

Est.
1841

YORK
ST JOHN
UNIVERSITY

Bloom, Katy ORCID logoORCID:
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4907-425X> (2023) Flexing formative feedback to achieve different outcomes. In: Association of Science Education National Conference, 4-7 January, 2023, Sheffield Hallam University. (Unpublished)

Downloaded from: <https://ray.yorks.ac.uk/id/eprint/8097/>

Research at York St John (RaY) is an institutional repository. It supports the principles of open access by making the research outputs of the University available in digital form. Copyright of the items stored in RaY reside with the authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full text items free of charge, and may download a copy for private study or non-commercial research. For further reuse terms, see licence terms governing individual outputs. [Institutional Repository Policy Statement](#)

RaY

Research at the University of York St John

For more information please contact RaY at ray@yorks.ac.uk

Flexing formative feedback to achieve different outcomes

Dr Katy Bloom @bloom_growhow
Associate Professor and Science Lead
School of Education, Language and Psychology
York St John University

Intended Learning Outcomes

By the end of the session you will be able to:

- Consider the value of language in encouraging students to take increased responsibility for acting on feedback;
- Develop an awareness of how feedback practice can be flexed.

The session will include:

- Opportunities to reflect on feedback experiences;
- Engagement with recent research related to student perceptions of feedback;
- Active tasks including analysis and reframing of feedback comments.

What is feedback?

“The notion of feedback is fascinating – whilst feedback is referenced in almost all studies of learning, it sometimes seems as if it is a unidimensional notion understood by all.”

Hattie & Masters, 2012

- How do you define feedback?
- Consider your own experiences of giving and receiving feedback.
- What might your students say?

Feedback as....

Analogies and metaphors are a common tool used within the feedback discourse:

- the feedback triangle (Yang and Carless 2013),
- feedback as a loop (Mislevy 2012),
- ‘feedback as telling’ (Boud and Molloy 2012 p.14),
- feedback as a gift (Hargreaves 2005),
- feedback as a dialogue (Carless *et al.* 2011; Nicol 2010),
- feedback as talk (Ajjawi and Boud 2018),
- feedback as a consequence (Hattie and Timperley 2007),
- feedback as a Trojan horse (Kirton *et al.* 2007) or
- feedback as an ‘elaborate dance’ (Dennis *et al.* 2018, p.93).

Position within AfL paradigm

1. Clarifying and sharing learning intentions and criteria for success.
2. Engineering effective classroom discussions, questions, and learning tasks.
3. Providing feedback that moves learners forward.
4. Activating students as the owners of their own learning.
5. Activating students as instructional resources for one another.

Interactions

Feedback Can Occur Between:

- tutor to student
- student to tutor
- student to student
- tutor to tutor

Which is most valuable in schools, and why?

The feedback students give teachers can be more powerful than the feedback teachers give students (Tovani, 2012)

What teachers see as feedback

- Comments
- Clarification
- Criticism (pros & cons)
- Confirmation
- Content development
- Correction

[All of these tend to relate to how the student is doing now]

(Hattie & Masters, 2012)

Student perceptions of feedback

Feedback is much more about what students receive than teachers give.

Students contend strongly that they attend to feedback, even if they fail to act upon it (Glover & Brown, 2006).

When feedback is given to the whole class, it's received by no-one as they believe it is not about them (Hattie talk, 2012).

Tutors believed that they were providing more detailed feedback than the students themselves believed they received, and that the nature of their feedback was more useful than the students perceived it to be (Glover & Brown, 2006).

There is confusion about the purpose of feedback from both tutor and student viewpoints, as it is often linked to grades rather than to improve learning (Carless, 2006, Handley, Price & Millar, 2008).

Students may claim to understand the feedback, even when they did not, and when they did understand it, they did not know how to apply it to their future learning (Nuthall, 2007).

What sort of feedback does your teacher give you about your physics work?

L: We get, like, those question things...

W: She marks our book regularly as well.

S: She gives like a question that we have to do, or something to prove.

B: All teachers have to do it, but it's not really very good 'cos normally they are questions that you don't know the answer to.

