

ASSESSMENT FOR LEARNING IN PRIMARY TECHNOLOGY CLASSROOMS

J. Moreland¹, B. Cowie¹ and Alister Jones²

1. Centre for Science and Technology Education Research, University of Waikato
2. School of Education, University of Waikato

j.moreland@waikato.ac.nz

ABSTRACT

Emerging international research suggests that enhancing teacher-student assessment for learning [AfL] interactions is a key to enhancing student learning. Planning frameworks that make explicit the multiple dimensions of technology can be used to extend teacher knowledge and focus interaction. Effective AfL interactions in technology encompass the multidimensional nature of technology, help students build continuity and coherence between ideas and actions over time, and are multimodal. AfL in primary technology classrooms is complex. Yet in this complexity there are rich opportunities for effective AfL interactions that contribute to students' technology learning.

1. INTRODUCTION

People use technology to expand their possibilities, to intervene in the world through the development of products, systems and environments. To do this, intellectual and practical resources are applied. The current focus of attention in technology education is towards technological literacy for all. This is the case for New Zealand where three inter-related strands are specified in the curriculum: technological knowledge and understanding, technological capability, and an understanding and awareness of the interrelationship between technology and society (Ministry of Education, 1995). Technological learning outcomes encompass conceptual, procedural, technical and societal aspects reflecting the multidimensional nature of technological activity. The technology tasks teachers devise for their students are therefore necessarily complex in order to accommodate opportunities for students to achieve multifaceted learning outcomes in an integrated manner. This then means that tasks may be undertaken over time. Such tasks pose particular issues for learning, teaching and assessment including students maintaining focus on the overall goals of the technology task, sustaining interest and engagement over time, and building connections between tasks and lessons. Teachers therefore need to encourage students to think reflectively and projectively about the tasks they are undertaking and to assist students to work iteratively when designing, making and testing (Kimbell, et al., 1991; Stables, 1997). Without this teacher assistance, the design process can become ritualised and step-like (Hennessy, McCormick and Murphy, 1993; Lave, 1988).

There is increasing agreement that assessment for learning [AfL] is an essential feature of classroom learning and that its development can raise achievement (Black and William, 1998). AfL is accomplished through teacher-student interactions and, while these interactions can be informal, they need to focus on key subject ideas and practices in a way that moves learning forward. For teachers to undertake AfL interactions effectively they require particular knowledge and skill, some of which is encompassed within the idea of pedagogical content knowledge (PCK). PCK is concerned with how teachers transform their knowledge of subject matter/content to a form their students can make sense of, but at the same time maintain the integrity of the content idea (Shulman,

1987). Teacher PCK is therefore crucial to the efficacy of their AfL interactions (Jones and Moreland, 2004). When teachers lack knowledge and understanding of what is important in technology they are not able to structure their interactions around curriculum learning goals and tend to focus on the managerial and social aspects (Black and Wiliam, 1998; Moreland, 2003). To be effective AfL interactions in technology need to encompass the multidimensional nature of technology, and help students build continuity and coherence between ideas and actions over time. Interactions in technology invoke multiple modes such as drawing, modelling and examination of real artefacts, not just talk, for communicating and developing ideas. In this paper we provide examples of productive teacher-student AfL interactions in technology.

An interpretivist methodology (Erickson, 1998) underpins the two research projects that provide data for this paper. The researchers in the first study worked with Years 1 to 8 teachers over three years to enhance their AfL practices in technology (Jones and Moreland, 2004; Moreland, 2003). In the second study currently being undertaken we are working in Years 1 to 8 technology and science classrooms over three years to explore the nature of effective student and teacher interactions around technology and science ideas and the PCK teachers utilize during these interactions. In each study multiple methods were used including case studies, interviews (teacher and student; individual and group), document analysis and classroom observations (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). Combined, the research studies represent work over a period of nine years. In all, the researchers worked with 24 primary (Years 1 - 8) teachers.

