

## Chapter 4 Receptivity to Instructional Feedback

Lipnevich, A. A., Lopera-Oquendo, C. & Park, M.J. (2023). Receptivity to Instructional Feedback. In Lipnevich, A., To, J, Tan, K. (Eds). *Unpacking Students' Engagement with Feedback : Pedagogy and Partnership in Practice*. Routledge

Anastasiya A. Lipnevich (Queens College and the Graduate Center, City University of New York, USA)

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0190-8689>

Carolina Lopera-Oquendo (The Graduate Center, City University of New York, USA)

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9355-5843>

Mi Jin Park (The Graduate Center, City University of New York, USA)

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8572-884X>

### Abstract

For feedback to lead to meaningful outcomes, students must engage with and actively process the feedback they receive (Jonsson, 2013; Van der Kleij & Lipnevich, 2020). In this chapter, we focus on students' receptivity to feedback and describe the nature of the construct, links to meaningful outcomes, and offer practical recommendations on how receptivity may be fostered. We describe a validation study conducted in fifteen secondary school classes in five schools in Singapore. We report validity evidence for the Receptivity to Instructional Feedback scale and offer ways in which it can be utilized by teachers to provide class- and student-level feedback. Importantly, we include the discussion of personality dimensions, and links of the Receptivity to Instructional Feedback scale with the Big Five personality factors. Finally, we examine gender differences in student receptivity to feedback and consider characteristics of specific feedback messages that teachers offer to the students. We also discuss feedback strategies that practitioners may consider, based on these findings.

## Introduction

The instructional feedback literature has consistently garnered considerable attention to the provision and delivery of feedback. Countless studies have explored links of various types and forms of feedback to students for learning outcomes (Goetz et al., 2018; Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2002; Lipnevich & Smith, 2009b). Unarguably, characteristics of feedback and the source of feedback matter greatly, and may as well make or break students' use of it. However, as a field, we realized that even the most perfect message delivered in the most efficient and science-supported manner will not improve learner outcomes if it is not used. Hence, over time, there has been a growing focus in the field on receptivity to instructional feedback and proactive recipience: how learners actively receive, process, and incorporate feedback from teachers (Lipnevich et al. 2021; Lipnevich & Lopera-Oquendo, 2022; Lipnevich & Smith, 2022; Jonsson, 2013; Winstone et al., 2017).

It is helpful to understand the delivery and receptivity of feedback as a dialogue rather than a unidirectional event. Moving away from passive recipience, proactive recipience involves “agentic engagement” (Reeve & Tseng, 2011; Winstone et al., 2017) in which the student has a shared responsibility in maximizing feedback gains. Four factors, (1) receiver, (2) provider, (3) message, and (4) context, facilitate proactive recipience (Winstone et al., 2017). First, as active receivers of feedback, not only is it important to understand that feedback contributes to their improvement with “readiness to engage” (Handley et al., 2011), but also internalize responsibility by proactively making improvements. Individual differences, such as more positive academic self-concept, higher self-efficacy, and higher self-regulation, are more likely to be associated with higher levels of dedication to engage with feedback (Winstone et al., 2017).

Second, senders whom students perceive as credible sources will be more likely to positively influence students' willingness to expend effort on feedback engagement. Credibility can be based on students' perception of the sender's expertise as well as respect for the provider (Bing-You et al., 1997). Third, the content, wording, and area of focus in feedback messages can also affect students' feedback uptake. Students value specific and detailed feedback – feedback uptake is unlikely if feedback message is ambiguous, lacks adequate details, or includes heavy academic terminology (Jonsson, 2013; Lipnevich & Smith, 2009; Winstone et al., 2017). Individualized feedback allows students to make more adjustments and more exact revisions if they are provided with precise steps (Baker and Hansen Bricker, 2010; Vardi, 2009). Additionally, quality feedback with remedial suggestions along with motivational, constructive, and encouraging wording rather than only a binary distinction of “correct” or “incorrect” enhances students' self-regulation skills, which are essential in putting feedback into practice (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006). Finally, context moderates proactive recipience. Students given clear instruction on how to interpret and act on feedback are more likely to be involved in feedback process (Jonsson, 2013; Winstone et al., 2017). The design and the timing of assessments and curriculum can also support or impede proactive recipience – if students cannot incorporate feedback into their upcoming tasks or assessments or receive feedback at the end of a module, they will less likely deem feedback useable.

However, every educator would agree that at times, even when all of the aforementioned components seem to be well-constructed and well-implemented, the coveted feedback exchange fails to take place. Jonsson (2013) attempted to disentangle conditions under which the feedback uptake was not happening as effectively as we would like. He described five potential barriers to students' productive use of feedback: (1) feedback is not viewed as useful, (2) feedback includes

limited details and inadequately individualized information, (3) feedback has an authoritative tone, (4) students are not equipped with appropriate strategies to act on feedback, and (5) feedback includes jargons that students do not comprehend. Further, in the analysis of conditions influencing students' use of feedback and their role as active agents, Jonsson and Panadero (2018) identified three major factors that may moderate student engagement with feedback: (1) feedback is regarded as useful, (2) students have strategies to act on feedback, and (3) feedback does not serve as a foundation for social comparisons (e.g., excludes grades).