L: if you just ask her, she tells you the answer, because that's all she can really do. But the questions are sometimes just like, why haven't you underlined this with a ruler? And it's like ...I forgot!

W: You get an odd question, every couple of months that you actually have to think about, but the rest of them, they're not that useful. The questions are more like time-wasting.

S: That's not her fault though, that's the school policy.

Task



What was your feedback about?

	Hattie & Masters (2011)	Gan (2011)	Van den Bergh, Rose & Beijaard (2013)
Level	18 secondary classes	235 peers	32 teachers in primary school
Task	59%	70%	51%
Process	25%	25%	42%
Regulation	2%	1%	2%
Self	14%	4%	5%

	Hattie & Masters (2011)	Gan (2011)	Van den Bergh, Rose & Beijaard (2013)	Brooks, Carroll, Gillies & Hattie (2019)	Bloom (2020)
Level	18 secondary classes	235 peers	32 teachers in primary school	1 Y7 class (n=28)	4 GCSE Physics teachers (45 lessons)
Task	59%	70%	51%	78%	37-84%
Process	25%	25%	42%	16%	13-40%
Self-Regulation	2%	1%	2%	6%	0-5%
Self	14%	4%	5%	*not coded	0-2%

Task repeat (with prompts!)



Observation audit 1

Statement: Provides information about the particular level:

Task/Product – correctness of response, clarification, criticism, confirmation

Process/Strategy – recognises what strategy or process has been employed

Self-regulation – recognises effort, persistence, resilience, reflection

Praise/self – undifferentiated, personal, non-task-related statements

Prompt: a cue for further development:

Task/Product – clarifies next step, what else to include, how to develop content

Process/Strategy – provides strategies/suggestions/cues for error detection, next steps, information search, procedural hints

Self-regulation – reflective probes that guide further self-evaluation

Praise/self – non-specific prompts, unrelated to learning intentions

Observation audit 2

Key:

Feedback level		Feedback type		Target	
Task/product	T	Statement	s	Girl	G
Process/strategy	P	Prompt	p	Boy	B
Self-regulation	R			Class	C
Praise/self	S				
Instruction	I			Team	T
Other	O				

2.00	TpG	TSspG	PpsG	PlpG
4.00	PpG	PpG	TpG	PpG
6.00	TPspG	SsG	TsC	
8.00	TPspB	TpB	TpB	TpsB
10.00	PpGB.	TspG	SsG*	
12.00	TpB →	TpB →	SpB →	SpB <small>save</small>
14.00	SpB	TsC	PpC <small>class instruct</small>	TPspC
16.00	TPpC	TpG	TspB	
18.00	PpG	PpG	TPsG	TsB
20.00	TspB	TsC	TsC	
22.00	TPsC	PpB	TpB	TSpB
24.00	TpC	PpC	PpC	SsC
26.00	PpG	TsC	TPpB	

