

Bethel University

Spark

All Electronic Theses and Dissertations

2022

Effective Feedback in the Secondary Writing Classroom

Lisa R. Murphy
Bethel University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://spark.bethel.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Murphy, L. R. (2022). *Effective Feedback in the Secondary Writing Classroom* [Master's thesis, Bethel University]. Spark Repository. <https://spark.bethel.edu/etd/883>

This Master's thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Spark. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Spark. For more information, please contact kent-gerber@bethel.edu.

EFFECTIVE FEEDBACK IN THE SECONDARY WRITING CLASSROOM

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY AT BETHEL UNIVERSITY

BY

LISA MURPHY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

AUGUST 2022

BETHEL UNIVERSITY

EFFECTIVE FEEDBACK IN THE SECONDARY WRITING CLASSROOM

LISA MURPHY

August 2022

APPROVED

Thesis Advisor: William Kron, M.A.

Program Director: Molly Wickam, Ph.D.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge a worldwide pandemic, Amazon Prime, waterskiing, joining a worship team, joining a new church, starting a new job as a 7th grade English teacher, running multiple 5ks, running a 10 mile race, Stranger Things, Marie Kondo, Everything that Jenny Han has ever written, Everything that Abby Jimnez has ever written, Margie's restaurant in Andover, women's small group at Northstar community church, Family birthday parties, working at Life Time Fitness, coaching volleyball at Crossfire Youth Sports and learning how to play beach volleyball - ALL - as reasons that this thesis took two years to complete. I would also like to thank the individual people in my life that supported me along this journey. Thank you.

Abstract

Feedback in an educational context is an amazing tool to guide learners towards a goal. This literature review examines the beginning of feedback research, beginning with Thorndike's Law of Effect in 1898 and moving into what researchers are finding today. The guiding questions for this literature review are: What does the research say about giving effective feedback for student writing in the secondary classroom and, also, which agents best deliver that feedback? As a seventh-grade English and Language Arts teacher in Minnesota, USA, I wanted an in-depth understanding of feedback and how to optimize my own role as an agent of feedback for my students. Understanding other agents of feedback give the additional benefit of learning about student preferences, peer interactions, and self-evaluations. Overall, my review found a strong theme of positivity when evaluating students' work or students' responses.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	3
Abstract	4
Table of Contents	5
Chapter I: Introduction	7
History of Feedback Research	7
Definition of Terms	10
Guiding Questions	11
Chapter II: Literature Review	13
Literature Search Procedures	13
Feedback Guidelines to Enhance Learning	14
Sieben’s Research about the Process of Giving Feedback	15
McConlogue’s Research about the Process of Giving Feedback	18
Lim’s Research about the Process of Giving Feedback	18
Formative Feedback Guidelines to Enhance Learning	20
Chilcoat’s Research about the Process of Giving Feedback	23
Behavior Specific Praise Feedback Strategies	26
What are Alternative Agents to Deliver Quality Feedback?	29
Agents of Feedback	29
Peer Feedback	30
Previous Peer Feedback Research	30
Benefits of Giving Peer Feedback	33
Challenges to evaluating peer feedback	35

Training Students to Effectively Deliver Feedback to their Peers	37
Feedback for Teachers from Their Students	38
Student Feedback Preference	41
Chapter III: Discussion and Conclusion	43
Summary of Literature	43
Professional Application	45
Limitations of the Research	47
Implications for Future Research	48
Conclusion	49
References	51
Appendix A - Feedback Types and Tracking Chart	56
Appendix B - Chilcoat's Reasons for Giving Excellent Feedback	57
Appendix C - Chilcoat's Script of Verbal Affirmation Feedback Strategies	58
Appendix D - Chilcoat's Script for Verbal Corrective Feedback	59
Appendix E - Molly and Boud's Guidelines for Peer Feedback	60

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

John Hattie defines feedback as “information provided by an agent (e.g., teacher, peer, book, parent, self-experience) regarding aspects of one’s performance or understanding” (Hattie, 2007). Education is full of opportunities for feedback, and historically, that feedback has been given from a teacher as grades on a report card. Students (hopefully) learn, perform an assigned task, and receive a score.

History of Feedback Research

The study of feedback began long ago and continues to this day. Knowing the history of researchers studying feedback will help us appreciate today’s findings. According to a beautifully written article by Anastasiya Lipnevich and Ernesto Pandero, Thorndike’s Law of Effect in 1898 was the beginning of modern feedback research (Lipnevich, 2021; Thorndike, 1927). Thorndike began research showing that “responses that produce a satisfying effect in a particular situation become more likely to occur again in that situation, and responses that produce a discomforting effect become less likely to occur again in that situation” (Gray, 2011, p. 108–109). Thorndike usually used cats as his ‘learners’ and had them practice solving puzzles for a reward. Once they solved the puzzle once and received a reward, he would have them do the puzzle again. They were incentivized to solve the puzzle again for the reward and could use their learned experience. His findings established what we know now as the Law of Effect and it has promoted positive reinforcement to this day (McLeod, 2018).

Moving Thorndike’s research even further was Edward Skinner. Skinner used Thorndike’s law as a foundation and built a theory of Operant Conditioning (McLeod, 2018). Operant

conditioning says that “actions that are followed by reinforcement will be strengthened and more likely to occur again in the future” (Cherry, 2020). For example, if a seventh grader makes a loud “sheeesh” sound in class and everyone responds with either laughter or their own “sheeeesh” back, their behavior is rewarded and they are more likely to repeat the behavior. This type of feedback research focused on the behavior of the learner and less on what happened in their thinking pattern.

Fast forward to 1968 when Benjamin Bloom took his turn to advance feedback research with formative assessments (Bloom, 1971; Scriven, 1967). Bloom developed a system for giving students feedback during the lesson and also assessing their progress at the end of the lesson.

Bloom described specific strategies teachers could use to implement formative assessments as part of regular classroom instruction, both to improve student learning, to reduce gaps in the achievement of different subgroups of students, and to help teachers to adjust their instruction. (Bloom, 1971) (Lipnevich, 2021 p. 1-2)

Researchers Lipnevich and Pandero trace the definition of feedback through history as: “moving from a monolithic idea of feedback as “it is done to the students to change their behavior” to “it should give information to the students to process and construct knowledge” (Lipnevich, 2021 p.2).

During the 1990s, researchers moved beyond focusing on behavior from learners and delved into the cognitive process that their minds went through as they were learning and processing feedback. Two researchers in particular, Butler and Winne (1995) and Kluger and DeNisi (1996) studied the process of learning and furthered our understanding of feedback.

These two groups enhanced behaviorism with cognitive learning and set the stage for Black and William (1998) to unveil their world renowned thematic review that “expedited and reshaped the field of formative assessment” (Lipnevich, 2021, p.2). According to Lipnevich,

The main message of their [Black & William (1998)] review still stands: across instructional settings assessment should be used to provide information to both the learner and the teacher (or other instructional agent) about how to improve learning and teaching, with feedback being the main vehicle to achieve it. (Lipnevich, 2021, p.2)

With assessments being the measure, teachers being the agent, and feedback being the vehicle, modern research has created many models for how feedback may be used and which agents will be delivering the feedback. “Additionally, a lot is known about how to involve students in the creation of feedback either as self feedback or peer feedback, and what key elements influence students’ use of feedback” (Lipnevich, 2021, p.2).

John Hattie’s (2011) definition of feedback intermixes well with Lipnevich’s (2021) working definition of the feedback process because the feedback is information given to the students so that they can use it in some way, shape or form their work. The feedback and agents that will be discussed in this paper will be a snowballed combination of evidence written by brilliant researchers. This review will describe what feedback looks and sounds like in a secondary student’s classroom, as well as the agents themselves that deliver feedback. John Hattie, as well as many other researchers, outline methods to maximize the impact of feedback for students. In order to follow along and understand the work that has been done, defining these key terms is important.

Key Terms

1. Administrator: a school leader, usually a principal or assistant principal.
2. Agency: "...having agency is to attribute choice, decision, practice and responsibility to a person's, an individual's, or a group's judgment outside natural and external causes, iron logic, laws of nature, and necessities." (Matusov et al., 2016, p. 422)
3. Assessment, Formative: assessments created by or selected by teachers for use on a day-to-day basis to measure student achievement; used to help students learn (Guthrie, 2003). In other words, formative assessments provide feedback to learners about how they can improve (Wallace, 2015).
4. Assessment, Summative: for the purposes of this study, assessment means an assignment that allows a student to show what has been learned during a unit of study (Ravitch, 2010).
5. Curriculum: what teachers are supposed to teach and what students are supposed to learn; what is taught (Ravitch, 2010).
6. Differentiation/Differentiated Instruction: an approach that enables instructors to plan strategically to meet the needs of every learner. The approach encompasses planning and delivery of instruction, classroom management techniques, and expectations of learners' performance that take into consideration the diversity and varied levels of readiness, interests, and learning profiles of learners (United States Dept. of Education, 2010).