In other words, there is a lot of consistency among factors that appear to help (or deter) students from effectively engaging with feedback. To summarize the components of the student-feedback interaction process, Lipnevich and Smith (2022) proposed a model that encompasses a range of elements involved in the feedback exchange process. The model emphasizes three components of processing, described by the following three questions: cognitive (e.g., Do I understand the feedback?), affective (e.g., How do I feel about the feedback?), and behavioral processing (e.g., What am I going to do with the feedback?). The answers to these questions comprise what the authors call self- or inner-feedback. The model, which is based on the idea that external feedback ultimately becomes an intrapersonal exercise, focuses on five components: (1) the context, (2) the source or provider's characteristics; (3) the feedback message attributes and delivery, (4) the student's characteristics, and (5) the cognitive, affective, and behavioral processing (Lipnevich & Smith, 2022). We would like to refer the reader to Chapter 3 of this volume for a more detailed exploration of this model, with a specific focus on student affective processing of feedback. In this chapter, we would like to turn the reader's attention to the construct of receptivity, defined as individuals' disposition to actively process feedback.

## **The RIF Scale: Measuring Receptivity to Instructional Feedback**

If a student does not believe that feedback is useful, applicable, and if the student cannot understand the message and regulate feedback-elicited emotions, this feedback is unlikely to positively impact students' work (Jonsson & Panadero, 2018; Lipnevich & Smith, 2009). These attitudinal and dispositional characteristics are subsumed under the umbrella of feedback receptivity. Hence, the concept of student receptivity suggests that individuals may vary in their willingness and readiness to accept feedback. Some students may be more open to receiving external comments on their progress or performance, while others may be less receptive. These differences can be influenced by situational factors and contexts, but there also seems to be a general trait-like component to this construct. That is, some individuals are more capable or willing to consider feedback irrespective of their provider or the situation.

To examine this claim, in our earlier work we developed a survey to assess student receptivity to instructional feedback (Lipnevich et al., 2021). This self-report instrument contains 24 Likert-type items (Lipnevich & Lopera-Oquendo, 2022) and includes four receptivity factors: (1) experiential attitudes towards feedback (e.g., I like receiving the instructor's comments on my assignment); (2) instrumental attitudes towards feedback (e.g., I find the feedback comments on my work very useful); (3) cognitive engagement with feedback (e.g., I understand how to incorporate feedback to better my work); and (4) behavioral engagement (e.g., When I receive feedback, I review all comments) (Lipnevich et al., 2021). We encourage the reader to consult the technical manual that contains the full list of items along with guidelines for administration and score calculation and questionnaire versions in different languages and for various educational levels (<https://osf.io/5xnz7>).

In the next section, we consider the Receptivity to Instructional Feedback scale and its linksto the educationally relevant constructs and report evidence supporting the validity of this scale.

### **Validity Evidence of the Receptivity to Instructional Feedback Scale**

The process of validating measurement tools is crucial for ensuring accurate interpretations of constructs and has to take place before any assessment results could be considered (Cohen & Swerdlik, 2017; Kane, 2013; Messick, 1989). In developing our scale, we carefully investigated relevant constructs that could potential overlap with the concept of receptivity to instructional feedback. In other words, we made sure to minimize the probability of jingle -jangle fallacies (Dawis, 1992; Judge, et.al., 2002). Additionally, we conducted analyses to examine the correlations between our scale and other relevant measures, as well as students' outcomes. These efforts aimed to gather valuable evidence that supports the interpretation and validity of the Receptivity to Instructional Feedback scale.

#### ***Jingle-Jangle fallacy and the Big Five Personality Factors***

With every new construct and scale that are introduced by researchers across various fields and domains of study, the concern of the jingle-jangle fallacy becomes very prominent. The jingle-jangle fallacy occurs when two distinct concepts are treated as equivalent or interchangeable because they are given the same label or term, despite actually representing different constructs (Kelley, 1927; Higgs & Lichtenstein, 2010; Marsh et al., 2019). In creating our scale, we were greatly aware of the consequences of the jingle-jangle for the following reasons:

*Conceptual confusion:* Treating different constructs as if they are the same can lead to a great deal of conceptual confusion. Each construct may have unique characteristics, meanings,

and implications, and failing to differentiate between them can obscure important distinctions in research findings.

*Measurement ambiguity:* Using the same label for different constructs can result in measurement ambiguity. Researchers and practitioners may mistakenly assume that a measure is valid for both constructs, leading to inaccurate or misleading data. This undermines the reliability and validity of research outcomes, and has serious (and often unwelcome) consequences.

