Available online at ijci.wcci-international.org

International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction 14(3) (2022) 1903–1921

IJCI
International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction

Can we talk? Promoting the enactment of instructional strategies through dialogic feedback

Denisse M. Hinojosa [a]*

[a] *Michigan State University, College of Education, USA*

Abstract

Prospective teachers (PTs) experience the complexity of teaching when they start developing their teaching practice in their field experiences. PTs express to have challenges when enacting instructional strategies from teaching preparation and professional development programs because in most cases, PTs lack supports that can guide them in the process of enactment. This study contributes to the efforts done to bridge the disconnect between university-based teacher education and field-based experiences at schools. This study explores how the types of feedback provided on lesson plans (i.e., in the form of questions, direct, and positive reinforcement with explanations) and planning sessions (i.e., starting questions, two-option questions, and clarification questions) supported PTs in enacting and appropriating instructional strategies from a professional development program in their field experiences. Further, this study describes attributes that these types of feedback have for PTs to consider it (i.e., balanced, in the form of suggestions, positive, in the form of dialogue).

Keywords: prospective teachers, dialogic feedback, modeling, field experiences.

© 2016 IJCI & the Authors. Published by *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction (IJCI)*. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY-NC-ND) (**http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/**).

1. Introduction

1.1. Introduce the problem

Prospective teachers (PTs) experience the complexity of teaching from the moment they start their field experiences. Experiencing this complexity without adequate professional guidance could prevent PTs from enacting what is learned in teacher preparation programs. Researchers (e.g., Ball, 2010; Ellery, 2008) suggest that studies can focus on types of feedback that support PTs' teaching practices, and on the context and form in which feedback is delivered. Mutch (2003) urged for research that provides empirical evidence on the types of feedback that support learning. In an effort to bridge the disconnect between university-based teacher education and field-based experiences at schools, this study explores how the types of feedback provided on lesson plans and planning sessions supported PTs' enactment of instructional strategies from a

*Corresponding author: Denisse M. Hinojosa. ORCID ID.: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2814-7464
E-mail address: denisseh66@gmail.com

professional development (PD) program (Hinojosa, 2022 b). Central to this undertaking are the following research questions, what kinds of feedback on lesson plans supported PTs in enacting instructional strategies? What kinds of questions in planning sessions supported PTs in enacting instructional strategies?

1.2. Literature Review

For decades, the tendency of teacher preparation programs has been to emphasize teaching knowledge and content (Korthagen, 2010; Zeichner, 2012). Since the 1900s, continuous efforts have been made to promote PTs to make connections to methods and foundational courses in their field experiences with the goal of bridging the gap between theory and practice (i.e., Darling-Hammond, 2006; Grossman, 2005; Grossman et al., 2009; Zeichner, 2010). Findings are consistent for teacher educators to take a clinical stance and adopt pedagogies of enactment to support PTs (Darling-Hammond, 2006; Grossman, 2005; Zeichner, 2010) arguing for more cohesive integration of university-course work and fieldwork by intensifying field.

The perennial disconnect between university-based teacher education courses and field experiences (Smagorinsky et al,, 2003; Zeichner, 2010) is due in part to the traditional view of field experiences which has defined the role of field supervisors—evaluation and supervision (Korthagen, 2010; Zeichner, 2010). This traditional view provides a space for PTs to teach; however, PTs benefit from field supervisors having an active coaching role (Darling-Hammond & Skyes, 2003; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Grossman et al., 2009; Margolis, 2007). In this role, field supervisors provide learning opportunities in which PTs inquire and rethink their teaching based on students' outcomes (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Zeichner, 1996). This support could be in the form of feedback that promotes PTs' enactment of desired teaching practices (Scheeler et al., 2004).