7. Evaluation, Formal: “refers to the formal process a school uses to review and rate teachers’ performance and effectiveness in the classroom. Ideally, 17 the findings from these evaluations are used to provide feedback to teachers and guide their professional development” (Sawchuk, 2015, p. 1).
8. Evaluation, Informal: an evaluation of teaching practice or efficacy that is not part of the formal process of a teacher’s performance (e.g. peer or student feedback).
9. Instruction: methods by which teachers produce classroom learning (Huitt, 2003); there are a variety of methods such as direct instruction, inquiry, facilitation, and cooperative learning, among others (Joyce, Weil, & Calhoun, 2004).
10. Pedagogy: the study of education and educational practices; details how to teach (Ravitch, 2007).
11. Professional Development (PD): programs or training for educators to gain and improve skills that may be beneficial or important to their job performance or position (National Education Association, 2020).
12. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs): groups of educators that meet regularly to discuss student performance, share ideas, and analyze data in an effort to improve teaching and learning (Kilbane, 2009).
13. SET (Student Evaluation of Teachers): this is a generic term used to describe the act of students evaluating teachers, whether for formal or informal methods. It can mean different things in different places. For example, some states use SETs as a formal part of a teacher’s annual evaluation. Other states use SETs as a tool to informally provide feedback to teachers. (Hood, 2020, p. 18)

14. Secondary schools: schools that are not primary; upper grades. Usually refers to schools that have grades 6-12.” (Hood, 2020)

I want to improve my use of feedback in my classroom. Using John Hattie’s set of instructions about feedback will help guide this literature review and search for research on *what feedback* needs to be given, and *how* it needs to be given. The guiding questions for this literature review will be: What does the research say about giving effective feedback for student writing in the secondary classroom and which agents best deliver that feedback?

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Literature Search Procedure

In order to find literature and academic articles for this review, Bethel's access to the Academic Search Premier, the ERIC database and the JSTOR database were used. Articles were searched for using the keywords: "Secondary Education Peer Feedback", "Feedback Hattie", "Feedback", "Student feedback high school", "Feedback Hattie Matrix" "Secondary Education Verbal Feedback", "Written Feedback Secondary Education", "Verbal Feedback Secondary Education", "Peer Feedback Secondary Education" and "Feedback Secondary Education." In addition, Google Scholar was used to search specific articles that were referenced by researchers.

Chapter II will include a review of the literature about the impact of feedback on student's writing in the context of a secondary educational setting. The analysis will use the following strategies: optimal content of feedback and best options for delivery of feedback.

Effective Feedback Content

John Hattie is a professor in the field of education and the director of Melbourne Education Research Institute. His extensive work towards understanding education and the process of learning is documented in his thousands of pages of published work. Hattie's guiding principles of feedback create a framework for how feedback is formed, delivered and evaluated for effectiveness. Examining what other researchers and teachers have learned, alongside Hattie, will steer this analysis into the deep blue abyss of becoming a better teacher.

Many teachers, writers and researchers have worked extensively with feedback during their careers. Teachers have worked through trial and error, to discover what feedback benefits their students the most. Many pieces of literature analyzed for feedback on writing were written by teachers who found themselves wanting the best for their students. A few of these researchers are Sieben, McConlogue and Lin. Their projects of finding, collecting, analyzing, testing, and evaluating various forms of feedback for student writers are what guide this section of literature review.

Feedback Guidelines to Enhance Learning (Things to Do)

Renowned researcher John Hattie is known for his passion for feedback. In 2007, he published “The Power of Feedback” where he outlines nine ways for teachers to effectively help students grow. These 9 methods of feedback are challenging to put into practice, but fellow researchers continue to conclude that Hattie is correct in his assessment. These nine strategies have been corroborated by teachers, researchers, and academics - all trying to unlock student potential. These are Hattie’s nine strategies:

1. Focus feedback on the task, not the learner.
2. Provide elaborated feedback.
3. Present elaborated feedback in manageable units.
4. Be specific and clear with feedback messages.
5. Keep feedback as simple as possible, but no simpler.
6. Reduce uncertainty between performance and goals.
7. Give unbiased, objective feedback, written or via computer.
8. Promote a learning goal orientation via feedback.
9. Provide feedback after learners have

attempted a solution (Hattie, 2007; Shute, 2008, p.30). ***Sieben's Research about the Process of Giving Feedback***

The first of five articles written about 'how-to-give-feedback' was from Nicole Sieben. Nicole Sieben gives instructions based on her experience and her extensive research in the field of feedback on student's writing in secondary school. Her article "Building Hopeful Secondary School Writers through Effective Feedback Strategies", written in 2017, outlines answers to her guiding question: "What type of feedback is most effective in secondary student's development as hopeful and competent writers?" In her original attempts at feedback, she found that she overwhelmed students with too many corrections, which collaborates with Hattie's strategy #3, "Present elaborated feedback in manageable units" (Hattie, 2011). Her advice and strategies evolved into the following: 1. Relate and react to the content/ideas in the piece. 2. Provide a balance of compliment and critique (positivity Ratio – 3:1) 3. Use minimal marginal notes and summative endnotes. 4. Keep it conversational and ask questions. 5. Ask students to write feedback response letters and highlight paper revisions. 6. Use emoticons (speak their digital language) (Sieben, 2017, p.49).

She ranks these strategies in a specific order – the most important is listed first. "Relate and react to the content/ideas in the piece." This idea pushes teachers to engage in the ideas and material that students are presenting in their writing. Responding and connecting to specific lines or words that students are bringing to their teacher, which researchers began referring to as the "one caring" for their writing (Noddings, 1995). Reading and responding to a student's writing is an amazing way to show care for students and strengthen relationships in

the classroom. Similarly, Hattie's first strategy for giving feedback is to focus the feedback on the task rather than the learner (Hattie, 2007).

Sieben's second strategy is to "Provide a balance of compliment and critique", with the positivity ratio at three positive comments to every one negative. Sieben consulted a *positivity* researcher, Barbara Fredrickson, and found that when someone hears a negative comment, in order to balance out their psyche, they need to hear three positive comments (Fredrickson, 2019). Combining this human psychology and her experience as a teacher, a ratio-ed blend of positive and constructive feedback is the best recipe for student success. Too much negative feedback leaves students feeling defeated and only positive feedback stunts their growth as writers (Kirby, 2004). Back to her guiding question- creating hopeful and competent writers requires boosting hope with three positive comments to every one critique (Sieben, 2017).

The third strategy given is to "use minimal marginal notes and summative endnotes." (Sieben 2017, p. 49) Aligned with research from Frey and Fisher, simply picking one or two grammar errors to focus on in the paper will help students stay focused on their cohesive writing, not overwhelm them with their flaws and keep in line with the positivity ratio (Frey, 2013). Seiben finds that using four marginal notes on a page (three positive and one corrective) is helpful to students without overwhelming them. At the end of the paper, she delivers a guiding feedback statement for the paper as a whole and closes her notes with something positive, such as "best wishes for the revision process." (Sieben 2017, p.50)

Sieben notes that "students do not need me to wear my "editor hat" while I am reading their work. Instead, I choose one or two grammatical rules - based on patterns of errors - and

ask each student to focus on for the next paper” (Sieben 2017, p. 51). Grammar errors can also be addressed as a goal for the student for the quarter/trimester/semester. This method will help the student work on their flow of thoughts and written work independently of perfecting their grammar (which can sometimes be arduous and painful – lacking in creative fun). These strategies align with John Hattie’s 8th guiding principle of feedback which is “Promote a learning goal orientation via feedback” (Hattie, 2007).

Fourth on the strategy list is “Keep it conversational and ask questions.” Sieben has had success framing feedback in the form of questions – helping students explore their own thoughts in the process of explaining answers to these questions. An example she gives is “Have you considered exploring the significance of this phenomenon in a bit more detail?” (Sieben 2017, p. 51) She discovered that the previous statement was more effective than writing “add more detail here” (Sieben 2017, p. 51). In her own research study, she found that “the majority of 249 students ranked one-on-one conferencing with teachers on draft writing as highly influential in improving their writing skills” (Sieben, 2015). Students value having conversations with their teachers about their writing and rank that direct form of feedback as preferred. While a one-on-one meeting with every student isn’t always plausible, written feedback can be designed to follow the patterns of a conversation about the writing sample (Sieben, 2015).

The fifth strategy on Sieben’s list is to “Ask students to write feedback response letters and highlight paper revisions.” (Sieben 2017, p.51) This idea helps guarantee that students read the feedback on their writing sample. They need to write a response letter to the teacher addressing the prompts, answering questions, or arguing/explaining their point of view. The

letters are a way to interact with the feedback that the teacher has given. Once changes are made to the paper, Sieben suggests that students highlight the changes that have been made so that they are thinking about how they wrote their draft and they can be self-aware of their thought process (Sieben, 2017).