*Misinterpretation of results:* If the jingle-jangle fallacy is present, it can lead to misinterpretation of study results. Conclusions drawn based on the assumption of equivalence between distinct constructs may not accurately reflect the underlying phenomena being investigated, potentially leading to flawed theories or misleading practical implications.

*Limited theoretical and practical advancement:* The jingle-jangle fallacy hinders theoretical advancement and practical utility by impeding the development of precise and nuanced frameworks. Without clear distinctions between constructs, researchers cannot effectively refine or expand existing theories or develop new ones, limiting progress in the field. Similarly, if there is no theoretical clarity on the topic, developing interventions and trying to bolster the constructs under investigation may be a futile exercise.

To avoid the jingle-jangle fallacy, researchers must be diligent in clearly defining and differentiating between constructs, even if they share similar labels or terms. This involves careful conceptualization, operationalization, and measurement of each construct, ensuring that they are accurately represented in research designs and analyses (Gonzalez, et. al, 2021). In our work on the Receptivity of Instructional feedback, we attempted to do just that and our first step

in ensuring that we are not creating a construct that is currently being indexed by other existing constructs, we turned our attention to the Big Five personality theory.

The Big Five personality factors, also known as the Five-Factor Model (FFM) or OCEAN model, are five broad dimensions that capture the major dimensions of human personality (Digman, 1990; 1997). Each factor represents a continuum along which individuals can vary, providing a comprehensive framework for describing and understanding personality traits. The factors are typically measured with the Big Five personality scale (John et al., 2008), has been translated into over 30 languages, making it one of the most widely utilized and cross-culturally validated theory-based scales in the field of psychoeducational assessment. Its extensive linguistic adaptation allows for comparative studies and a deeper understanding of personality traits across diverse cultural contexts. Hence, showing the unique contribution of the receptivity to instructional feedback beyond the Big Five was a critically important step in the validation process.

We would like to provide the reader with an overview of the Big Five personality traits and present empirical evidence highlighting their significance in students' academic and life functioning:

*Openness to Experience:* This factor reflects a person's inclination toward imagination, curiosity, and openness to new ideas and experiences. Individuals high in openness tend to be creative, intellectually curious, open-minded, and willing to explore unconventional ideas. On the other hand, individuals low in openness tend to be more traditional, conservative, and prefer familiarity. For example, a student high in openness may enjoy experimenting with different school activities or exploring new skills, while a student low in openness may prefer sticking to routine and familiar activities.



Ackerman and Heggestad's (1997) comprehensive analysis uncovered a noteworthy connection between the personality factor of Openness and standardized measures of knowledge and academic performance. Openness demonstrated a moderate correlation with cognitive ability, typically ranging from 0.20 to 0.30. Interestingly, among the Big Five traits, Openness exhibits the highest correlations with standardized test scores, such as SAT verbal scores, falling within the 0.20 to 0.30 range (Noftle & Robins, 2007). Additionally, Openness has been found to have a positive association with final grades, even when controlling for intelligence (Farsides & Woodfield, 2003). Further, a meta-analysis by Crede and Kuncel (2008) revealed that while Openness is correlated with study attitudes (but not study habits).

*Conscientiousness:* Conscientiousness refers to an individual's tendency to be organized, responsible, diligent, and goal-oriented. Those high in conscientiousness are generally disciplined, reliable, and exhibit strong self-control. Conversely, individuals low in conscientiousness may be more spontaneous, laid-back, and less focused on details and planning. For example, a highly conscientious student may carefully plan their schedule, set clear goals, and consistently meet deadlines, while a student low in conscientiousness may take a more relaxed approach to tasks and deadlines, often failing to meet them.

Consistently across various stages of education and into adulthood, the personality factor of Conscientiousness has demonstrated a remarkable ability to predict academic achievement. From preschool (Abe, 2005) to high school (Noftle & Robins, 2007), postsecondary education (O'Conner & Paunonen, 2007), and even into adulthood (Ackerman & Heggestad, 1997; De Fruyt & Mervielde, 1996; Shiner et al., 2003), Conscientiousness has displayed its predictive power. Remarkably, measurements of C in school children have been found to predict academic success at age 20 and eventual academic attainment at age 30 (Shiner & Masten, 2002). Even

when controlling for high school grades and SAT scores, Conscientiousness continues to predict college grades (Conard, 2006; Nofle & Robins, 2007), suggesting that it compensates for lower cognitive ability (Chamorro-Premuzic & Furnham, 2003). The association between high Conscientiousness and academic pursuits can be attributed to personal attributes such as organization, dependability, efficiency, a drive for success, and self-control (Matthews & Deary, 2003). For instance, Conscientiousness has been found to predict the early completion of independent credit assignments and the proactive signing up for study participation (Dollinger & Orf, 1991). The effects of Conscientiousness on academic performance may be mediated by motivational processes, including effort expenditure, persistence, perceived intellectual ability, effort regulation, and attendance (Boekaerts, 1996; Nofle & Robins, 2007; Bidjerano & Dai, 2007; Kuncel et al., 2005).