The traditional concept of feedback (Boud & Molly, 2013) suggests a monologue in which information is provided with the hope that PTs find use in it. However, some researchers in the medical field and in higher and teacher education (e.g., Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Scheeler et al., 2004) have suggested moving away from this traditional approach. When provided effectively (Ferguson, 2011), feedback can increase PTs' confidence and motivation to enact and appropriate instructional strategies. The effectiveness of feedback is related to the timing, specificity, and complexity (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Scheeler et al., 2004). For example, if feedback is not provided on time, PTs may assume that there is an implicit approval of their teaching practices. Further, feedback needs to be provided with language that PTs understand and it has to be objective and related to observed teaching practice. These attributes contribute to PTs' acknowledgement of what steps to take to act upon feedback as soon as they receive it. In addition to these attributes, Gibbs and Simpson (2004) considered the sufficiency and detail of feedback. There needs to be a correlation between the quality and amount of

feedback. Ferguson (2011) suggested that for feedback to be effective it has to be personalized, accessible, understandable, and acted upon. These attributes promote PTs' positive attitudes toward feedback and encourage them to put feedback in practice because they understand how to enact it (Carless et al., 2011; Ferguson, 2011; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Sadler, 2010).

Sadler (1989) emphasized that "it cannot simply be assumed that when students are 'given feedback' they will know what to do with it." For PTs to enact desired teaching practices, they need support that goes beyond written feedback on lesson plans. Researchers (e.g., Gibbs & Simpson, 2004; Hounsell et al., 2008; Nicol 2010; Rust, O'Donovan, & Price, 2003) strongly encourage engaging in dialogue as an effective practice to discuss written feedback. Feedback as dialogue (Laurillard, 2005; Nicol & Macfarlane, 2006) refers to feedback that provides opportunities for field supervisors and PTs to engage in conversations about performances. PTs benefit from planning sessions that open and promote dialogue with field supervisors (e.g., Nicol, 2010; van der Schaaf et al., 2013; Yuan & Kim, 2015). Learning sessions facilitate PTs to take a more active role and reflect (Prins et al., 2006; Sadler, 1998) about their teaching practice because in these conversations PTs can clarify information and ask questions about feedback.

1.3. Theoretical Background

This study builds on the IDEAL (Instructional Strategies, Design, Engagement, Approximation of Practice, and Learning) framework (Hinojosa, 2018). Building on the sociocultural perspective (Ericsson, 2002; Rogoff, 1996) and the zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978), the IDEAL framework draws on scaffolds, modeling and feedback to explore teacher learning as a socially mediated activity. This framework is described as a trajectory of participation that takes place in three iterative stages: (1) the professional development program stage, (2) the approximation of practice cycle, and (3) the appropriation of practice stage.

Stage One describes how the program provides resources to support teacher learning. Stage Two describes the approximation of practice cycle. Stage Three discusses appropriation of practice. Appropriation of practice (Grossman et al., 1999) refers to the developmental process in which PTs enact and appropriate instructional strategies from the PD programs in iterative cycles. There are four components that support Stage Three: feedback on lesson plans, planning sessions and debriefing sessions after classroom observations, and coaching during classroom observations. To provide PTs with feedback during planning session, IDEAL builds on Pendleton's model for feedback interaction (Pendleton et al., 2003) used to encourage student-doctors to reflect on their medical practices. For the purpose of this study, I focus the first two components—feedback on lesson plans and planning sessions.

The process of appropriation varies in degrees that range from lack of appropriation to, appropriating a label, appropriating surface features, appropriating conceptual underpinnings, and achieving mastery. IDEAL explores how coaching (i.e., feedback and modeling) supports PTs' appropriation of instructional strategies. Because IDEAL draws on the sociocultural perspective, feedback is perceived as facilitative and participatory (e.g., Carless et al., 2011; Showers, 1985; Yıldırım & Uzun, 2021). A sociocultural approach to feedback (Leont'ev, 1981; Vygotsky, 1978) provides opportunities for PTs to take an active role in discussing written feedback through dialogue and participation in shared experiences that develop awareness of their own performance and improvement (Gibbs & Simpson, 2004; Hounsell et al., 2008; Nicol, 2010). Through reflection-in-action (Schön, 1987) PTs think and experiment with interpretations and possible solutions, provide a rationale, and elaborate on why they selected those pedagogical tools to engage in critical thinking.

This theoretical framework is appropriate for this study because it explains how features of the PD program support PTs' enactment of instructional strategies. At the same time, this helps explain the phenomenon of how PTs negotiate new ways of teaching as they engage in iterative stages of practice through the trajectory of participation. In relation to teacher learning, this perspective emphasizes the agency of PTs while they situate the enactment of instructional strategies in social contexts, going beyond what PTs have learned in the PD and shared in the CoP, and extending it to their classroom practices.