17.00	$P_p B_s'$					'when you do calculations, assuming no E. loss...
18.00	$S_p B' \rightarrow P_p B^2 \cdot S_p G^3 \cdot T_p G \rightarrow T_p G^4 \cdot \checkmark P_p B \rightarrow P_p B \rightarrow$					'ok? ² explains Δ process. ³ Ladies, we OK? ⁴ query colour paper
19.00	$\rightarrow T_p B \rightarrow P_p B \rightarrow T_p B' \rightarrow S_s B^2 \cdot P_p B^3 \rightarrow S_s B \cdot * P_p B \rightarrow T_s B \rightarrow P_p B \cdot * P_p B \rightarrow P_p B \rightarrow T_p B \rightarrow$					'Just do it like that ² OK. ³ You can round, alright
20.00	$\rightarrow T_s B \rightarrow P_p B \rightarrow T_s B \rightarrow$					(describing to Jack)
21.00	$T_p B \rightarrow T_s B \rightarrow T_p B' \rightarrow T_s B \cdot$					'what's in storage heaters...
22.00	$S_p B \rightarrow P_p B \rightarrow S_s B \rightarrow P_p B \rightarrow T_p B \rightarrow T_s B \rightarrow S_p B - T_p B \cdot T_s B'$					'It would still be SO.
23.00	$P_p G' \rightarrow T_s G^2 \cdot T_p G \rightarrow P_p G^3 \rightarrow T_p G \rightarrow T_p G \cdot T_p B^4$					'Memy prompt. ² Yes that's right. ³ You need to include that it's copper. ⁴ Be there in a second Ben
24.00	$P_p G \rightarrow P_p G \cdot P_p G \rightarrow T_p G \cdot S_s G' \rightarrow S_s G \rightarrow T_s G \rightarrow T_p G \rightarrow S_s B^2 \cdot T_s B \rightarrow S_s B^3 \cdot T_s B^4$					'You wally. ² Well done plus. ³ That's right well done ⁴ that's right.
25.00	$T_s B \rightarrow P_p B \rightarrow S_p B \cdot P_p B \rightarrow T_s B' \rightarrow P_p B \rightarrow T_s B \cdot T_s B \rightarrow P_p B \rightarrow P_p B \rightarrow$					'That's wrong.
26.00	$\rightarrow T_s B \cdot T_s B' \cdot T_p B^2 \cdot S_p B^3 \rightarrow S_s B \rightarrow P_p B \rightarrow T_s B \rightarrow T_p B \rightarrow T_s B \rightarrow$					'That's alright that's fine. ² stick sheet in. ³ Ben why are you on a low chair.
27.00	$\rightarrow P_p B \rightarrow S_s B \rightarrow R_s B' \rightarrow S_s B \cdot P_p G \rightarrow P_p G \rightarrow P_p G \rightarrow P_p G^2$					'You're doing some work. ² See if you can work out these.
28.00	$T_p B' \cdot R_p B^2 \rightarrow S_p B^3 \cdot T_p B - T_s B - P_p B \cdot T_p B^3 \rightarrow S_s B \cdot T_s G$					'Gue. ² What's wrong with you lot ³ Don't forget your units well done
29.00	$\rightarrow T_s G \rightarrow P_p G \rightarrow T_s G - T_s G \cdot P_p B^2$ (task?) $\cdot S_p G \cdot T_s B \rightarrow P_p B$					'You've done it right. ² How are we doing?
30.00	$\rightarrow T_s B \cdot T_s B' \cdot T_s G \rightarrow P_s G^2 \rightarrow P_p G \rightarrow T_s G \rightarrow T_p G \cdot$					'I'd like to see your working kit. ² You changed this when you worked it out.
31.00	$T_s G - T_s G \cdot R_p B \rightarrow P_p B' \cdot P_p G \rightarrow P_p G \rightarrow R_p G^2$					'were you stuck on number 7. Have a little discussion. ² Does that help solve the problem.
32.00	$P_s B \rightarrow P_p B \cdot P_p G B \rightarrow T_s G \rightarrow T_s G \rightarrow$					
33.00	$\rightarrow T_p G \rightarrow T_s G \rightarrow T_p G \cdot P_p G' \rightarrow$					'I think about a storage heater.
34.00	$\rightarrow T_s G \rightarrow T_p G \rightarrow P_p G' \rightarrow T_s G \rightarrow P_p G \rightarrow T_s G \cdot$					'what do you think.
35.00	$T_s B \rightarrow T_p B \rightarrow T_s B \cdot P_p B' \rightarrow T_p B \rightarrow P_p B \rightarrow T_s B \rightarrow P_p B \cdot S_s G^2 T_p G$					'Jack how did you get on (task?) ² OK, good, have you finished?
36.00	$T_s G \cdot T_p G \rightarrow T_p G \rightarrow T_s G \cdot T_s B S_s B' \cdot P_p G \cdot$					'Yes, well done Jack ² on.
37.00	$S_s B' \cdot P_p B \rightarrow T_p B^2 \rightarrow T_p B \rightarrow P_p B \rightarrow T_s B \rightarrow T_p B \rightarrow$					'OK. ² what's your change in temp.
38.00	$\rightarrow T_s B \rightarrow T_s B \rightarrow P_p B \cdot T_s G^*$					*talks to Hester who came into room.