2. DISCUSSION

In this paper we present examples of AfL interactions from five of our teachers. Rachel and her Year 2 and 3 students developed mock-ups of containers for storing their classroom mathematics equipment. Ellie and her Year 2 and 3 students made masks to wear in their school production. Burt and his Year 5 and 6 students designed hand held devices to aid those with arthritis. Betty and her Year 5 and 6 students made a light tower for a model stage. Grant and his Year 4 to 6 students made signs for their school grounds. The examples illustrate three aspects of AfL in primary technology classrooms: being clear about and focusing on the multiple dimensions of technology, AfL interactions to build connections and coherence, and the value of multimodal AfL interactions.

2.1 Being Clear About And Focusing On The Multiple Dimensions Of Technology

To help students develop a sophisticated understanding of the multiple dimensions of technology it is important for teachers to identify and include these in their planning. Teachers need to be clear about and focus on the conceptual (knowledge and understanding of relevant technological concepts and procedures); procedural (knowing how to do something, what to do and when to do it); societal (the interrelationship between technology and groups of people); and technical (skills related to manual/practical techniques) aspects. As well teachers need to think about and plan for the establishment and sustainment of a dynamic interaction between these aspects. The findings illustrate how planning may be a tool for clarifying and focusing on the multiple dimensions of technology. Teachers perceived that planning around the dimensions added focus, breadth and depth to their interactions.

2.1.1. Planning as a tool for focusing on technology as multidimensional

Planning emerged as a key tool for assisting teachers to be clear about, and focus on, the multidimensional nature of technology, and to engage with the broad spectrum of student technology ideas and actions. When the teachers were planning they were required to think about the task/unit as a whole and how the activities they outlined might contribute to the full range of intended learning; their PCK was activated. They began their planning by deciding on a topic and overall task that fitted their students. In

both the studies the researchers provided the teachers with a planning format that required them to think about the conceptual, procedural, societal and technical learning outcomes of the task/unit. The planning format included a space that prompted teachers to think about how these learning outcomes would come together in technological practice, rather than being individual and discrete. This articulation helped teachers to decide what they wanted the students to know and do within the context of the overall task. An example of Rachel's planning for her Year 2 and 3 students (6- and 7- years) for their task of designing and constructing an attractive, portable and durable 3D storage container for holding classroom maths equipment will be presented at the conference. Her plan shows that she defined the main task (a mock-up of a 3D storage container to hold classroom mathematics equipment). She also defined three aspects of technological practice, which were more detailed than the task definition, but not as detailed as the more specific learning outcomes she articulated in the conceptual, procedural, societal and technical categories. In the aspects of technological practice she identified technological concepts (knowing about the design process, aesthetics, portability, durability, practical solutions, and storage equipment for different groups of people) and procedures (being able to design, develop, evaluate the technological principles). She also synthesised conceptual and procedural aspects in the technological practice aspects. For example, an understanding of attractiveness, portability and durability was to be integrated in with developing and evaluating solutions. Finally her planning shows the intended learning outcomes itemised in the four categories. Conceptual learning outcomes specify the technological principles (durability, optimisation, portability, purpose of mock-ups, aesthetics); techniques (joining of materials); and materials and structures (nature of materials and size, shape and capacity of container); procedural learning outcomes specify the procedures and processes to be undertaken; societal learning outcomes specify the people and environmental considerations; and technical learning outcomes specify the technical skills required.

Rachel's planning also demonstrates she had her students in mind when she was detailing the learning outcomes as she defined the learning outcomes in terms her students would understand. For example, durability was defined as 'takes lots of use over a long time'; portability as 'one person can carry the container and it can be easily moved around the room'; aesthetics as 'eye catching'; suitable shape as 'needs to fit'; and optimisation as 'don't waste materials'. These translations were used as guides for her AfL practices, as she had articulated the terminology she would use when interacting with her students.