2. Method

By adopting an embedded single-case study with two units of analysis (Yin, 2014) and discourse analysis (Gee, 2014) I explored the type of feedback I provided on lesson plans and the kinds of questions I asked on planning sessions, and how these promoted, or not, prospective teachers' enactment and appropriation of instructional strategies. One of the criticisms in studying my own practice is of the researcher being too close to the study. Because I am an insider to this data, I used the "making strange tool" (Gee, 2014, p. 19) to take an outsider perspective which allowed me to see old things new. I adopted a critical stance and questioned the grounds of the conventional which allowed me to see our interactions strange. The making strange tool allowed me to look into the oddness and arbitrary nature of how my feedback and questions promoted prospective teachers' enactment of instructional strategies. The outsider's perspective allowed me to detach from the data to move to a higher level of abstraction (Erickson, 1984) to look at prospective teachers' discourse on why and how they planned on enacting instructional strategies building from feedback on lesson plans and planning sessions.

2.1. Contexts and Participants

In the year 2017-2018, 47 PTs—42 female and 5 male, eleven with Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) minor—participated in a PD program focused on learning to teach EBs in general education classrooms (Hinojosa, 2022 b). Out of these 47 PTs, 2 volunteered to receive support in their placement. These PTs were Helen and Kate†. Helen was placed at Braxton Elementary. Helen taught 3rd grade. Helen held a TESOL minor and she speaks Spanish as-a-second language and Arabic. Helen had study abroad experience in a Spanish speaking country in South America. Kate was placed at Dexter Elementary. Kate taught 1st grade, speaks English only and prior to the study did not have TESOL background.

2.2. Data Collection

I used voluntary sampling (Remler & Van Ryzin, 2015) to recruit the participants. I visited Helen and Kate in their field placements for nine weeks. I coached them in the enactment of instructional strategies. Some coaching practices included feedback on lesson plans and feedback in planning sessions. These were followed by coaching during classroom observations in the form of modeling, and debriefing sessions (Hinojosa, 2022 a). PTs sent their lesson plans before classroom observations to get feedback and to discuss possible changes. Before each classroom observation we discussed how to implement the lesson. PTs and I exchanged emails throughout the week to clarify tasks, instructional strategies, worksheets, etc. Data sources include: 200 minutes of transcripts from planning sessions, 94 minutes of transcripts from focus group interview, 32 lesson plans, and artifacts (Table 1).

Table 1: *Planning Sessions during the 2017-2018 Academic Year*

	Helen		**Kate**	
Type of Data	Collection Dates	Duration (minutes)	Collection Dates	Duration (minutes)
Planning session 1	01/22/18	21:00	01/24/18	17:00
Planning session 2	01/30/18	15:00	01/31/18	08:00
Planning session 3	02/05/18	16:00	02/07/18	05:00
Planning session 4	02/12/18	15:00	02/14/18	05:00
Planning session 5	02/20/18	12:00	02/22/18	08:00
Planning session 6	02/26/18	11:00	02/28/18	07:00
Planning session 7	03/05/18	12:00	03/07/18	06:00
Planning session 8	03/12/18	20:00	03/14/18	06:00
Planning session 9	03/19/18	10:00	03/21/18	07:00
Focus group			03/24/18	94:00

Note. Planning sessions occurred between 01/22/18 and 03/24/18.

† All names are pseudonyms

2.3. Data Analysis

To analyze the data, first I read the transcripts and focused on utterance meaning and force, which are central to pragmatics—the study of interaction (Thomas, 2013). I focused on the relationship between my feedback and PTs' responses and understanding of those. For instance, "‡One thing that usually works for me (2) is if I ask them to work in pairs." Helen responded, "Yeah, (2) I thought about that, ↓(2) uh, and I do like to do like (1) like a turn and talk (3) like think, pair, and share. So they think (1)↑ and they work in a small group↑(1) and they share it out↓. I do like that↑". In this example, I analyzed how my questions and utterances influenced Helen. I focused on the meaning of her responses, tone, and intonation. To analyze PTs' enactment over time, I traced the strategies that PTs used throughout their internship, as evidenced in their lesson plans, artifacts, and transcripts from planning sessions. I focused on instructional strategies that appeared to be new to the PTs and the ways in which they justified and reflected on their choices PTs made.

