

Erratum

In the article “Formative assessment: A meta-analysis and a call for research,” by Neal Kingston and Brooke Nash (Winter 2011 EM:IP), many of the effect sizes in the article came from a 2004 article by Wiliam, Lee, Harrison & Black. After seeing the results of the authors’ moderator analysis (Table 4, p. 34), in which effect sizes were presented by content area, Paul Black caught an error that has been brought to authors’ attention. Namely, eight science studies were miscoded as reading studies. In addition Briggs, Ruiz-Primo, Furtak, Shepard & Yin (2012) suggested that the authors should not have included an effect size based on Ruiz-Primo & Furtak (2007) as that study compared two different approaches to formative assessment. The corrected Table 4 below addresses both of those issues.

This correction is important because in the original Table 4 the .95 confidence interval for science crossed zero, and in the corrected table it does not. The two main points of the original article still hold:

(1) current empirical evidence of the efficacy of formative assessment indicates an overall effect size of about .20, and

(2) more and better research on this topic is needed and might change this finding (and perhaps lead to improved use of formative assessment).

References

- Briggs, D. C., Ruiz-Primo, M. A., Furtak, E., Shepard, L., & Yin, Y. (2012). Meta-analytic methodology and inferences about the efficacy of formative assessment. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 31(4), 13–17.
- Kingston, N.M. & Nash, B. (2011). Formative Assessment: A Meta-Analysis and a Call for Research. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 30(4), 28–37.
- Ruiz-Primo, M. A., & Furtak, E. M. (2007). Exploring teachers’ informal formative assessment practices and students’ understanding in the context of scientific inquiry. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 44(1), 57–84. doi:10.1002/tea.20163
- Wiliam, D., Lee, C., Harrison, C., & Black, P. (2004). Teachers developing assessment for learning: Impact on student achievement. *Assessment in Education*, 11(1), 49–64.

Table 4. Revised Moderator Analysis for Content Area

Content Area*	n	Effect Size .95 Confidence Interval			Q _B	Q _W	Sig. Level
		Lower	Mean	Upper			
Mathematics	19	0.14	0.17	0.20	61.07	57.85	0.0000
English Language Arts	4	0.30	0.32	0.34		8.79	0.0322
Science	17	0.06	0.19	0.31		44.46	0.0001
Total	40					111.10	0.0000

*One study was categorized as ‘music’ and was not included in this analysis