*Extraversion:* This factor represents a person's level of sociability, assertiveness, and preference for social interactions. Extraverts tend to be outgoing, energetic, and enjoy being around others. They gain energy from social situations and often seek stimulation from external sources. Introverts, on the other hand, tend to be more reserved, introspective, and prefer solitude or smaller social interactions. For example, an extraverted student may thrive in group settings, enjoy initiating conversations, and feel energized by group work, whereas an introverted student may prefer quiet activities and limited social interactions and will avoid volunteering responses.

In the realm of college performance, the relationship between Extraversion and academic success appears to be generally absent (Kuncel et al., 2005; Nofle & Robins, 2007).

Interestingly, the impact of age on this relationship seems to be a moderating factor. Prior to approximately 11-12 years of age, extraverted children tend to outperform introverted children. However, among adolescents and adults, research suggests that introverts may exhibit higher

levels of achievement compared to extraverts (Furnham & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2004). This shift in correlation direction has been attributed to the transition from the sociable and less competitive environment of primary school to the more formal settings of secondary school and higher education, where introverted behaviors, such as a preference for less intensive socializing, can become advantageous. Furthermore, extraverts and introverts demonstrate differences in various information-processing parameters, including speech production, attention, and reflective problem-solving (Zeidner & Matthews, 2000), leading to performance variations along meaningful dimensions. For instance, extraverts tend to excel in oral contributions during seminars but may show lower proficiency in essay writing compared to introverts (Furnham & Medhurst, 1995).

*Agreeableness:* Agreeableness refers to an individual's tendency to be compassionate, cooperative, and considerate toward others. Those high in agreeableness are generally warm, empathetic, and value harmonious relationships. They are more likely to prioritize others' needs and exhibit prosocial behaviors. Conversely, individuals low in agreeableness may be more skeptical, competitive, and less concerned about maintaining harmony in relationships. For example, a highly agreeable student may go out of their way to help others, show kindness, and prioritize cooperative solutions in conflicts, while a student low in agreeableness may be more assertive and less concerned about pleasing others.

Despite the positive association between prosocial orientation and improved social skills, the link between Agreeableness and academic achievement consistently yields nonsignificant findings (Kuncel et al., 2005; Nofle & Robins, 2007; O'Connor & Paunonen, 2007; Shiner et. al, 2003). However, it is worth noting that antisocial personality traits linked to low A can have detrimental effects, as discussed further below.

*Neuroticism*: Neuroticism reflects an individual's emotional stability and tendency to experience negative emotions such as anxiety, depression, and vulnerability. Those high in neuroticism are prone to mood swings, worry, and may be more sensitive to stress. In contrast, individuals low in neuroticism tend to be more emotionally stable, resilient, and less likely to experience intense negative emotions. For example, a student high in neuroticism may be easily stressed, exhibit frequent mood swings, and worry about various aspects of school life, whereas someone low in neuroticism may maintain a more calm and stable emotional state even in challenging situations and bounce back after failures or substandard performance.

Early investigations indicated that Neuroticism was associated with poorer academic performance among school-aged children. Entwistle and Cunningham (1968) conducted a study involving nearly 3000 13-year-olds, revealing a connection between emotional stability and academic success. In a longitudinal study by Shiner and Masten (2002) involving 205 participants assessed at ages 10, 20, and 30, negative emotionality at age 20 was correlated with concurrent and previous poor adaptation. A meta-analysis suggested an approximate negative correlation of 0.20 between Neuroticism and academic achievement measures, with particular emphasis on the anxiety and impulsiveness facets of Neuroticism (Kuncel et al., 2005; O'Conner & Paunonen, 2007). Another meta-analysis proposed that this relationship might be attributed to correlation between neuroticism and study attitudes (-0.40; Crede & Kuncel, 2008).

The above mentioned evidence suggests that the Big Five factors are important for scholastic attainment and meaningfully predict a range of educational outcomes across lifespan. Thus, it was critical for us to determine whether the construct of receptivity increments over the personality factors and does not get subsumed under them by covering individual characteristics included into the Big Five factors.

Hence, across several we explored the relationship between receptivity and the Big Five personality factors as well as receptivity and grades. In a study using 319 undergraduate students from the United States (n = 147) and New Zealand (n = 172) enrolled in public universities, Conscientiousness and Openness were found most highly associated with the four factors of receptivity, particularly with behavioral engagement with feedback. In other words, students were more receptive to feedback if they were academically disciplined and welcomed new knowledge. Interestingly, students' cooperative tendencies (Agreeableness) were a weaker predictor of feedback acceptance than academic discipline (Conscientiousness) and intellectual curiosity (Openness). And students who scored high on emotional instability (Neuroticism) were less likely to deeply engage in feedback and no links were found for students high on sociability (Extraversion) (Lipnevich et al.,2021).