To analyze feedback on lesson plans, I did four cycles of analysis. First, I used the frame problem tool (Gee, 2014) to determine how PTs differentiated instruction. In each lesson plan, I highlighted the instructional strategies and tallied how many PTs considered in each lesson plan. I looked into how PTs proposed to enact such strategies and the connections they made with their enactment and implications on students' learning. For instance, Helen mentioned, "I will ask questions to both push the students' thinking, reinforce the lesson objectives, and make connections between concepts/presentations." I looked for these kinds of thinking to understand at what point of the PD PTs made these connections and what types of feedback and questions promoted these kinds of discourse. In addition, I looked at whether the amount of feedback PTs received increased or decreased across time.

I used the deixis tool (Gee, 2014) to categorize people, places, and time to later analyze stanzas. For example, Kate proposed, "They will be exposed to high frequency words and spelling words they will be using this week. While reading these words, I will be activating schema by asking them to give their own examples and definitions of the words." In these sentences, Kate used "while reading, I, they, them, and their" to talk about the students. Kate used "this week" to refer to week 5 in the observations. I highlighted the feedback provided, and organized the feedback and how PTs addressed this feedback into a "meta-matrix" (Miles & Huberman, 1994). I looked across feedback to determine if there were patterns across the types of feedback and how PTs responded to it. I realized that there were three categories that were used consistently: in the form of questions, direct, and positive reinforcement with explanations.

‡ *voice pitch and style change; (number) pause by seconds; ↓ falling intonation; ↑ rising intonation; underline emphasis in the utterance.

Analysis of the feedback during planning sessions also took place in four cycles. First, I used the frame problem tool to reconstruct and capture how our conversations allowed PTs to reflect on enacting instructional strategies. While reconstructing the context of our conversations, I used the deixis tool to categorize the people we talked about, as well as the place and time to make sense of the events for the subsequent analysis. Next, I highlighted relevant questions and responses from the transcripts and organized them into a meta-matrix in stanzas (Gee, 2014). For example, I placed my questions followed by PTs' responses. I grouped PTs' responses into larger blocks of information in the form of explanations. I organized these stanzas across the 18 classroom observations to look for changes across time. I looked for patterns in the types of questions, and how those questions prompted PTs' enactment of instructional strategies. Three categories emerged: starting questions, two-option questions, and clarification questions. I contrasted the questions to find similarities or differences. Making this contrast allowed me to realize that I consistently used these three categories. Finally, I looked for evidence about the relationship between feedback across lesson plans and planning sessions, and PTs' enactment of instructional strategies by looking if the amount of feedback provided decreased or increased.

3. Results

Supporting Helen and Kate for one year in their field experiences allowed me to understand how feedback provided on lesson plans and questions on planning sessions supported PTs' enactment of instructional strategies. Three kinds of feedback in lesson plans emerged: in the form of questions, direct, and positive reinforcement with explanations. Feedback supported PTs considering enacting instructional strategies. Feedback allowed PTs to shape worksheets, presentations, and tasks. Additionally, feedback supported PTs in reflecting on how to consider students' responses toward the instructional strategies when designing tasks. In relation to PTs' dispositions to enacting feedback, at early stages, there was some degree of resistance, which changed after PTs realized the implications on students' learning.

Planning sessions promoted PTs to reflect on how the instructional strategies they proposed in the lesson plans could support their students learning. Three kinds of questions emerged: starting, two-option, and clarification. Planning sessions allowed PTs to reflect on making changes on lesson plans and on how to enact instructional strategies. Another set of questions used interchangeably in planning and debriefing sessions (Hinojosa, 2022 a) were: questions that drew on prior knowledge and reflection/suggestion questions. These questions fostered reflection on past teaching experiences, focus on students' responses, and make connections when the coach was not providing supports. Finally, PTs developed self-awareness about how their changes impacted students' learning by comparing early lesson plans and recent ones. In the

following sections, I discuss feedback provided on lesson plans and planning sessions and how those supported the enactment of instructional strategies.

3.1. Feedback on Lesson Plans before Classroom Observations

Prior to classroom observations, PTs submitted a lesson plan. To provide feedback, I adopted a clinical stance. I intended to shape the content and pedagogy of the lesson by suggesting including instructional strategies in case PTs did not consider doing so.

