire also captured key demographic information and any prior experience with CRA.

The questionnaire was administered in a lecture session towards the end of the semester. All students enrolled in the unit were eligible to complete the questionnaire. The unit included full and part time public relations students as well as students from other disciplines who were taking the unit as an elective. In line with the university's profile, the students were both domestic

and international and represented both school leavers and more mature age students returning to university after a period of absence from formal education. All students studied on campus. Completion of the questionnaire was anonymous and optional in line with the University's ethics approval for research on current students.

The questionnaires were completed and the data analysed using SPSS. Frequency counts and descriptive statistics were calculated for relevant variables with chi-square analyses and t-tests conducted where appropriate.

Results

Approximately 70 percent of the 290 students enrolled in the unit completed the questionnaire. One hundred and ninety-four questionnaires were returned. Female students represented 78 percent of the responding sample, in line with a strong female skew across enrolments in public relations internationally. Approximately 40 percent of the class were students in their first semester of university study and 20 percent were in their final year. There were more students who had previously used CRA (n=103) than those who had not (n=83).

Overall, the results reflected strong use of the assessment rubrics by students throughout the semester and the value of the rubrics as reflective learning tools.

Approximately 80 percent of students agreed or strongly agreed that the assessment rubrics were useful in planning their assignment. A consistently high level also agreed or strongly agreed that the assignment rubrics were useful in writing and reviewing their assignment prior to submission (see Table 1).

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	**Freq**	**%**
Planning assignment	1	0.5	6	3.1	30	15.5	113	58.2	44	22.7	**194**	**100.0**
Writing assignment	1	0.5	7	3.6	27	13.9	113	58.2	46	23.7	**194**	**100.0**
Reviewing assignment	2	1.0	8	4.1	28	14.4	107	55.2	49	25.3	**194**	**100.0**

Table 1: Student reflections on use of rubric in assignment development and review

Students were asked to reflect on how they had used the assessment rubrics to assist their assignment development. Options included using the assessment rubric straight from the beginning with constant reflection through the preparation period, starting the assignment and then using the assessment rubric to check performance, completing the assignment and then using the rubric to check before submission, and not using the rubric. Approximately half the students (n=98) supported the second option where they started the assignment and then used the rubric to check that they were on the right track before completing the assignment. The next most common approach was option one with approximately one third of students (n=67) using the rubric to reflect on the assignment before commencing work and then constantly referring to the rubric in the assignment preparation (see Table 2 for full details).

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Rubric used from start and constant reference	67	34.7	34.7
Rubric used after assignment started and then throughout to ensure on track	98	50.8	85.5
Rubric used after assignment completed but before submission	22	11.4	96.9
Rubric not used	6	3.1	100.0

Table 2: Student reflections on use of rubric as completion guide

Students identified strongly with the usefulness of the assessment rubric as a means to achieve clear understanding of what was required in the assignments. This was addressed separately to the other embedding strategies which were also examined in this study. Approximately 77 percent said that they agreed or strongly agreed that the rubric had been useful in understanding the assignment requirements which was higher than the marking of the sample assignment at 65 percent and the self assessment process at 54 percent.

As the assessment rubric had been designed as a learning and feedback tool, the researchers wanted to capture the student experience in this area. Approximately 71 percent of students suggested that they agreed or strongly agreed that they now understood how to improve their performance by seeing how the assessor had graded their assessment on each of the criteria using the specific performance levels (see Table 3 for full details). This approach was confirmed by similar levels of students identifying that they could now identify both their strengths and weaknesses which the assessors believed was integral as a self-learning mechanism for students.

	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	**Freq**	%
Understands how to improve	4	2.1	9	4.6	42	21.6	90	46.4	49	25.3	**194**	**100.0**
Can identify strengths	1	0.5	8	4.3	39	20.7	106	56.4	34	18.1	**188**	**100.0**
Can identify weaknesses	2	1.1	8	4.3	35	18.6	111	59.0	32	17.0	**188**	**100.0**

Table 3: Student reflections on use of rubric to improve performance

The level of experience at university did not appear to impact the usefulness of the CRA rubrics as learning and assessment tools. For example, a chi-square analysis showed there were no significant differences on how students in the first semester or last semester used the CRA rubrics in planning, writing or reviewing their assignments ((12, N=188) = 10.296, $p > .05$).