The last guiding strategy of feedback given by Sieben in her analysis is to “Use emoticons (speak their digital language)” (Sieben, 2017, p.52) Examples of this strategy are to use 😊 and 😎 mainly as positive feedback markers in the student’s writings. This strategy of praising students in their own language reflects Hattie’s “keep feedback as simple as possible” (Hattie, 2011; Sieben, 2017).

McConlogue’s Research about the Process of Giving Feedback

Sieben analyzed feedback and gave 6 guiding strategies which move student’s learning forward through feedback. Teresa McConlogue has similar views, which she highlights in her book, “Assessment and Feedback in Higher Education” (McConlogue, 2020). Her chapter titled “Giving Good Quality Feedback” examined research that asked why students were disappointed in feedback that had been given to them. McConlogue says “the purpose of feedback is to enable students to effect change in the quality of their work” (McConlogue, 2020, p. 130).

McConlogue sorts different types of feedback into six categories (see Figure 1) (McConlogue, 2020, p.128). She uses a chart to track: giving praise, recognizing progress, critical feedback, giving advice, clarification requests and unclassified statements.

Lim’s Research about the Process of Giving Feedback

Lim conducts a meta analysis of written feedback for students who are trying to acquire a second language and published his findings in *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*. His article is titled: "Efficacy of Written Corrective Feedback in Writing Instruction: A Meta-Analysis. Lim examines feedback for students writing from three angles: cognitive (how learners attend to corrective feedback), behavioral (learner's uptake or revision due to corrective feedback) and attitudinal (learner's attitudes to corrective feedback such as aversion or anxiety) (Lim, 2020, p.2) Lim's guiding questions were: 1. What is the overall effect of written corrective feedback on improving L2 written accuracy? 2. Which type of written corrective feedback is more effective? And 3. What factors might mitigate the efficacy of written corrective feedback? After analyzing 35 primary studies, Lim's findings reveal that direct feedback was more effective than indirect feedback. Written corrective feedback improved L2 written accuracy and the factor that mitigated the effects of the feedback were learner proficiency.

Based on the idea that a student's proficiency determines how much the feedback helps them, Lim's study points to a classroom in which highly proficient students may self-assess against a rubric but students below proficiency may need more direct teacher feedback. This agrees with what Shute found in her study "for low-achieving learners, use a correct response and some kind of elaboration feedback" and "For high-achieving learners, use facilitative feedback" (Shute, 2008, p.33)

Formative Feedback Guidelines to Enhance Learning (Things to Avoid)

McConlogue, Chilcoat and Haydon are three researchers who studied the best, optimal feedback. Alongside their goal to understand how to best serve students with helpful feedback, they uncovered several key practices to avoid. All three of them share their findings and are helping teachers who are looking to better serve their students.

McConlogue's Research about Avoiding Pitfalls in the Process of Giving Feedback

Based on student surveys, McConlogue's study reveals these pitfalls to avoid when giving feedback: 1. Slow turnaround times, 2. Not enough feedback or feedback that is too generic, 3. Feedback given to the group and not to an individual 4. Feedback that is not useful for the next assignment 5. Feedback that students do not understand 6. Feedback or assessments that made students feel overburdened 7. Feedback that is too critical.

These pitfalls are difficult to avoid. Depending on class size, number of classes and length of assignments, teachers may take a week or two to return 5-page essays (with feedback) to their 120 students. Rebecca Lefroy tries to tackle this obstacle by recording herself talking through feedback to students and attaching the audio file to the document that she was giving feedback about. Practices of offering peer feedback sometimes slow down the feedback loop even more and can "produce hostile reactions from students" (McConlogue, 2020, p. 119). No easy fix solution has been found by researchers, but teachers/researchers acknowledge this challenge exists.

Secondly, McConlogue explains that students need **enough** feedback. Hattie includes this in his strategies when he says: "Provide elaborated feedback" (Hattie, 2011). Another

researcher, Sieben, suggests that a productive amount of feedback on student writing is four comments on a page of text, three positive and one constructive (Sieben, 2017). Hearing from individual students whether this was enough feedback for them, or if it was overwhelming would be a guide from there. Canned feedback or a 'well-done' stamp that is put on every paper was also frowned upon by students. Personalized feedback was preferred in student surveys – not feedback for the class as a whole (McConlogue, 2020).

Third on the list of McConlogue's feedback guide is feedback that is not useful for the next assignment. McConlogue explains that feedback that is given for an isolated assignment – with no chance of a second draft or way to earn credit or points for improvement – may go unread or unopened. If the purpose of feedback is to help students improve on their work, and the students don't see it as a way to improve anything, it has failed (McConlogue, 2020, p. 120).

Next up on the list is feedback that is difficult to understand. According to McConlogue: "It seems student bewilderment about how to use feedback to improve their work fuels dissatisfaction" (McConlogue, date, p. 120). If students aren't able to understand the feedback, they aren't able to use it to "effect change in the quality of their work" (McConlogue, 2020, p. 126). This coincides with Hattie's 8th strategy of feedback which is to "have feedback promote a learning goal." (Hattie, 2011, p. 153). Without the ability to use the feedback as a tool for improvement on an immediate assignment, students will not put it to use, and therefore will not value anything written or given from the classroom teacher.

Fifth on the list from McConlogue is feedback that makes students feel overburdened or is too critical. Trying to cram too much content or too many assignments into a unit of learning creates a heavy stress load for both teacher and student. "Students faced with an

increased amount of assessment have no time to do formative assessments, or to have dialogue around feedback with peers and teachers" (McConlogue, 2020, p. 121). Sieben echoes these findings during her self-reflection about the feedback she gave before she researched feedback. She would unintentionally overwhelm students. This is what she said: "When I returned the graded papers to my students, I saw despair in their eyes. I saw tears welling up and palms hitting foreheads and desktops. And then I heard, "Are you kidding me? I am a GOOD writer! This is insane!" ... "My students were outraged, and with good reason" (Sieben, 2017, p. 48). Hattie also echoes this sentiment with his third guiding principle of feedback "deliver feedback in manageable units" (Hattie, 2011). The examples from Sieben were large amounts of feedback or too much negative feedback which students were not able to manage.

McConlogue's guidance about what not-to-do feedback to students agreed with both Hattie's feedback strategies and Sieben's guidelines. These three researchers have all found:

1. Feedback needs to be about the writing specifically – not about the student.
2. Feedback needs to be specific
3. Feedback needs to be the right length, not too long, not too short.
4. Feedback helps the student reach a goal
5. Feedback should be encouraging and positive while giving correction
6. Feedback should be written so students can understand (even use their language/phrases)
7. Feedback should be delivered in a timely fashion after the writing sample has been submitted.

Research has shown the best written types of feedback that students can receive – feedback that helps them improve their writing, gives them hope, shows that the teacher cares and helps them progress in their education by strengthening their written communication (Hattie, 2011; McConlogue, 2015; Sieben, 2017). Alongside research by Hattie and McConlogue, Chilcoat has written a guide to corrective feedback in writing instruction.

Chilcoat's Research about the Process of Giving Feedback

Levels of personal content in feedback is something that researcher George W. Chilcoat goes into depth studying in his article “Developing Student Achievement with Verbal Feedback.” (Chilcoat, 1988)

Verbal feedback can provide immediate encouragement to student learning (Chilcoat 1988, p. 8). Verbal feedback in the classroom, according to George W. Chilcoat, writer of “Developing student Achievement with Verbal Feedback”, is likely to improve students’ confidence and therefore the quality of their learning.

Chilcoat sorts verbal feedback into two categories: Affirmative feedback and corrective feedback. Both of these categories of feedback are personal for individual students. Some types of verbal affirmative feedback are given during class when learning is taking place. Chilcoat recommends these specific combinations of affirmative verbal feedback as strategies during a lesson (Chilcoat, 1988).

Script of Verbal Affirmation Feedback Strategies.

Chilcoat's first strategy is to affirm students with back-to-back encouragements. He titles this option "praise + praise" (Chilcoat 1988, p.9). Chilcoat's second strategy is to give an affirmative statement and explain what the student did to earn the recognition. He calls this strategy "Praise + reason" (Chilcoat, 1988, p.9). This strategy is echoed by Hattie's directives of feedback as being specific and being directly tied to a task (Hattie, 2011). Chilcoat's last scripted strategy of feedback is to give an affirmation to a student and then use that moment to refocus the entire class back to the goal of the lesson, or lead them to the next step. He refers to this strategy as "Praise + Integration" (Chilcoat, 1988, p. 9). The fourth and final piece of feedback guidance that Chilcoat offers teachers in the classroom is to give a "personal citation" (Chilcoat, 1988, p.9). Delivering a personal compliment to a student, using their first name and announcing their accomplishment to a group of peers can be highly motivating. Claire McCartney delivers a TED talk titled "Missing the obvious in employee recognition" where she brings workplace feedback into the mix. She reveals that the most motivational feedback is public recognition (McCartney, 2015).