Teachers' PCK, as evidenced in their ability to analyse tasks to identify appropriate technological learning, was enhanced by their use of this planning format. Burt reported that the process of articulating and specifying concise learning goals compelled him to "hone in on the technological concepts and skills" he intended students to learn and helped him to consider the ways the selected activities could support learning. As part of his planning, for example, he investigated a wide range of technological learning outcome possibilities from which he then selected particular learning outcomes that best fitted his students and the overall technology task.

2.1.2. Planning For The Dimensions Adds Breadth And Depth To Interactions

Teachers planned for multiple dimensions of technological learning and designed activities to support these. They reported that planning in this way changed their interactions; they now focused on the conceptual, procedural, societal and technical aspects within the tasks. For example, Burt reported that his being aware of the multiplicity of learning outcomes meant he was better able to appreciate and respond to divergent student ideas.

"The planning helped me to have a better look at exactly what technology is being taught and what the technology is in different activities. The activities that I am giving my children are more clearly targeted and identified. My children had a fair

idea of where they were going to go but they have still gone in a thousand different directions. You can start to see the divergence coming out in children and that's neat too."

Other teachers in the studies also confirmed that there were connections between their planning and their AfL conversations with students. The responsiveness and focus of their interactions derived from their PCK.

2.2. AfL Interactions To Build Connections And Coherence

The long-term and multi-dimensional nature of technology tasks means that particular students may struggle to see the connections between days, between activities and between ideas. Teachers helping students build continuity and coherence is a legitimate and important aspect for effective AfL.

2.2.1. Making Connections

Teachers nearly always took time to make links between lessons. Connections were effective when this linking focused on technology. For example, Ellie open and closed lessons with discussions related to the students' task of making a mask for their school production. Ellie orchestrated class conversations at the beginning of lessons to look back at what had been achieved and to introduce the activities and ideas for that day. End of lesson conversations were also set up so that activities and ideas of that day were reviewed. Together Ellie and the students also talked about what might happen the next day. For example, at the beginning of the third day of working on their masks Ellie asked the students to recall the ideas from the previous day and introduced the activity and ideas for the day:

Ellie: "Today we are going to carry on with our ideas about masks. Can you tell me about your sketching from yesterday? What does it mean?"

Tama: "It doesn't need to be good."

Paru: "It's fast and quick pictures."

Ellie: "Aye (yes). So what did you sketch?"

Tama: "We sketched pictures of the mask we are going to make."

Ellie: "Aye, kapai (good). You did sketches of the masks you will make, so you could decide on what you might make a mask of, and how they might look. Today we're going to go on from there and take a look at the specifications your mask will need to have. We'll talk about specifications now. What do you think this big word might mean?"

This dialogue allowed Ellie to check student understanding. Conversations like this guided the students to see how the activities they were undertaking linked to each other and contributed to the overall task. They built a sense of connectedness and continuity across the technological ideas. Students were encouraged to think ahead to next steps and to think back to what had happened and what they learned. These conversations provided a framework to help students monitor their ideas and progress over the course of the lesson and unit.

2.2.2. Supporting Coherency And Continuity

Success criteria are often advocated within the AfL as a means to support students' self-assessment. Just as importantly they can serve as a mechanism to develop continuity and coherence in students learning and understanding. In technology, product specifications are encompassed in the brief that the technologist works to. Teachers and students may use product specifications to the same effect as success criteria. Betty and her Year 5 and 6 students were involved in designing and making a light tower for a model stage. Betty used success criteria as product specifications as a tool for students to independently assess their product in both the design and evaluation of their model.

The success criteria were an on-going point of reference and therefore provided coherency in the design process.

Betty: "Now, how big is it [the model light tower] going to be? Look at the success criteria, how big is it going to be?"

Kyle: "25-35 cm."