Previous experience with CRA was not a discriminating factor on the majority of areas targeted in this research, however, previous experience did appear to influence how useful the rubrics were in helping students identify their strengths and weaknesses. Students who had used CRA before (M = 4.03, SD = .720) were more likely to agree that they could identify their strengths than those who had not used CRA before ((M= 3.68, SD = .799), t(183) = 3.093, $p <$ .05). Similarly, students who had used CRA before (M = 3.98, SD = .779) were

more likely to agree that they could identify their weaknesses than those who hadn't used CRA before ((M = 3.72, SD = .774), t(183) = 2.270, p < .05).

Discussion

Undergraduate public relations students reflected positively on the implementation of CRA in their introductory unit, with the majority of students supporting the value of the approach and its use in their self reflective practices. The results in this study reflect more positively on the introduction of CRA than the O'Donovan et al (2001) study on which it was broadly based. In that study, only 73 percent of responding students used the CRA assessment rubric compared with 97 percent in this study. O'Donovan et al (2001) found that only 52 percent of their students had used the rubric in planning, doing or reviewing their work prior to submission whereas this study reported levels of satisfaction in excess of 70 percent among students using the rubric in these three stages.

While there are many possibilities for the range of perspectives, one of the key differences between the studies was the design of the assessment rubrics. The UK study used a standard assessment rubric for all courses within the discipline with lecturers drawing from an established databank of performance standards to compile their assessment rubrics. The assessment rubric in this study was designed specifically for the unit and for the assessment piece, therefore, better reflecting the type of information needed by the students to interpret the assessment requirements. Students could clearly see the relevance of the written descriptors to the item in question and this was supported by the multi-faceted embedding strategy. The importance of the embedding strategy was confirmed in this study with the majority of students agreeing on the importance of each of the different elements.

The development and grading of assessment tasks consumes a considerable amount of time and intellectual effort (Neil et al, 1999). Development of the assessment rubrics for this unit occurred sporadically over a 12 month period with time for reflection and enhancement. The assessment rubrics were trialled by all staff involved in the unit prior to its introduction and moderation occurred at least twice on each piece of assessment in the first semester of implementation to ensure consistency. This process helped increase the quality of implementation and ensured students saw consistency in the approach.

Most pleasing to the researchers was the students' ability to see how to improve their performance through the feedback mechanisms. Sadler (1987: 196) suggests 'one of the conditions necessary for the intelligent use of feedback is that learners know not only their own levels of performance but also the level or standard aspired to or expected'. The assessment rubrics made clear to students the level of their performance and provided the detailed descriptors to guide improved performance. Both these elements were important to the self-learning practice. Students with previous CRA experience rated their ability to identify their strengths and weaknesses and identify methods to improve more highly than those without CRA experience. As this was the introductory unit in a sequence of six public relations units, the embedding strategy for CRA is an important component in providing this level of CRA experience at an early stage of the students' academic careers. The methods used for self assessment and reflection identified in this introductory unit can be used by the students as they progress through their course. A similar approach to CRA has been introduced in each of the six units, thereby

improving student understanding of the approach and reducing the possibility of confusion over expectations.

Further research in this area will explore more detailed student feedback on CRA through student focus groups and replication of the student survey across a three year time period. Particular analysis of each of the embedding strategies will be undertaken to assist in unit design in order to maximise learning advantages within time and resource constraints.

CRA provides an assessment paradigm to increase transparency in assessment processes for both educators and students and to enhance the learning experience by encouraging assessment 'for' learning as well as 'of' learning. Further research in this area across a range of disciplines will help enhance assessment practices which are a critical component to student learning and the academy's accountability to stakeholders.