The study was downward extended in a sample of secondary school students in Singapore (N = 314) from 15 school classes in 5 schools to explore the generalizability of the instrument. Even after controlling for gender, results showed that behavioral engagement, cognitive engagement, and experiential attitudes provided an explanation for increments in grades (Lipnevich & Lopera-Oquendo, 2022). These links were meaningful and the magnitude of correlations (between .10 and .30) suggested that receptivity was a viable construct that may contribute to both theory and practice. In other words, this evidence was critical for the validation of the construct. It showed that we are not simply indexing personality characteristics that can be subsumed under the umbrella of the Big Five personality factors, but are measuring a trait-like construct that can be measured and thus, can be potentially intervened

***Receptivity to feedback: A close-up.***

People who view feedback as an *opportunity* have a higher chance of thriving in life, compared to those who approach feedback as a threat to their ego. So, fostering student receptivity skills is a critically important educational outcome. Furthermore – and not surprisingly – receptivity does relate to student achievement. In our study, the factors of behavioral engagement and experiential attitudes accounted for 15% of the variance in student grades even after controlling for gender (Lipnevich & Lopera-Oquendo, 2022). Thus, incorporating receptivity as one of the ways to explain meaningful student outcomes in class- and student-level performance is crucial.

Studies have repeatedly shown gender differences in different contexts influencing educational outcomes. Goetz et al. (2013) revealed that compared to boys, girls demonstrated lower levels of perceived competence on math-related self-efficacy and higher levels of traitlike, habitual mathematics anxiety regardless of similar mathematics achievement outcomes for both groups. Similarly, female students showed lower self-efficacy than male counterparts throughout a two-semester introductory physics courses despite their equal performance levels (Marshman et al., 2018).

Gender differences in feedback receptivity is no exception. Female and male students can engage differently in peer feedback. In one study on gender differences in argumentative peer feedback (Noroozi et al., 2020), female students delivered more individualized and high-quality argumentative feedback along with more thorough explanations than male counterparts. This outcome is in line with the findings of Prinsen et al. (2009), revealing that females explain their messages more clearly than male counterparts in peer feedback. In fact, female students were more likely to make revisions based on peer feedback that specifically improved their counterarguments against the position in argumentative essay writing (Noroozi et al., 2022). The

same study also showed higher writing performance among female students aligned with gender differences in peer assessment in other studies (Hamer et al., 2015; Noroozi et al., 2020; Yurdabakan, 2011). Female students described their claims more explicitly than male students on whether they opposed or supported the topic of the essay (Noroozi et al., 2022). One of the possible explanations for the gender effect points to different personalities between females and males (Weisberg et al., 2011). Females score higher than males on Conscientiousness, encompassing characteristics related to discipline, dutifulness, and order (Costa et al., 2001).

Gender differences in feedback receptivity were also observed using the self-report instrument in our study. After establishing the equivalence of the scale for boys and girls (aka establishing invariance) we observed that girls scored higher on experiential attitudes and behavioral engagement scales than boys (Lipnevich & Lopera-Oquendo, 2022) suggesting that female students have a tendency of enjoying feedback more than their male counterparts. In other words, girls viewed feedback more positively than boys and enjoyed receiving feedback on their work. Girls also reported possessing a wider arsenal of behavioral tools on how to use feedback effectively.

### **Pedagogical insights**

Even if teachers give the highest quality feedback, if students do not use it, it will be discarded with no gains. Some students are more enthusiastic than others to engage with feedback irrespective of specific subject areas (Murano et.al, 2018). In addition to the elements of feedback comments (Winstone et al., 2017), mode of delivery (Lyster & Saito, 2010), and context (Gielen et al., 2010), different student variables reflect differential effects of feedback on educational outcomes. It makes sense that students who appreciate feedback will more likely

engage with it and expend effort into incorporating feedback to improve their educational outcomes.

So what makes feedback meaningful for students? Students respond differently to feedback – receptivity to feedback can be treated as trait-specific (valuing or not valuing feedback overall) and state-specific (valuing or not valuing feedback based on specific situations) (Lipnevich & Smith, 2022). We have described a significant general trait-like characteristic of receptivity to instructional feedback (Lipnevich and Lopera-Oquendo, 2022; Lipnevich et al., 2021) that increments over the Big Five personality factors. Hence, enhancing student receptivity to feedback is key to improving their affective, cognitive, and behavioral interactions with feedback (Lipnevich and Lopera-Oquendo, 2022; Lipnevich & Smith, 2022).

In line with the idea of a dialogic approach to feedback, students are more likely to be receptive to feedback during one-on-one review and discussion of their work beyond written feedback (van der Schaaf et al., 2013). In these interactions, teachers may strive to enhance students' behavioral engagement with feedback providing explicit instruction on how to incorporate feedback into their work. Another key consideration is understanding how different instructional activities can increase student receptivity. Teachers could encourage students to reflect on their own work before receiving feedback. This can be done through self-assessment activities where students evaluate their performance against predetermined criteria (see Lipnevich et al, 2014; 2022; Tomazin, et. al, 2023). These approaches may help students to become more aware of their strengths and weaknesses, making feedback more meaningful.