Betty: "That's right. So you have to think of a material, Kyle, you can make it out of that would fit that. Okay. Now we did choose that height because, look at our stage, our stage is about 30 cm (she measures again). So your light tower has to be between that height and that height" (she points to height criteria specifications written on the board).

Betty told the students that the criteria were to "help you keep focused on what we are doing, what we are working towards." It was this explicit and ongoing emphasis on the main task and its success criteria (product specifications) that provided for coherence of student experience.

2.3. The Value Of Multimodal AfL Interactions

Technologists draw, make models and prototypes to develop and test ideas. In technology teachers typically engage students in tasks that have a practical aspect. As teachers and students work together on technological tasks, meaning is constituted through the interplay of linguistic, pictorial, material and gestural resources (Kress, et al., 2001; Roth, 2005). These experiences provide students with access to multiple modes for developing, representing and communicating their technological ideas. An analysis of teacher-student interactions revealed that teachers deployed a range of strategies when interacting with students to assess and come to a shared understanding of the task and related ideas. Strategies incorporated multiple means for representing and exploring student ideas and designs. Drawing, modelling and manipulating materials contributed to, and became integral to, teachers and students exploring tasks and negotiating ideas together.

2.3.1. Helping Students To Understand And Particularise The Task

Students may need teacher guidance to understand and particularise the task so that it is meaningful to them. Because technology briefs are often multi-faceted and complex, students may require help to define, and refine, the task they will work on. For example, Ellie and her 6- and 7-year-old students were involved with designing and making masks for their school production about Maui (a Māori mythical person). Ellie set up an introductory activity where the students examined real masks and books about masks to get ideas in preparation for creating their own. Two boys had the following conversation:

Rakai: "Let's look in the books and get a (sic) idea to choose then."

Tama: "Yea."

[The boys looked through the mask book together. They were very taken with the patterns on a photograph of an African mask.]

Tama: "Look at that."

Rakai: "Yea"

[Ellie joins the boys to check their progress.]

Ellie: "What have you got there?"

Tama: "Patterns on a mask."

Ellie: "Oh, it says here [pointing to the text] this is an African mask. It looks a bit like moko" (traditional Māori facial tattoo).

Rakai: "Let's do a warrior then. They can have that." [pointing to the patterns on the African mask]


Tama: "OK." [Enthusiastically]

Ellie: "That's good. Now I'll give you some more books to get some ideas for making a warrior mask."

In the first part of their conversation Tama suggested they get a book to help them find ideas. Ellie entered the conversation when the boys' attention was focused on a decorated African mask. She asked about it; Tama told her the features they were looking at "patterns on a mask"; and then Ellie gave them new information "this is an African mask". She connected the patterns on the African mask to the boys' cultural experience of moko. This customization opened up new possibilities for the boys because of the explicit connection to their past experience of moko, something that Maori warriors had tattooed on their faces. In response to her comment Rakai proposed that they make a warrior mask. Ellie praised the boys for reaching their decision. She gave them some books to help them think about their next steps around how to make such a mask. In this example, Ellie helped the boys make connections and better understand their task.

2.3.2. Establishing A Shared Understanding

The complexity of technology tasks can pose a challenge to shared understanding between teachers and students. Teachers need student ideas to be manifest before they can interact. Multimodal conversations provide rich points of entry into discussion of ideas. The necessity for a conversation to involve more than talk is evident in the following example. Burt had noticed that Danielle, a 9-year-old student, was sitting looking at her concept sketch of a device she was designing to help people with arthritis get toothpaste out of toothpaste tubes more easily. The first drawing here is Danielle's initial concept sketch.



Danielle's concept sketch

Burt asked Danielle to explain her sketch to him.


Burt: "I'm not sure how this works? (He pointed to the scissor-like handles at the side of the toothpaste tube). Does this go in to the toothpaste tube and push against it?"

Danielle: "No. That joins onto it, so you clip it on." (She pointed to the piece attached to the side of the tube)

Burt (looking puzzled) "OK. But what does this do?" (He pointed to the scissor-like handles again).