References

Abbiss, Jane & Hay, Iain (1992) 'Criterion-referenced assessment and the teaching of geography in New Zealand Universities', New Zealand Journal of Geography, 2-5

Andrade, Heidi G. (2005) 'Teaching with rubrics: The good, the bad and the ugly', College Teaching, 53(1), 27 – 30

Badaracco, Claire H. (2002) 'How we teach: An introduction to this special issue on innovative pedagogy', Public Relations Review, 28, 135-136

Biggs, John (2001) 'Assessment of student learning: Where did we go wrong?' Assessment Update, 13(6), 6-9

Brown, Ashley & Fall, Lisa T. (2005) 'Using the port of entry report as a benchmark: Survey results of on-the-job training among public relations internship site managers', Public Relations Review, *31*, 301-304

Carlson, Teresa, Macdonald, Doune, Gorely, Trish, Hanrahan, Stephanie & Burgess-Limerick, Robin (2000) 'Implementing criterion-referenced assessment within a multi-disciplinary university department', Higher Education Research and Development, 19(1), 103-116

Dunn, Lee, Parry, Sharon, & Morgan, Chris (2002) 'Seeking quality in criterion referenced assessment', Paper presented at the Learning Communities and Assessment Conference: Connecting Research with Practice, University of Northumbria

Gregory, Anne, Yeomans, Elizabeth, & Powell, Joanne (2003) 'Peer assessment and enhancing student learning. In R. Kaye & D. Hawkridge (Eds.), *Learning and teaching for business: Case studies in successful innovations*. London: Kogan Page

Hay, Iain (1995) 'Communicating geographies: Development and application of a communication instruction manual in the geography discipline of an Australian university', Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 19(2), 159-176

Hornby, Win (2003) 'Assessing using grade-related criteria: A single currency for universities', Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 28(4), 437-456

King, Cynthia M. (2001) 'The write stuff: Teaching the introductory public relations writing course', Public Relations Review, *27*, 27-46

Lubbers, Charles A (2002) 'Using alternative teaching techniques to enhance student performance in the traditional introductory public relations course', Public Relations Review, 28, 157-166

Marginson, Simon (1997) 'Markets in education' Allen & Unwin, Sydney

Motschall, Melissa & Najor, Michele A. (2001) 'The client-centered approach as a foundation for teaching the introductory course in public relations', Public Relations Review, 27, 3-25

Neff, Bonita. D., Walker, Gael, Smith, Michael F., & Creedon, Pam J. (1999) 'Outcomes desired by practitioners and academics', Public Relations Review, 25(1), 29-44

Neil, David T., Wadley, David A., & Phinn, Stuart R. (1999) 'A genetic framework for criterion-reference assessment of undergraduate essays', Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 23(3), 303-326

Nonaka, Ikujiro (1991) 'The knowledge-creating company', The Harvard Business Review, November-December, 96–104

Norton, Lin (2004) 'Using assessment criteria as learning criteria: A case study in psychology', Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 29(6), 687-702

O'Donovan, Berry, Price, Margaret & Rust, Chris (2001) 'The student experience of criterion-referenced assessment', Innovations in education and teaching international, 38(1), 74-85

Reynolds, Michael & Trehan, Kiran (2000) 'Assessment: A critical perspective', Studies in higher education, 25(3), 267-278

Rust, Chris, O'Donovan, Berry & Price, Margaret (2005) 'A social constructivist assessment process model: How the research literature shows us this could be best practice', Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 30(3), 231-240

Rust, Chris, Price, Margaret & O'Donovan, Berry (2003) 'Improving students' learning by developing their understanding of assessment criteria and processes', Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 28(2), 147-164

Sadler, D. Royce (2005) 'Interpretations of criteria-based assessment and grading in higher education', Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 30(2), 175-194

Sadler, D. Royce (1987) 'Specifying and promulgating achievement standards', Oxford Review of Education, 13(2), 191-209

Sizmur, Steve & Sainsbury, Marian (1997) 'Criterion referencing and the meaning of national curriculum assessment', British Journal of Education Studies, 45(2), 123 – 140

Slattery, Karen. L (2002) 'Loyalty, harm and duty: PBL in a media ethics course', Public Relations Review, 28, 185-190

Stacks, Don W, Botan, Carl H & Turk, Judy V. (1999) 'Perceptions of public relations education', Public Relations Review, 25(1), 9-28

Tariq, Vicki N, Stefani, Lorraine A. J., Butcher, Anthony C., & Heylings, David J. A. (1998) 'Developing a new approach to the assessment of project work', Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 23(3), 221-241

Van Leuven, Jim (1999) 'Four new competencies for majors', Public Relations Review, 25(1), 77-85