These four verbal affirmation strategies are what Chilcoat has found to be most effective in the classroom for praise situations. Chilcoat however warns of improper use by: praising higher achieving students more than lower, acting superior than students, using sarcasm, making the feedback of praise more random, and distracting from the student learning.

Script of Verbal Correction Strategies.

Verbal correction has entirely different strategies. According to Chilcoat, this "feedback is not intended to give disapproval or negative criticism" (Chilcoat, 1988, p.10). Immediate

verbal correction can benefit students right away, correcting misconceptions and preventing them from continuing.

The following are strategies of corrective verbal feedback found most effective by Chilcoat. The first strategy of verbal correction is titled “Correction + Information” (Chilcoat, 1988, p.12). An example of this in the classroom would be “No, the correct answer is the book *Tangerine*” – or “That’s incorrect, a metaphor was used in that line of poetry.” The second verbal correction strategy from Chilcoat is titled “Praise + Correction” (Chilcoat, 1988, p.12). This strategy rewards a student’s attempt or a partially correct answer and then follows up with the accurate information needed to answer the question. An example would be: “I love that you’re sharing your writing – but you didn’t give me the correct answer” or “You’re really close, the simile is correct, but the metaphor needs more work”. Chilcoat’s third strategy is “Correction + Reason” (Chilcoat, 1988, p. 12). This form of verbal response labels a student’s answer wrong and then explains why it’s wrong, OR gives the correct answer and explains why it’s correct. An example of this would be: “No, you have given me the definition of a pronoun.” + “The correct definition is: a noun names people, places things, events and ideas.” (Chilcoat, 1988) The fourth and last correction strategy from Chilcoat is “Correction + Probing” (Chilcoat, 1988, p.12) This strategy labels part of the answer incorrect, but– followed up with more questions. A more detailed script of “Correction + Probing” is included in Appendix 3.

Chilcoat outlines that verbal feedback is effective and immediate. He highlights the need to tell students when they’re correct, and why they’re correct, as well as when they’re wrong and why they’re wrong. During a lesson, verbal feedback is able to check for

understanding – whereas written feedback and peer feedback take place after the lesson has already been taught. There are measurable advantages to verbal feedback (Chilcoat, 1988).

Behavior Specific Praise Feedback Strategies

A researcher who would agree with Chilcoat about verbal praise in the classroom is Todd Haydon. Haydon wrote up his thorough research and published “Effective Use of Behavior-Specific Praise: A Middle School Case Study.” Haydon used the concept of Behavior specific praise and taught two new middle school math teachers how to use the method correctly – in order to reduce disruptive behavior and teacher reprimands (Haydon, 2020, p 33).

Haydon found the two teacher volunteers because they had approached the principal and requested for classroom management help. They were both in their first years of teaching and were having problems with managing disruptive behavior in their classroom. Resources that they had already exhausted were: response cards, adjusting the pace of instruction, adjusting the level of instruction, using incentives with the students, tutoring during free hours and after school. Haydon reported that the interventions and support the teachers were given had no significant impact on student interruptions and classroom disruptions (Haydon, 2020).

The study began when the teachers signed on and began teaching their 8th grade math classes using new strategies – outlined by Haydon. Haydon observed both classrooms to confirm the need for classroom management strategies and to document the rate of disruptions and teacher reprimands.

After a baseline of need was assessed, Haydon had the teachers enroll in a Behavior Specific Training class and learn to use MotivAiders (specialty devices – worn by teachers) – to

vibrate and prompt a behavior-specific praise statements at the rate of one every four minutes (Haydon 2020). This rate was developed by previous research from Austin and Soeda in 2008 when studying the best behavior-specific praise rate in third graders (Austin 2008).

Both teachers began their behavior-specific praise in the classroom, even as they both claimed that “praise statements did not come naturally” to them (Haydon, 2020, p 37). Both math teachers were glad that the intervention consisted of only “one thing to do” (Haydon 2020, p. 37) and that they were able to instruct just as before – with only one new tool in their toolbelt. The results of the study show a significant decrease in teacher reprimands after the behavior-specific praise exercise occurring every four minutes in the classroom. “The results highlight the need for increasing teachers’ skills in the use of praise, while demonstrating the effectiveness of a simple teacher practice on positively changing students’ behaviors.” (Haydon, 2020, p. 36)

Cam Brooks recognized the important role that teacher’s verbal feedback has in the classroom and set out to study the tool of verbal feedback in the context of improving student achievement. He collaborated with 4 other researchers, including John Hattie, and set out on an intimidating task.

Brooks & Hattie wanted to study Hattie’s model of feedback from the 2007 model and “take into account the differing learning states of students” (Brooks, 2019, p.17). To immerse themselves in the data – they recorded an English teacher teaching 12 lessons in a classroom. “Data from the teacher’s voice recorder, comprising 41,179 words (approximately 12 hours of audio) were transcribed into Microsoft Word in preparation for thematic analysis” (Brooks,

2019, p. 20). The matrix of feedback had nine possible themes, and the audio files from the teachers were combed through for verbal feedback, which fell into any of the nine categories.

The extensive coding process considered what the purpose of the feedback was – to “feed up” – clarifies for learners – “Feed back” – any feedback received by the learner that informs them of their current learning state (Hattie 2007). Finally, “Feed Forward” explains the next step to learners.

The study showed that the teacher used the question “How am I going” the most during English lessons. Usually, feedback follows instructions – and students do not get feedback until they have received instruction and then been given a chance to demonstrate their own understanding of those instructions.

Giving an opportunity for feedback earlier in the lesson was a ‘finding’ of the study – that could be a game changer. A study by Brookhard done in 2012 shows that teachers should select the feedback mode that will be most effective to ensure that their message will be received by the learner – so striving to find what mode would be best, and what time during the lesson for feedback would be best are crucial to finding the optimal feedback (Brockhard, 2012).

The study acknowledges that much of the feedback that teachers give students is not used. What feedback will be used by students? What kind of feedback is being given – that isn’t being used? Even though an earlier study of Hattie’s shows that feedback enhanced student motivation and improved student work, a later study showed that in over 600 feedback studies, more than one-third showed a decrease in student performance. The negative side of feedback has possibly been overlooked – so this study “needs to (1) clarify expectations and

standards for the learner; (2) schedule ongoing, targeted feedback within the learning period; (3) foster practices to develop self-regulation; and (4) provide feed forward opportunities to implement the feedback and close the feedback loop.” Feeding back was the most common form of feedback given in the 12 hours of audio – and more specifically, feedback directed to the task was the subset category with the most examples in the audio (Broakhard, 2012).

Chilcoat, Haydon, Brooks & Hattie all agree that verbal feedback in the classroom is highly complex. The classroom teacher is the common denominator in all classrooms. When the variables of quality feedback hinge on the classroom teacher, best practices and strategies become clear.

What are Alternative Agents to Deliver Quality Feedback?

After reviewing what research shows is the most influential content to include in feedback for growing writers, the second half of the guiding research question can be analyzed. With content reviewed, according to the research, what are the best methods to deliver feedback to secondary students in a writing classroom? Researchers Gielen, McConalogue, Wihastyanang, Hood, Selvaraj and Klash all have studied the most effective delivery method of quality feedback. Hattie’s guiding strategies of powerful feedback # 3, 4, and 9 suggest that teachers should 3) Present elaborated feedback in manageable units, 4) Be specific and clear with feedback messages and 9) Provide feedback after learners have attempted a solution. Hattie’s strategies, combined with what other researchers have learned about delivering feedback to students will be outlined in this portion of the literature review.

Agents of Feedback

Teacher feedback is complex and powerful. Teacher feedback is typically what comes to mind, and what research databases bring up in searches when feedback is discussed. However, teachers are simply an agent that delivers feedback to students. Agents of feedback refer to the different vehicles/methods/ways to deliver feedback to students (Klash 2020). Peer Feedback and self-assessment feedback are two other agents that can be utilized in a classroom setting. Sometimes, having an agent who is not a teacher can be helpful to propel students forward in their learning. One of these agents/methods of delivering feedback to students is called “peer feedback” and refers to the practice of having students give one another feedback.

Peer Feedback.

The first branch of the delivery method to explore is that of peer feedback. What research has been done about peer feedback? Is this a viable method for feedback to be delivered? Can content be of high quality when it’s generated by fellow learners? What does the research say about peer feedback as a method to deliver feedback to students in a secondary classroom? A few researchers dug into peer feedback, including Gielen, McGonague, and, Malloy and Boud.

Previous Peer Feedback Research.