Danielle: "There's a button that you press there and then you pull up the handle and the toothpaste comes out."

Burt was puzzled and began to draw his interpretation of her ideas. The sketches presented are his. As he drew the lower left-hand sketch he described the sort of toothpaste tube he was designing as being soft-sided with a screw-top.



Burt's sketches

Danielle then realised he was thinking of a different type of toothpaste tube from her. She explained her drawing was a pump toothpaste tube, not a squeeze tube. Burt subsequently sought confirmation he had understood her correctly using her sketch as a referent:

Burt: "Oh, those pump ones. So you are making a device that will depress the pump easier."

Danielle: "Yes."

Burt: (Pointed to Danielle's concept sketch and the handles) "So this is your device and it is going to go on here, and basically, you are going to have a bigger device to press down the existing depressor. Is that where you're going?"

Danielle: "Yes."

In this example, the combination of talk, gesture and drawing were pivotal to Burt and Danielle coming to understand each other's ideas. The drawings served as tools that contributed to the meanings that were taken-as-shared by Burt and Danielle.

2.3.3. Extending Technological Thinking

Multimodal interactions are productive when teachers interact with students to extend their technological thinking. This happened in the continuation of Burt's conversation with Danielle. Once he understood Danielle's idea, his goal turned to helping Danielle think about the effectiveness of her device if it were to be used. He focused her attention on key features of functionality for a workable device that could be attached to a pump toothpaste tube.

Burt: "I see. You're saying that as you pull this one up [Pointing to a handle] it's going to push down like that. So you might need a **hinge** in here" [Pointing to the space between the handles].

Danielle: "Yes, I suppose I will."

He prompted Danielle to think about attaching her device to the pump and to stability issues.

"And this one is going to be locked on. I want you to think about how you are going to **lock that on** and think about how you **attach** it to there [Pointing to the pump]. You will need to draw them as exploded drawings. My one concern is, that I've got this device and it is attached to the toothpaste pump here, [Pointing to the joining point]. I'm wondering about how to make sure the pump doesn't fall over, I'm wondering about its **stability**. That's what I want you to also think about. What an interesting idea. It's different."

In this sequence Burt's AfL conversation utilised Danielle's concept sketch to alert her to aspects of functionality relevant to her device: hinging, attachments and stability.

2.3.4. Artefacts As A Source Of Ideas And Feedback

Technological development may involve the analysis and refinement of existing technologies. With appropriate teacher guidance real artefacts are a rich and powerful source of ideas and feedback. For example, Ellie used books with mask photographs for this purpose. In a continuation of the previous sequence Burt encouraged Danielle to examine the range of devices for arthritis sufferers that he had previously collected. Burt also provided her with examples of how mechanisms are represented in exploded drawings. Grant's students made outdoor signs for their school. Initially he took his students on a 'discovery walk' around the neighbourhood to examine signs in situ to discern their shape, their visual impact and fitness for purpose. He also took photographs of many signs around the town and neighbourhood, placed them in a *PowerPoint* presentation, which he showed to the students. In addition he gave printouts of the

photographs to each student. His students initially examined the *PowerPoint* photographs as a class and discussed their salient features. With this information, and the information they had gleaned from their walk, they established the specifications for their own signs. They referred to the printouts over time for more particular detail and usually as individuals. Features such as suitable materials, weatherproofing, structural stability, and sign and lettering size and colour were evident in the students' final products. Incorporating these features was critical given that the signs were to be actually used in the school grounds (see photographs of some completed signs).



The analysis of existing artefacts, systems and environments provides a source of ideas for students when they design and produce their own artefacts, systems and environments. They provide a vehicle for students to think about and a forum for teachers and students to talk about. Teacher guidance is important in helping students to analyse and transform and translate the salient aspects of examples into something that is useful for their context and purpose.