Teachers could also be encouraged to incorporate opportunities for students to provide feedback to their peers, thus enhancing instrumental attitudes of feedback receptivity. Engaging in peer feedback not only allows students to gain different perspectives but also enhances their



understanding of the evaluation criteria. Supporting constructive and respectful feedback practices among peers would be highly critical for these interactions to be of value. Further, teachers could model and scaffold feedback interpretation. They may help students understand and interpret feedback effectively, thus fostering cognitive engagement. Instructors could teach students how to identify key points, clarify any uncertainties, and set goals for improvement based on the feedback received. Providing examples and modeling the process of feedback interpretation would bolster cognitive and behavioral engagement with feedback.

Teachers also play a crucial role in helping students manage and process these emotions effectively. We turn the reader's attention to Chapter 3 of this volume, but here are a few suggestions on how to enhance students' affective processing of feedback. Firstly, it is important for teachers to create a supportive and non-judgmental classroom environment where students feel safe expressing their emotions. Encourage open discussions about the emotional impact of feedback and validate students' feelings. Instructors could teach students strategies for emotional regulation, such as deep breathing or taking a short break to regain composure. Engaging in empathetic conversations, actively listening to students' concerns and offering reassurance have also proven to be effective ways for teachers and students to co-regulate emotions. Teachers could also be encouraged to help students reframe the feedback as an opportunity for growth and emphasize that mistakes and setbacks are natural parts of the learning process. By setting small, achievable goals to work towards improvement and fostering a sense of control and progress, teachers can empower students to navigate challenges, learn from feedback, and continue their academic development.

## **Conclusion**

In this chapter we described a relatively new construct, receptivity to instructional feedback, along with the development and application of the tool that measures it. We emphasized the distinction of the receptivity from the Big Five personality dimensions and emphasized the important links between these sets of constructs. We also offered recommendations for teachers on how to foster student receptivity.

In sum, connecting feedback with subsequent learning activities would benefit learners immensely. Teachers could design lessons and assignments that explicitly reference and build upon previously received feedback which will inevitably foster development of learners as effective users of feedback. Recognizing and celebrating students' progress and growth based on their implementation of feedback is another important strategy. Highlighting specific instances where students have improved based on feedback, reinforcing the value of feedback and motivating further engagement with it would all enhance their trait receptivity. By implementing these instructional activities, teachers will have an environment where students actively engage with feedback, appreciate its significance, and use it to enhance their learning and performance.

### **Questions for reflections**

1. How can you create a supportive classroom environment that effectively addresses students' feedback processing?
2. What strategies have you found to be effective for fostering meaningful engagement with feedback among your students?
3. To what extent do your lesson plans, assignments, and classroom assessment practices offer opportunities for leveraging feedback to enhance student learning and performance in subsequent activities?

## References

- Abe, J.A.A. (2005). The predictive value of the Five-Factor Model of personality with preschool age children: A nine year follow-up study, *Journal of Research in Personality* **39**, 423–442.
- Ackerman, P. L., & Heggestad, E. D. (1997). Intelligence, personality, and interests: Evidence for overlapping traits. *Psychological Bulletin*, *121*, 219-245.
- Baker, W., & Bricker, R.H. (2010). The effects of direct and indirect speech acts on native English and ESL speakers' perception of teacher written feedback. *System*, *38*, 75-84.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.12.007>
- Bidjerano, T. & Yun Dai, D. (2007). The relationship between the big-five model of personality and self-regulated learning strategies. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *17(1)*, 69-81.
- Bing-You, Paterson, J., & Levine, M. A. (1997). Feedback falling on deaf ears: residents' receptivity to feedback tempered by sender credibility. *Medical Teacher*, *19(1)*, 40–44. <https://doi.org/10.3109/01421599709019346>
- Boekaerts, M. (1996). Personality and the psychology of learning. *European Journal of Personality*, *10*, 377-404.
- Chamorro-Premuzic, T., & Furnham, A. (2003). Personality traits and academic examination performance. *European Journal of Personality*, *17*, 237-250.
- Cohen, R. J., & Swerdlik, M. E. (2017). *Psychological testing and assessment* (9th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Conard, M.A.(2006). Aptitude is not enough: How personality and behavior predict academic performance. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *40*, 339–346.