To begin analyzing peer feedback, Gielen conducted a study comparing peer feedback to teacher feedback in a 7th grade classroom in Belgium. The study took place in the student’s first language and was built on Sadler’s 1998 research on feedback. Gielen quotes Sadler’s statement “A good teacher uses experience and skills that are not available to pupils, such as superior knowledge, a set of attitudes and dispositions towards teaching as an activity and

towards learners (empathy, desire to help, and a deep knowledge of criteria and standards or insights into the set of expectations for a specific assignment (Sadler, 1998).” Because Sadler believes that “students’ peer assessments skills can be trained so that their feedback becomes as effective as teacher feedback in the end (Sadler, 1998), Gielen structures a learner based environment of writing. She chooses to observe students receiving feedback from teachers, as well as students practicing giving and receiving feedback from peers (Gielen, 2010).

Gielen begins her research by outlining seven specific reasons that peer feedback is valuable and should be used in the classroom. Using these seven guiding principles of peer feedback, she builds a case, acknowledging teacher feedback as valuable as well, that peer feedback is essential in the classroom. Peer feedback can be as valuable as teacher feedback with practice (Gielen, 2010).

Gielen says, “Peer feedback can increase the social pressure on students to perform well on an assignment.” (Gielen, 2010) This statement was strongly supported by a study done by Cole in 1991 and a study done by Pope in 2005. The fear of embarrassment or the desire to impress peers both motivates students to do better work. Using peer feedback can tap into these different forms of motivation. The dark side of this form of coaxing better work could be higher levels of anxiety – especially for students who do not feel safe and accepted by their peers before the exchange of student work. They may not want to feel another level of evaluation from a group by whom they are not accepted.

Principle 2 - Students view peer feedback as more understandable and relatable. A study by Toppings says that students feel they “are on the same wavelength.” Students report that

sometimes the feedback from the teacher is difficult to understand. Feedback from Peers requires less interpretation and therefore is easier to digest (Gielen, 2010).

Principle 3 – Student feedback – peer-to-peer feedback – helps students understand the process of feedback itself. Sharing one’s opinions of writing, suggestions for improvements, and then seeing those improvements take place is a rewarding cycle – and when students get to see that cycle work and function, they are more ‘on board’ with the practice of feedback and improving writing (Gielen, 2010).

Principle 4 – peer feedback is fast. Teachers may take some time between students turning in work and when the work is returned to students with feedback. Peer to peer feedback can be almost immediate because they are only responsible for one paper’s feedback – rather than a class of 35 students. Gibbs reported in 2004 that ‘imperfect feedback from a fellow student provided almost immediately may have much more impact than more perfect feedback from a tutor four weeks later’ (Gibbs, 2004, p.19).

Principle 5 – Peer feedback is beneficial because it can happen more often and can be given as formative feedback – rather than just feedback at the end of a lesson. If teachers could work peer feedback into the learning loop – many more drafts and steps of improvement could take place.

Principle 6 – Peer feedback is very valuable because it is highly individualized. Often, if teachers give frequent feedback, they make an announcement to the group, perhaps about formatting their essays (in 7th grade)! - but individual peer feedback can steer clear of the need for a group announcement if 5 students have been seen struggling with one component.

Principle 7 – Students may be more honest and ask more honest questions to peers instead of a teacher. If the relationship between teacher/student feels like a power struggle – students may feel highly defensive when a teacher is giving them feedback. Peer feedback may feel safer for a student because they don't need to hide misconceptions or worry about appearing a certain way to the teacher. Peer feedback may be more welcomed than teacher feedback (for some students) – (for others it's the opposite)(Gielen, 2010).

After analyzing the benefits of peer feedback, Gielen created a plan to compare teacher feedback to peer feedback. What was the best way to compare these two methods of evaluating writing and giving suggestions and guidance for improvement? Which method was a more effective agent for delivering feedback to the student.

Benefits of Giving Peer Feedback.

Malloy and Boud spent years studying peer feedback and looked for positive implementations of peer feedback in the classroom. Identifying these reasons for using peer feedback and linking to another study by Malloy and Boud in 2018 identifying these seven beneficial aspects of peer feedback.

The first beneficial aspect noted by Malloy and Boud is that if students are working towards a standard or common goal, they can see the purpose of feedback. The feedback becomes something that will help them get closer to the goal instead of a punishment or a harsh word given to them. If the peers that are working together have a common standard in mind that they're working towards, they become a team. Their feedback towards one another is steps closer and closer to the goal.

The second beneficial aspect from Malloy and Boud about peer feedback is that students may examine their own work more closely before submitting to a peer. This process of self-evaluation is a valuable skill that can be repeated and utilized in almost every aspect of life.

The third benefit to peer feedback is that students feel more comfortable asking for specific feedback. An example is that they may ask another student, “what do you think of my title?” whereas, with a teacher, students will wait for the feedback. Also, students may explain a more vulnerable aspect of the work to a peer, exposing a weak area and requesting specific feedback.

Finally, Malloy and Boud explain that with peer feedback, someone other than the teacher gives “performance information” to the student (Malloy, 2013, 24). With the information, students can improve their work and move closer to the learning target. Peer feedback has many benefits, but not all researchers recognize the same aspects.

John Hattie’s strategies of peer feedback differ slightly because they are not only about the task itself, they are having the learners practice the comparison process, judge their own work, reflect on a rubric and how others’ work measures up against a rubric. Is there room in excellent feedback to have students looking to their peers or themselves for guidance? Researcher Nicole Sieben looks into this question after conducting a study in her own classroom.

Nicole Sieben also outlines the benefits of students taking responsibility for giving feedback in her article “Building Hopeful Secondary School Writers through Effective Feedback Strategies.” She outlines a plan to have students give feedback on their papers using

highlighters and with written response letters. Her reasons for this strategy are to “keep the conversation going between my students and I about this particular paper” as well as to “Give a guarantee that students read and consider the suggestions that she shares with them for revision (Sieben, 2017, p.51)

Students are able to give their own feedback to the teacher or to their peer editor with the letter they’ve written. If they can acknowledge that they have room to improve and then are able to wrestle with the process of editing their own writing, they will attempt their own solution before the teacher solves it for them. This method agrees with Hattie’s 9th strategy of powerful feedback which is “Provide feedback after learners have attempted a solution” (Hattie, 2011).

Overall, Sieben says that “Feedback makes writing matter to students” (Sieben, 2017, p. 52). She gave guidance for content earlier in the literary review, and she gives guidance on how to deliver the content as well. Sieben wraps up her article by saying “learning to use each of these strategies in ways that feel authentic to my teaching practice took experience, experimentation, and feedback from students and other teachers” (Sieben, 2017, p. 52). The component of teachers receiving feedback from their students about feedback itself is a component that also needs to be researched, because adding another loop in the feedback circle would enable teachers to hone in and personalize feedback to a greater degree. The added feedback loop as well as the self-assessment and rubric piece that Sieben lightly introduces are major components in other researchers’ methods for feedback delivery.

Challenges to evaluating peer feedback.

Gielen found that after evaluating multiple methods of feedback analysis, even more problems of comparison were uncovered. Many studies have been done, but for Gielen, evaluating them and trying to make a conclusive decision based on evidence was challenging. (Gielen, 2010)

The first challenge was that in the studies, there was never a 'control group.' Students never received 'no feedback' on their writing – to develop a baseline of how much teacher feedback and then peer to peer feedback benefited them.

The second challenge is that the term 'peer feedback' is very loosely used for many different methods of delivering feedback from one student to another. The terms 'peer assessment', 'peer feedback', 'peer review', "peer editing.' sometimes describe the exact same practice in studies, and sometimes refer to a very different method of gathering and delivering feedback to students in the academic setting (Gielen, 2010).

The third challenge to comparing and evaluating studies about peer feedback is that the results can be (and are) compiled in a wide variety of ways. Sometimes, student preference is the standard to which the feedback is evaluated. Sometimes "perceived usefulness" is the yardstick. Sometimes "nature of comments, self-reported use in revision, objectively measured use in revision, correct understanding of comments, types of revision initiated, effects on self-revision, effects on performance in revision or performance with transfer to a new assignment or effects on longer term learning (self-regulation, audience awareness, understanding or criteria etc.)" (Gielen, 2010, 4)

After analyzing the differences in other studies' methodologies, Gielen directed her study to be limited to a four-month period, establishing the comparison between teacher feedback and student feedback to be taken into consideration during a two-cycle writing exercise. The 'control' group would be the group receiving teacher feedback, and the experimental/variable group would be the student feedback group. The peer evaluation group will take surveys about their 'perceived helpfulness' and whether or not they would like to do peer reviews again. (Gielen, 2010)

Gielen steered her project with questions about the differences between scores between pretest and posttest of groups that utilized peer feedback. Sometimes the groups would have extended peer feedback (more exchanges between students) or simple feedback. Finally, Gielen wanted to know if students would like to continue the practice of peer feedback after all of these assessments and projects had been completed (Gielen, 2010).