3. CONCLUSION

In this paper we have illustrated some of the ways the teachers we have worked with have been able to establish and sustain effective AfL interactions in primary technology classrooms. Teacher pedagogical content knowledge plays a crucial role in assisting teachers to plan for student learning and to think about how they might interact with students around technology ideas and practices. Planning is a powerful tool for helping teachers' clarify the intended learning, deepen and extend their pedagogical content knowledge, design learning activities and anticipate AfL interactions. Planning formats that make explicit the multiple dimensions of technology, and that require teachers to detail the accompanying activities, support teachers to envisage and build links between the learning goals and effective interactions. The teachers indicated that the planning had changed their AfL interactions to focus on each of the conceptual, procedural, societal and technical aspects of the tasks and the relationship between these aspects. The teachers in our studies considered that detailed planning increased their ability to respond to student understanding of technology ideas and, at the same time, increased their confidence to allow students to pursue divergent ideas and interests.

An important goal for AfL interactions is to help students build a sense of continuity and coherence between ideas and actions over time. Technology tasks are usually complex and multifaceted. Product/artefact specifications are integral to students understanding and achieving technological solutions. Product specifications provide a touchstone in the design-make-test process thereby acting as a means to connect and provide coherence to these activities. In technology AfL success criteria can be the same as product specifications. Hence, in technology success criteria/product specifications can support students' genuine involvement in AfL and enhance their technology learning.

Multimodal interactions provide rich entry points into students developing ideas. In technology teachers can use different modes singly, and in combination, to help students

understand and particularise a technological task. For example, drawing and the examination of real artefacts are authentic activities that can help students access a range of ideas and solutions. Teacher and student use of multiple modes in technology helps develop shared understandings and extends students' technological thinking. Technology is a multidimensional and multimodal subject. This means that the challenges teachers and students face in AfL interactions are complex. Yet this very complexity provides teachers with rich opportunities to find out about, and engage with and enhance, student learning.

Note: A fuller version of this paper may be accessed in Moreland, J., Cowie, B., and Jones, A. (2007, June). Assessment for Learning in Primary Technology Classrooms. *Design and Technology Education: An International Journal*, 12, 273-48.

4. REFERENCES

- Black, P. & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education*, 5(1), 7-74.
- Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.) (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Erickson, F. (1998). Qualitative research methods for science education. In B. J. Fraser, and K. G. Tobin, (Eds.) *International handbook of science education*. (1155-1173) Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishing.
- Hennessy, S., McCormick, R. & Murphy, P. (1993). The myth of general problem solving capability: Design and technology as an example. *The Curriculum Journal*, 4(1), 73-89.
- Jones, A. & Moreland, J. (2004). Enhancing Practicing Primary School Teachers' Pedagogical Content Knowledge. *Technology International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, 14(2), 121-140.
- Kimbell, R., Stables, K., Wheeler, T., Wozniak, A. & Kelly, V. (1991). *The assessment of performance in design and technology – the final report of the APU design and technology project*. London, SEAC/COI.
- Kress, G., Jewitt, C., Ogborn, J. & Tsatsarelis, C. (2001). *Multimodal teaching and learning: The rhetorics of the science classroom*. London: Continuum.
- Lave, J. (1988). *Cognition in practice: Mind, mathematics and culture in everyday life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mercer, N. (1995). *Guided construction of knowledge: Talk amongst teachers and students*. Multilingual Matters Ltd: UK.
- Ministry of Education (1995). *Technology in the New Zealand Curriculum*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Moreland, J. (2003). *Becoming effective technology teachers: enhancing assessment practices in primary classrooms*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Hamilton: University of Waikato.
- Roth, W.-M. (2005). *Talking science: Language and learning in science classrooms*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-22.
- Stables, K. (1997). Critical issues to consider when introducing technology education into the curriculum of young learners. *Journal of Technology Education*, 8(2), 1-17.