- Costa, P. T. Jr., Terracciano, A., & McCrae, R. R. (2001). Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: Robust and surprising findings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(2), 322–331. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.81.2.322>
- Crede, M., & Kuncel, N. R. (2008). Study habits, skills, and attitudes: The third pillar supporting collegiate academic performance. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3(6), 425-453.
- Dawis RV (1992). The individual differences tradition in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 39, 7–19. DOI: 10.1037/0022-0167.39.1.7
- De Fruyt, F. & Mervielde, I. (1996). Personality and interests as predictors of educational streaming and achievement. *European Journal of Personality*, 10, 405-425.
- Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology* (41), 417-440.
- Digman, J. M. (1997). Higher order factors of the Big Five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(6), 1246-1256.
- Dollinger, S. J. & Orf, L. A. (1991). Personality and performance in “personality”:  
Conscientiousness and openness. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 25, 276–284.
- Entwistle, N. J., & Cunningham, S. (1968). Neuroticism and school attainment: A linear relationship? *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 38, 123-132.
- Farsides, T., & Woodfield, R. (2003). Individual differences and undergraduate academic successes: The roles of personality, intelligence, and application. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 34, 1225-1243.

- Furnham, A., & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2004). Personality and intelligence as predictors of statistics examination grades. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37(5), 943–955.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2003.10.016>
- Furnham, A., & Medhurst, S. (1995). Personality correlates of academic seminar behavior: A study of four instruments. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 19, 197-208.
- Gielen, S., Peeters, E., Dochy, F., Onghena, P., & Struyven, K. (2010). Improving the effectiveness of peer feedback for learning. *Learning and Instruction*, 20(4), 304–315. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.08.007>
- Goetz, T., Bieg, M., Lüdtke, O., Pekrun, R., & Hall, N. C. (2013). Do girls really experience more anxiety in mathematics? *Psychological Science*, 24(10), 2079–2087.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613486989>
- Goetz, T., Lipnevich, A. A., Krannich, M., & Gogol, K. (2018). Performance feedback and emotions. In A. A. Lipnevich, & J. K. Smith (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Instructional Feedback*. Cambridge University Press
- Gonzalez, O., MacKinnon, D. P., & Muniz, F. B. (2021). Extrinsic Convergent Validity Evidence to Prevent Jingle and Jangle Fallacies. *Multivariate behavioral research*, 56(1), 3–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00273171.2019.1707061>
- Hamer, J., Purchase, H., Luxton-Reilly, A., & Denny, P. (2015). A comparison of peer and tutor feedback. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 40(1), 151–164.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2014.893418>
- Handley, K., Price, M., & Millar, J. (2011). Beyond ‘doing time’: Investigating the concept of student engagement with feedback. *Oxford Review of Education*, 37, 543–560.  
doi:10.1080/03054985.2011.604951

- Higgs, M., & Lichtenstein, S. (2010). Exploring the ‘jingle fallacy’: a study of personality and values. *Journal of General Management*, 36(1), 43-61.
- Jonsson, A. (2013). Facilitating productive use of feedback in higher education. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 14(1), 63–76. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787412467125>
- Jonsson, A., & Panadero, E. (2018). Facilitating students’ active engagement with feedback. In A. A. Lipnevich & J. K. Smith (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of instructional feedback*. Cambridge University Press
- Judge TA, Erez A, Bono JE, & Thoresen CJ (2002). Are measures of self-esteem, neuroticism, locus of control, and generalized self-efficacy indicators of a common core construct? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 693–710. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.83.3.693.
- Kane, M. T. (2013). Validating the interpretations and uses of test scores. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 50(1), 1-73.
- Kelley, T. L. (1927). *Interpretation of educational measurements*. World Book Company.
- Kuncel, N., Hezlett, S.A., Ones, D. S., Crede, M., Vannelli, J. R., Thomas, L. L., Duehr, E. E., & Jackson, H. L. (2005). *A Meta-Analysis of Personality Determinants of College Student Performance*. 20th Annual Meeting of the Society of Industrial-Organizational Psychology, Los Angeles, CA.
- Linnenbrink, E. A., & Pintrich, P. R. (2002). Achievement Goal Theory and Affect: An Asymmetrical Bidirectional Model. *Educational Psychologist*, 37(2), 69–78. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3702\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3702_2)
- Lipnevich, A. A., & Lopera-Oquendo, C. (2022). Receptivity to Instructional Feedback: A Validation Study in the Secondary School Context in Singapore. *European Journal of*

- Psychological Assessment*, 1015-5759/a000733. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000733>
- Lipnevich, A. A., & Smith, J. K. (2009b). “I really need feedback to learn:” Students’ perspectives on the effectiveness of the differential feedback messages. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(4), 347–367.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-009-9082-2>
- Lipnevich, A. A., & Smith, J. K. (2022). Student–Feedback Interaction Model: Revised. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 75, 101208.
- Lipnevich, A. A., Gjicali, K., Asil, M., & Smith, J. K. (2021). Development of a measure of receptivity to instructional feedback and examination of its links to personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 169, 110086.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110086>
- Lipnevich, A., & Smith, J. (2009). Effects of differential feedback on students’ examination performance. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 15, 319–333.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017841>
- Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 265–302.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990520>
- Marsh, H. W., Pekrun, R., Parker, P. D., Murayama, K., Guo, J., Dicke, T., & Arens, A. K. (2019). The murky distinction between self-concept and self-efficacy: Beware of lurking jingle-jangle fallacies. *Journal of educational psychology*, 111(2), 331.
- Marshman, E. M., Kalender, Z. Y., Nokes-Malach, T., Schunn, C., & Singh, C. (2018). Female students with A’s have similar physics self-efficacy as male students with C’s in