After four months of experimenting, documenting, analyzing and collecting data, Gielen discovered that there was 'no significant difference in students' progress on essay marks between students who worked with substitutional peer feedback on writing assignments for a semester and students in the control group who worked with teacher feedback. Her study concluded that peer feedback can therefore be substituted for teacher feedback without fear of lowered student performance. Gielen continues..., However, 53-87% of students reported that they do not want to use peer feedback in the future.(Gielen, 2010) Even though it was comparable, students preferred to receive their corrections from the teacher. Students also reported not enjoying the 'paperwork' that accompanied giving other students feedback (Gielen, 2010).

Overall, the method of peer feedback, while it saves teachers time and provides feedback immediately to large classrooms full of students, was not preferred by students and eliminates the expertise and relational aspect that so many other researchers have determined are what makes the content of feedback so effective in the first place (Gielen, 2010).

Training Students to Effectively Deliver Feedback to their Peers.

Another researcher that delves into peer feedback is Teresa McConlogue. In her book, "Giving Good Quality Feedback" she discusses the importance of teaching peer feedback and using it, as a teacher and student, to improve written work. McConlogue highlights five reasons to train students in the methods of peer feedback: 1. "to identify oneself as an active learner." 2. "to identify one's level of knowledge and the gaps in this." 3. "to practice testing and judging." 4. "to develop these skills over time." 5. "to embody reflexivity and commitment." (McConlogue, 2020, p. 6)

The goals listed by McConlogue in her research align with Hattie's strategies of feedback's goals, but seem to be teaching the student another set of skills alongside the writing process. If the goal is to help the student become a more effective evaluator, then the peer feedback is hitting the target. However, if the teacher's goal is to help the student be a better writer, McConlogue's peer feedback methods are missing the mark. What does other research say about peer feedback? Is there research that argues that it's the best way to deliver feedback, or is it simply another avenue of learning like McConlogue suggests?

Feedback for Teachers from their Students.

Researchers Hood and Hujala have written extensive research about self-assessment and adding a feedback loop for students to give insight back to teachers about their teaching and their own feedback. They create a new chain of thought surrounding the practice of reaching out to students for feedback. Hood spends her research asking the question of teachers in California if they're even interested in getting student feedback. Hujala analyzes different types of feedback from students and determines what could be helpful in the learning process.

Hood begins with research questions: How might student feedback impact instruction? What do teachers perceive to be important feedback from students? To what extent do teachers agree with the use of student feedback? To what extent does feedback from students drive teacher reflection? In Hood's quest to answer these looped feedback questions, (Hood, 2020).

The purpose of Hood's study is to understand how teachers view and interact with student feedback in the form of surveys. In addition, measuring if teachers agree with feedback and examining how the feedback might change instruction.

This study was thorough. The opinion of teachers' views on feedback was looked at from many different sides. The range of participants in Hood's research included 9th – 12th-grade teachers, male and female, with varying levels of experience, different levels of education and professional development, as well as different subjects (Hood, 2020). Teachers responded that 83% had asked for student feedback in the past and 17% had not. Based on the teacher surveys, four themes were formed. They are: student feedback aids in instruction and teaching, negative comments from students help to spur reflection, student feedback helps to build

relationships between teachers and students and teachers must be vulnerable to feedback (Hood, 2020).

The teaching group that was surveyed were established in their careers – with 30% having their Bachelor's Degree, 65% having their Master's Degree, and 5% having their Doctoral Degree. The teachers that were asked questions about student feedback were used to teaching in a very specific environment and receiving their peer professional development evaluations in a specific format. Options on the questionnaire were to have student opinions included in formal evaluation. I believe that new teachers may be more open to the student opinions in their evaluations vs. seasoned teachers. Many teachers cited that students can be fickle in their opinions and focus on one incident (usually a negative incident, failing a test or behavioral confrontation) to evaluate a teacher (Hood, 2020).

Hood's conclusion was that most teachers were already asking for feedback from their students and processing that information. Teachers were hesitant to have student feedback tied to an employer/review system with results being on file in their employment. Hood digs into whether teachers would appreciate student feedback, whereas Mark, Hujala and Selvaraj study the results of student feedback given to teachers (Hood, 2020).

Hujala focuses research on how to measure student feedback. According to Hujala, "this article presents a process for gathering open-ended feedback by using a "topic modeling approach that goes beyond listing modeling outcomes." ... "This study will also make it easier to distinguish meaningful themes within the feedback." (Hujala, 2020, p. 1). After creating a 7-step electronic method of measuring student feedback intended to be imputed electronically

by students, Hujala was able to create a topic and theme table based on student responses.

The top five topics of the surveys about the class became:

Student Satisfaction Survey

Good Content	1	2	3	4	5
Improvements in Arrangements	1	2	3	4	5
Severe, Emotional Dissatisfaction	1	2	3	4	5
Dissatisfaction with Course	1	2	3	4	5
Dissatisfaction with Workload	1	2	3	4	5
Interesting, but challenging content, stressful	1	2	3	4	5

Hujala used a Likert scale and analyzed the students' responses to find correlations between the answers. As an example, if a student responded strongly with a “dissatisfied with the course’s implementation, the higher the probability that his or her written feedback is related to the topic “severe, emotional dissatisfaction” (Hujala, 2020, p. 11). Overall, Hujala created a method of collecting student feedback, sorting it, scoring and analyzing the trends, therefore making it more valuable for teachers. Hujala states:

“This study’s objective was to evaluate the use of topic modeling for analyzing written student feedback. To achieve this goal, we established a streamlined process for examining masses of open feedback using a combination of topic modeling, thematic analysis, and multilevel modeling. As a result, we present a reproducible process for handling masses of feedback, which also is rigorously rooted in SET literature.” (Hujala 2020, p.11)

Student Feedback Preference.

One researcher that addresses both written feedback content and verbal feedback content is Rebecca Lefroy. Lefroy says, “Typically, classroom formative assessment takes the form of written marking. However, feedback can be more or less effective depending on its focus, timing and the way it is given.” (Hattie, 2007). She created a study around an innovative practice of recording feedback as an audio file – so it is both verbal, but ‘written’ in a sense that students can reference it and listen to it as many times as they need. Her research showed that students, who were taking a mandatory English class at the secondary level in the United Kingdom, preferred audio feedback to written feedback (Lefroy, 2020). Her research also showed that audio feedback was more effective than written feedback. “According to the few published studies about audio feedback, its most effective and unique attribute is the relational approach it brings” (Lefroy, 2020, p. 323).

Lefroy found a way to combine the personal touch that verbal feedback carries and written feedback that can be referenced back to later in time. More research needs to be done on recorded audio feedback replacing written feedback, but in her class, it helped students improve their first draft more dramatically than written feedback alone. (Lefroy, 2020, p. 325)

Towards the beginning of her school year, Lefroy had her students read *Romeo and Juliet* (in November-December) and *Frankenstein* in January-March. The students did a timed essay about Shakespear’s classic in the fall, and one week later they received written feedback from their teacher (Lefroy) – marking two positives and two or three goals for students to reach in their writing. Students were required to use a chart and try to meet all of the standards required for the assignment – as well as use the feedback from Lefroy (Lefroy, 2020).

In March, the students were given the same exercise about the book *Frankenstein*. They wrote a timed essay and received feedback in an audio format on the App “Seesaw.” Students were given a 50-minute class period to listen to the audio file in class and make adjustments that would help their essay meet the requirements as well as respond to the teacher’s feedback (Lefroy, 2020).

The students’ progress on their *Frankenstein* essay was significantly better – based on Lefroy’s data analysis adopted by Martyn Denscombe’s 2007 “outline of four main tasks to interpreting data” (Lefroy, 2020, p. 326). Their measured progress supported the use of audio files for feedback in a classroom setting.

Lefroy’s research presents evidence that verbal feedback is preferred by students and enables students to improve their writing by a greater margin – thus making it more effective. Additional data in Lefroy’s study were survey results from her students that explored four themes of feedback and learning. The four themes were: building resilience and active participation, clarity and depth of feedback, the role of the relationship between teacher and learner, and the structuring and delivery of feedback. What Lefroy learned using these four frameworks of themes in her study leaves her wanting to learn more about the benefits of personalized feedback – in vocal formats – from teachers to students (Lefroy, 2020, p. 331). This personalized style of feedback agrees with Hattie’s third and seventh strategies for feedback - 3 - Present elaborated feedback in manageable units and #7 - Give unbiased, objective feedback, written or via computer (Hattie, 2011).

CHAPTER III: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Summary of Literature

Studying the process of giving feedback is vital. If teachers and students can unlock the ways they learn and communicate with one another, the process of education will be efficient and uplifting. Looking through where feedback started to where it is today traces steps and people who contributed to the steps that we have made. Our progress towards understanding optimal feedback is exciting.