Analysing verbal feedback

Is that the furthest forward he goes?

prompting a girl to process a response

PpG

Well what do you think?

prompting the girl to think further

PpG

If that's what you think then use that number

prompting the girl to consider the number

PpG

[girls answers in negative] **well then, we'll talk about it**

stating that they could discuss the answer

TsG

Don't be frightened of making a mistake,

prompting a self-regulation response

RpG

this is part of the learning process

prompting a self-regulation response

RsG

[Teacher 2, lesson 7, 29.50-30.05m]

Main findings

- teachers have dialogic characteristics that can be mapped across lessons and form a 'teacher profile'
- there are a large number of oral interactions made by teachers in lessons, and feedback interactions form a high proportion of this, although *pupils do not recognise it as feedback*
- feedback styles as part of oral interactions vary between teachers and is a key part of their dialogic repertoire
- teachers of some experience find it hard to flex their 'default' style, despite CPD and coaching; *this has implications for ITE*
- Intervention teachers did manage to increase their P and R feedback amounts
- pupils who received a higher amount of both *prompt* and *process* feedback developed more positive self-belief systems (gains in self-concept and self-efficacy, reduced subject anxiety)
- relationship is key, and verbal feedback builds relationships; the current notion of disparaging praise as detrimental to learning needs to be nuanced.

Feedback is complicated...

- Feedback is complex;
- Feedback has affective dimensions;
- Feedback is inherently relational;
- You cannot remove the self from the feedback;
- Feedback can have positive/negative consequences in terms of identity, motivation, self-worth, self-regulation;
- Feedback is often focused on the product;
- How the feedback is intended does not always translate to how it is received.

So, how can we modify our feedback to make it less problematic?

Three Fundamental Principles of Effective Classroom Feedback

1. Be more work for the recipient than the donor.
Feedback should cause thinking. Students should be expected to have time to do something with it.

2. Be focused

'less' can be more: feedback should be accurate *and* helpful

3. Relate to shared learning goals

Have clear learning intentions and success criteria that are referenced through a lesson & in feedback given at the appropriate time

Selected References

- Ajjawi, R. and Boud, D. (2018) Examining the nature and effects of feedback dialogue. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, pp.1-14.
- Boud, D. and Molloy, E. (2012) *Feedback in Higher and Professional Education: Understanding it and Doing it Well*. London ; New York, Routledge.
- Carless, D., Salter, D., Yang, M. and Lam, J. (2011) Developing sustainable feedback practices. *Studies in Higher Education*, 36 (4), pp.395-407.
- Dennis, A., Foy, M., Monrouxe, L. and Rees, C. (2018) Exploring trainer and trainee emotional talk in narratives about workplace-based feedback processes. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 23 (1), pp.75-93.
- Glover, C. and Brown, E. (2006) Written Feedback for Students: too much, too detailed or too incomprehensible to be effective? *Bioscience Education*, 7 (1) pp1-16
- Hargreaves, E. (2005) Assessment for learning? Thinking outside the (black) box. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 35 (2), pp.213-224.
- Hattie, J. and Timperley, H. (2007) The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77 (1), pp.81-112.
- Kirton, A., Hallam, S., Peffers, J., Robertson, P. and Stobart, G. (2007) Revolution, evolution or a Trojan horse? Piloting assessment for learning in some Scottish primary schools. *British Educational Research Journal*, 33 (4), pp.605-627.
- Mislevy, R.J. (2012) Four metaphors we need to understand assessment. *Unpublished Manuscript*, .
- Nicol, D. (2010) From monologue to dialogue: improving written feedback processes in mass higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35 (5), pp.501-517.
- Tovani, C. (2012) Feedback is a two-way street. *Educational Leadership*, 70 (1), pp48-51
- Yang, M. and Carless, D. (2013) The feedback triangle and the enhancement of dialogic feedback processes. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18 (3), pp.285-297.