- introductory courses: A cause for alarm? *Physical Review Physics Education Research*, 14(2), 020123. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.14.020123>
- Matthews, G., Deary, I. J., & Whiteman, M.C. (2003). *Personality Theory*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Messick S (1989). Validity. In Linn RL (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (3rd ed., pp. 13–104). New York: Macmillan
- Murano, D., Martin, J., Burrus, J., & Roberts, R. D. (2018). Feedback and noncognitive skills: From working hypotheses to theory-driven recommendation for practice. In A. A. Lipnevich, & J. K. Smith (Eds.). *Cambridge handbook of instructional feedback* (pp. 240–264). Cambridge University Press.
- Nicol, & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: a model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090>
- Noftle E.E. & Robins R. (2007). Personality predictors of academic outcomes: Big Five correlates of GPA and SAT scores. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 93, 116-130.
- Noftle E.E. & Robins R. (2007). Personality predictors of academic outcomes: Big Five correlates of GPA and SAT scores. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 93, 116-130.
- Noroozi, O., Banihashem, S. K., Taghizadeh Kerman, N., Parvaneh Akhteh Khaneh, M., Babayi, M., Ashrafi, H., & Biemans, H. J. (2022). Gender differences in students' argumentative essay writing, peer review performance and uptake in online learning



- environments. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 1–15.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2022.2034887>
- Noroozi, O., Hatami, J., Bayat, A., van Ginkel, S., Biemans, H. J. A., & Mulder, M. (2020). Students' online argumentative peer feedback, essay writing, and content learning: Does gender matter? *Interactive Learning Environments*, 28(6), 698–712.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2018.1543200>
- O'Conner, M. C., & Paunonen, S. V. (2007). Big Five personality predictors of post-secondary academic performance. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43, 971-990.
- Prinsen, Volman, M. L. L., Terwel, J., & van den Eeden, P. (2009). Effects on participation of an experimental CSCL-programme to support elaboration: Do all students benefit? *Computers and Education*, 52(1), 113–125.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2008.07.001>
- Reeve, J., & Tseng, C.-M. (2011). Agency as a fourth aspect of students' engagement during learning activities. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 36(4), 257–267.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2011.05.002>
- Remmers, H. H., Shock, N. W., & Kelly, E. L. (1927). An empirical study of the validity of the Spearman-Brown formula as applied to the Purdue rating scale. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 18(3), 187–195. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.gc.cuny.edu/10.1037/h0072665>
- Shiner, R. L., & Masten, A. S. (2002). Self-efficacy, attribution, and outcome expectancy mechanisms in reading and writing achievement: Grade level and achievement level differences. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87, 386-398.

- Shiner, R. L., Masten, A. S., & Roberts, J. M. (2003). Childhood personality foreshadows adult personality and life outcomes two decades later. *Journal of Personality, 71*, 1145-1170.
- Tomazin, L., Lipnevich A.A. & Lopera-Oquendo, C. (2023). Teacher feedback vs. annotated exemplars: Examining the effects on middle school students' writing performance. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 78*, 101262
- Van der Kleij, & Lipnevich, A. A. (2020). Student perceptions of assessment feedback: a critical scoping review and call for research. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 33*(2), 345–373. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-020-09331-x>
- Van der Schaaf, Baartman, L., Prins, F., Oosterbaan, A., & Schaap, H. (2013). Feedback Dialogues That Stimulate Students' Reflective Thinking. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 57*(3), 227–245.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2011.628693>
- Vardi, I. (2008). The Relationship Between Feedback and Change in Tertiary Student Writing in the Disciplines. *International Journal of Teaching & Learning in Higher Education, 20*(3), 350–361.
- Weisberg, Y. J., Deyoung, C. G., & Hirsh, J. B. (2011). Gender Differences in Personality across the Ten Aspects of the Big Five. *Frontiers in Psychology, 2*, 178–178.  
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00178>
- Winstone, N. E., Nash, R. A., Parker, M., & Rowntree, J. (2017). Supporting Learners' Agentic Engagement With Feedback: A Systematic Review and a Taxonomy of Recipience Processes. *Educational Psychologist, 52*(1), 17–37.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2016.1207538>

Yurdabakan, İ. (2010). The investigation of peer assessment in primary school cooperative learning groups with respect to gender. *Education*, 39, 153–169.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/03004270903313608>

Zeidner, M., & Matthews, G. (2000). Intelligence and personality. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of intelligence* (pp. 581–610). Cambridge University Press.