The study of feedback began in 1898, 124 years ago, with Thorndike's Law of Effect. He showed that positive results would increase specific behaviors. Building off his findings, teachers and researchers have built an understanding of how a person's brain learns as well as how feedback sculpts and promotes learning. This literature review highlighted Chilcoat's findings in the 1980s and dug into John Hattie's strategies for optimal feedback - pulling from researchers who tackled similar areas of interest. Positivity emerged as a theme. Chilcoat (1988), Sieben (2018), McConlogue (2020), Haydon (2011), and Brooks (2019) all highlighted positive feedback, praise or affirmations as vital components to their feedback. Simplicity also emerged as a theme. Hattie, in his multiple publications and career of studying education, stresses keeping feedback simple and being concise. Researchers Hujala (2020) and Lim (2020) support Hattie with their advice to keep written feedback as simple as possible, avoiding overwhelming students in their learning tasks.

In addition to optimal feedback, researchers dug into questions about the agents that deliver this feedback. Teachers were the most commonly studied agent in my research. Their

role and influence in students' lives is almost inseparable from the education system. Peer feedback, using peers to deliver feedback, is a common alternative agent. Research asked questions like: Do students prefer getting feedback from their peers, or does peer feedback benefit students to a similar degree as teacher feedback? Also included in the literature review, is feedback from students to teachers. The literature walks through a teacher's desire for feedback from students, students' preferences towards what kind of feedback they receive and a variety of ways to measure improvement. The favorite pieces of literature reviewed were the most practical pieces of advice - commonly from teachers. The scripts from Chiton were excellent - demonstrating what positive feedback in a classroom discussion sounds like, as well as the gems of advice from Sieben to choose one or two grammar rules to focus on while editing a student's paper (Sieben 2017, p. 51). So much can be learned from reading and compiling research for two years. The opportunity to apply some of the strategies suggested by was an unexpected benefit.

Professional Applications

I set out on this journey to become a better teacher. Reading the work of researchers and teachers alike has absolutely helped me achieve my goal. One benefit of taking two years to research and write this literature review is that I was able to practice and apply some of what I was learning. One example of how this affected my classroom is that I asked the students what their preferences were for projects or gave them options. Towards the beginning of 2021, we did a research project gathering background information on Charles Dickens and the London era in which he wrote "A Christmas Carol." I remember the peer feedback research discussing that students did not like the paperwork which accompanied peer feedback, so I had the research

assigned in groups of four people. They had a topic, (example: Charles Dickens adult life) and they made a Google Slideshow - knowing that they would present to the class and “teach” the group. They were instructed to each create their own slide and then look over the group project as a whole to make sure it made sense and hit the targets on the rubric. This style of project became a favorite of mine because I could walk around the room and hear students' conversations at the beginning of a task as well as at the end. Some students wanted advice on color choice before they began their research. Some students would ask me to review their work in the middle of the process and I would encourage them to have their group look through. Having the rubric was also something that was reinforced by all of the literature that I read about because the rubric then became the measuring stick, instead of the knowledge that their peers possessed.

Another piece of advice that I gleaned from this process was specific praise. Instead of saying “good job Charlie,” it was recommended that I say, “I like the words you chose to describe the evil doctor in your story, Charlie.” I actually appreciated the advice, because as a teacher, it became a game of searching for my favorite specific aspect from their work and eventually, students would wait while I read their project to hear what I liked!

Positivity emerged as a theme in the literature, but alongside the research was the idea of growth mindset and learning from failure. I incorporated “highs and lows” on Monday morning attendance, asking “what was your high and low from the weekend? - or you can pass :)” I tried to ask follow up questions about the low, because often times it was the most interesting. If they won a basketball tournament, I would say “congratulations,” but if their low was that all of their plans were canceled, I would ask for more information. Sometimes

students would share that they did not make a sports team that they tried out for. Sometimes students would say they did nothing and were very bored. I enjoyed the challenge of looking for the positive, empathizing, and offering balance to 7th graders who seemed blindly immersed in emotion.

While reading through the peer research and student preference research, I also attempted to incorporate peer editing in my classroom. The first attempt was asking students if they would like to have another student read their short story. This idea was strongly rejected. I strategized and offered to read anyone's story out loud - anonymously - if they emailed me with permission. I had five students on the first day in my advanced English class give permission, and I received even more emails as I was reading stories out loud. After two weeks of me reading anonymously, a few students volunteered to read their stories out loud to the class. This plan only worked for students who were confident with their writing, and not the students that needed more support.

The next phase of the plan was an idea from a coworker. I had students write scripts for plays and their group had to perform the play. This plan was a way to include all students, have them read each other's writing and engage with the content. I had students fix their typos because individuals in their group were saying the wrong words. This was significant because I hadn't unlocked how to make a select group of students care about their typos or spelling errors until this assignment.

My current vibe on 7th graders is that they are already evaluated and rated by one another; they do not want another risk of judgment and vulnerability. I will not have them grade one another or give scores for someone else's assignments. I will continue to do the

script writing assignment and have students share Google Slides for presentations - working together towards a goal. Writing this literature review has helped me hone in my intentional peer editing interactions.

Professionally, I would like to build on my understanding of feedback. I will continue to reflect on John Hattie's strategies for feedback on my whiteboard next to my desk, and I will keep practicing the craft of teaching. My professional development goal last year was to give feedback to parents during the school year, alongside students. I will continue my efforts to give high quality feedback to students and promote a positive learning environment for my students. I am a more mindful teacher because of the research I have reviewed for this thesis.

Limitations of the Research

The feedback studies in this literary review compared different styles of feedback, different types of peer feedback, different student preferences, and multiple teacher preferences. Elements that are difficult to measure are the teaching style and personality of a specific classroom teacher, and the relationship that students have with their teacher and with their peers. Materials included in this literary review were highly readable and often written by teachers. The practical element of application in the classroom is important and many of the researchers included their own experiences in their writing. Moreover, articles that were difficult to read and understand were excluded from this collection.

Another limitation to the research is the location in which each study took place. Would they have the same results in England as they did in Australia? Would studies completed in

Minnesota show a different student preference or teacher preference than the studies completed in California?

Lastly, the measure of 'gain' or progress that a student makes with feedback cannot be compared well to a control group, because there were rarely studies where students received no feedback.

Implications for Future Research

Feedback research has come a long way since its beginning. Learning about how the human brain processes information, how patterns of behavior emerge, and how students best receive and use feedback to improve have all propelled the education model forward. Covid- 19 and the worldwide pandemic sent students and teachers into an online model of school that stretched individuals technological abilities and learning styles. Moving forward, more research to bolster an online learning community would be useful. If all variables except the classroom environment stayed the same, how would the studies' results change? Would students become better writers if they had to type in a chat in order to engage with one another? The world is moving forward and technology has made school accessible for students who cannot make it into a classroom. I would enjoy studying the process of online feedback and what the future holds for education for years to come.

Conclusion

Overall, research guides teachers how to provide feedback to students. A common theme of positivity emerged when looking through the different styles, examples and scripts of feedback provided by teachers and researchers. I have learned more about feedback strategies

and seen evidence that positivity often goes hand in hand with growth. I will pursue excellent feedback and hope that I have fostered relationships with my classes so that they can receive it.

References

- Austin, J. L., & Soeda, J. M. (2008). Fixed-time teacher attention to decrease off-task behavior of typically developing third graders. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 41*, 279-283.
- Ajjawi, R., Dawson, P., & Tai, J. (2018). *Developing evaluative judgement in higher education*. D. Boud (Ed.). London and New York: Routledge.
- Bloom, B. S. (1971). Handbook on formative and summative evaluation of student learning.
- Brooks, C., Carroll, A., Gillies, R. M., & Hattie, J. (2019). A matrix of feedback for learning. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education (Online), 44*(4), 14-32. Retrieved from <https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol44/iss4/2>
- Cherry, K. (2020). "What Is Operant Conditioning and How Does It Work? How Reinforcement and Punishment Modify Behavior." VeryWellMind <https://www.verywellmind.com/operant-conditioning-a2-2794863>
- Chilcoat, G. (1988). "Developing Student Achievement with Verbal Feedback." pp. 8-13
- Fredrickson, Barbara. (2019) *Positivity*. Harmony Books.
- Frey, N., & Fisher, D. (2013). A formative assessment system for writing improvement. *English Journal, 66*-71.
- Gibbs, G. & Simpson, C. (2004). Conditions under which assessment supports students' learning, *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education, 1*, 3-31.

Gielen, S., Tops, L., Dochy, F., Onghena, P., & Smeets, S. (2010). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback and of various peer feedback forms in a secondary school writing curriculum. *British educational research journal*, 36(1), 143-162.

Gray, P. O. (2010). *Psychology*. Macmillan.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of educational research*, 77(1), 81-112. DOI: 10.3102/003465430298487

Haydon, T. and Musti-Rao, S. (2020) "Using Teacher Praise with Middle and High School Students." *Beyond Behavior*, vol. 29, no. 2, 2020, pp. 108–115.,
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1074295620915883journals.sagepub.com/home/bbx>.

Haydon, T., & Musti-Rao, S. (2011). Effective use of behavior-specific praise: A middle school case study. *Beyond Behavior*, 20(2).

Hood, L. (2020). *Teacher perceptions of student feedback as a tool for reflection* (Order No. 28089554). Available from Publicly Available Content Database. (2449871411). Retrieved from:
<https://ezproxy.bethel.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.ezproxy.bethel.edu/dissertations-theses/teacher-perceptions-student-feedback-as-tool/docview/2449871411/se-2?accountid=8593>

Hujala, M., Knutas, A., Hynninen, T., & Arminen, H. (2020). Improving the quality of teaching by utilizing written student feedback: A streamlined process. *Computers & Education*, 157, 103965. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.bethel.edu/10.1016/j.compedu.2020.103965>

Kirby, D. L., & Crovitz, D. (2012). Inside out: Strategies for teaching writing. Kennesaw State University.

Klash, E. F., & Simmons, K. D. (2020). *The Virtual Avatar Lab (VAL): Tapping into Virtual Live Environments to Practice Classroom Feedback Conversations*. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, 9(3), 149-160. <https://doi.org/10.5430/jct.v9n3p149>

Kluger, A. N., & DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: a historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological bulletin*, 119(2), 254. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.119.2.254.

Lefroy, R. (2020). Audio or written feedback? The secondary school English student experience. *English in Education*, 54(4), 321-333.

Lim, S. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2020). Efficacy of Written Corrective Feedback in Writing Instruction: A Meta-Analysis. *TESL-EJ*, 24(3), n3.

Lipnevich, A. A., Murano, D., Krannich, M., & Goetz, T. (2021). Should I grade or should I comment: Links among feedback, emotions, and performance. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 89, 102020.

Noddings, N. (1995). Teaching themes of care. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76, 675-675.

McCartney, C. (2002). *Work-life balance: The role of the manager* (pp. 1-96). Horsham: Roffey Park Institute.

McConlogue, T. (2015). Making judgements: Investigating the process of composing and receiving peer feedback. *Studies in Higher education*, 40(9), 1495-1506.

McLeod, S. A. (2017). Behaviorist approach.

Sadler, D. R. (1998). Formative assessment: Revisiting the territory. *Assessment in education: principles, policy & practice*, 5(1), 77-84.

Selvaraj, A. M., & Azman, H. (2020). Reframing the Effectiveness of Feedback in Improving Teaching and Learning Achievement. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 9(4), 1055-1062.

Sawchuk, P. H. (2015). Informal learning as dialectics of activity. In *Measuring and analyzing informal learning in the digital age* (pp. 1-17). IGI Global.

Scriven, M. S. (1967). The Methodology of Evaluation. *Perspect. Curriculum Eval. AERA Monogr. Ser. Curriculum Eval.*, 1.

Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on formative feedback. *Review of educational research*, 78(1), 153-189.

Sieben, N. (2018). Writing Hope as a Matter of Social Justice: At the Intersection of Positive Psychology and English Education. In *Writing Hope Strategies for Writing Success in Secondary Schools* (pp. 221-236). Brill.

Sieben, N. (2017). Building hopeful secondary school writers through effective feedback strategies. *English Journal*, 48-53.

Wihastyanang, W. D., Kusumaningrum, S. R., Latief, M. A., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2020). Impacts of providing online teacher and peer feedback on students' writing performance. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 21(2), 178-189.

Appendix A

Feedback Types Tracking Chart

128

ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Table 8.1: Feedback profiling tool

Assessment Careers JISC funded

Assessment Careers Feedback Analysis Tool

Programme

Module Student Name (to be anonymised)

Grade if known Assessor(s) (to be anonymised) Formative or summative assessment

Category of feedback	Code	Sub-category	Examples	Score	Rank order
Giving praise	P1		'A well-constructed argument...'		
Recognising progress (ipsative)	P2		'This represents a significant improvement ...' 'You have taken on board critique ...'		
Critical feedback	C1	Correction of errors	Spelling, grammar, referencing etc.		
	C2	Factual critiques (of content)	'I do not think you can say X.' 'This is not in enough depth.'		
	C3	Critique of approach (structure and argument)	'It would have been better to conclude with Y ...'		
Giving advice	A1	Specific (to current assignment)	'You might want to consider X ...'		
	A2	General points (specific to current assignment)	e.g. on depth, argument and structure: 'There is scope to tease out further detail on X ...'		
	A3	For future assignments	'In your next essay you should consider Y ...'		
Clarification requests	Q		'What do you mean by Z?'		
Unclassified statements	O		Statements which do not make a judgement, e.g. descriptions of the work.		

Find out more about the feedback profiling tool here: <http://jiscdesignstudio.pbworks.com/w/page/50671006/Assessment%20Careers%20Project>

Chilcoat's Reasons for Giving Excellent Feedback

“Develop students’ self-confidence, which in turn, improves and develops their ability to learn

- Require students to be on task
- Require students to be accountable for their own learning
- Ensure students effort is positively recognized, strengthened, and maintained
- Aid in developing student interest in the subject matter
- Encourage students to spend more time formulating correct answers and responses
- Eliminate student errors and misunderstandings that can lead to frustration
- Provide students with the skills or knowledge needed to accomplish a particular academic task
- Indicate to students - what level they are to achieve
- Orient students to their own strengths and weaknesses in order to direct or alter their own learning
- Focus student learning responses on lesson objectives
- Pace student learning
- Measure student learning frequently and systematically in order to check for understanding and to determine adequacy of learning
- Identify exactly what students know and do not know. “ (Chilcoat 1988, pp. 8-9)

Chilcoat's Script of Verbal Affirmation Feedback Strategies:

1) praise + praise: this strategy rewards an appropriate learning behavior. Examples in a classroom setting would be "Good!" + "You are doing better" and "Not bad!" + "I knew you could do it!" (Chilcoat 1988, p. 9).

2) Praise + reason: this is a statement made by the teacher to recognize an answer or learning process as correct and explaining why it's correct. Examples in the classroom would be "Good going!" + "Those are the four steps used to solve this theorem." and "That's right!" + "The capital of Argentina is Buenos Aires." (Chilcoat 1988, p. 9)

3) Praise + Integration: "These are statements by a teacher indicating how a student's response applies to the focus or the objective of the lesson" (Chilcoat 1988, p. 9).

An example of this strategy is: "Right, John!" + "Those are the four major causes of the civil war" (Chilcoat 1988, p. 9).

4) Personal Citation: this is the last strategy Chilcoat outlines in positive verbal affirmations from teachers to students and it would look like this in a classroom: "Lisa, the thesis you wrote about feedback is so informative!" (Chilcoat 1988)

Chilcoat's Script for Verbal Corrective Feedback

“Teacher: What was the Emancipation Proclamation, Susan?”

Student: It was a cause of the Civil War

Teacher: No, the Emancipation Proclamation was not a cause of the Civil War. Susan, remember back to our previous discussion on the causes of the Civil War. What was one of the major causes?

Student: The election of Abraham Lincoln.

Teacher: That's right. What was another cause?

Student: Slavery.

Teacher: O.K. What did President Lincoln want to do with the slaves?

Student: He wanted to free them

Teacher: Free the slaves from what?

Student: From doing work without pay, living in bad conditions, being shipped.

Teacher: “That's correct. Now, Susan, can you recall what word means to free someone from slavery, or bondage?”

Student: Yes, the word is Emancipation.” (Chilcoat 1988, p. 12)

Appendix E

Molly and Boud's Guidelines for Peer Feedback

“1. Students are orientated not only to standards or work (learning outcomes) but also to the purpose of feedback. With this explicit orientation, students are more likely to see feedback as a process they can use, rather than a tool imposed on them.

2. Students judge their own work and are encouraged to articulate this judgment (self-evaluation).

3. Students seek or solicit feedback on those aspects of their work that matter to them most (for example asking the external source to comment on particular aspects of their performance that require improvement). This serves to cue educators and external providers of information into what to focus on to best help learners achieve their goals. This honesty in acknowledging limitations in their own practice does leave them vulnerable, and this honesty can be compromised if students are overly attuned to the summative assessment process, that is, they are always attempting to ‘show their best selves’ to the educator.

4. Educators or ‘others’ provide performance information to the learner.

5. The learner then engages in a comparative process where they combine the internally and externally generated judgements and decide how to meaningfully interpret these messages.

6. The comparison of judgements, and how these relate to the standards or goals of work, are used to generate a plan for improved work.

7. The strategies are implemented in the subsequent participation in later tasks. “

(Molly & Boud, 2013, p.24)