> *3.1.1. Feedback in form of questions.* This feedback encouraged PTs to reflect on how to enact the tasks proposed on the lesson plans. The questions were formulated providing an answer or a suggestion as part of the question. For example, Kate and I worked on enacting literacy instructional strategies. One of those strategies was asking pre-, during, and post-comprehension questions. Initially, Kate was somewhat reluctant to enact this strategy. Kate changed her orientation when she realized that students were more focused on the readings and they used that academic language across content areas. Kate reflected,
>
> I was surprised how much the students remembered from the story I read yesterday…But they were recalling, not just like little details either, but like the big point of the story which was pleasantly surprising to me because I wasn't really sure where I was going to go from there.

Kate expressed her satisfaction with enacting the strategy I suggested and reflected on students' responses to it. Once Kate included comprehension questions, I encouraged her to reflect on the kinds of questions she wanted her students to focus on. I suggested,

> Maybe you wish to be more explicit about the questions you ask. What kinds of questions do you wish to ask: scanning, skimming, or inference, or all? These levels of questions are related to the comprehension level of each student. Are all your students in the same level? If not, what kinds of questions can each student answer? How can you 'push' all students to answer different level of questions?

In this example, Kate was encouraged to reflect on kinds of questions she could use. I also used questions to make her reflect about all her students achieving the same learning goals. In the planning session, we discussed the types of questions she wrote and how she would use them to support comprehension.

In a math class, Helen wanted to introduce the concept of estimates by asking, "What does it mean to estimate? When do we estimate? Why?"

> I suggested scaffolding students' understanding of the concept by asking, "How about start by asking students to estimate the price of something? Can you show pizzas and ask students to estimate the cost of 2 or 3 pizzas? If students don't know

> the definition of estimate, you ask one student or two to infer the definition building from the example.

Here, I encouraged Helen to introduce a math concept with examples students were familiar with. The questions allowed Helen to reflect on how students benefit from making connections with their use math in the real world to make sense of this new concept. During the planning session, Helen shared that she liked my idea and she followed by saying, "And then they are going to want a pizza party (giggle)."

> *3.1.2. Direct feedback.* Direct feedback sought to remind PTs to reflect on how the enactment of the tasks impacted students' learning. For example, to teach prepositions of place, Kate planned on asking students to draw a house on a piece of paper and asking them to read sentences using different prepositions. Kate wrote, "[Write "inside" on the board.] Draw something inside your house." I realized that the task was well designed; however, Kate started under the assumption that students were familiar with all the prepositions. I suggested,
>
> I would suggest assessing students' prior knowledge. Look for an image of a bedroom on the internet and project that on the board. Write down the prepositions that they need to use (inside, by, above, on) on the board and say 'You are going to answer the questions using these prepositions.' And you show the prepositions making it explicit. You ask a few questions making students use the prepositions you have on the list (no more than 2 minutes). If they do this correctly, you move to the task you have here which is pretty good.

Direct feedback on how to build from students' prior knowledge made Kate reflect on her students' different levels and learning needs. During the planning session, Kate showed me the image she was going to use and asked, "But how do I use it?" This was an opportunity to coach her on how to scaffold the use of prepositions by showing and image, and to assess the content students were familiar with.

Direct feedback encouraged PTs to anticipate based on students' responses. For example, Helen designed a task for students to estimate costs. Feedback encouraged Helen to think ahead on students' responses and on how to follow up. For example,

> Students share how much a pizza cost, say $8.99. Next, you can ask students, 'If I have $15 dollars and a pizza costs $8.99, can I buy the pizza?' Students may say 'Yes.' You ask them 'Why?' After that, you elicit their responses and write those down on the board. You can follow up and say, 'If a small pizza costs $3.99, how many pizzas can I buy?' Scaffolding means to start from something easy to later make it more complex. If you start using very complex examples, some students will not get what you are trying to convey.

Direct feedback allowed Helen to reflect on how to scaffold students' understanding of task from going from simple to more complex. Helen expressed, "I definitely think it was

a good addition. This will let me more like a check in instead of a like ah an activating knowledge thing." Further, asking Helen to anticipate to students' responses systematically helped her focus on students' learning.

> *3.1.3. Positive reinforcement with explanations.* I provided positive feedback with an explanation on how instructional strategies would support students' learning to encourage PTs to reflect on how and why to continue enacting observed instructional strategies. One of the challenges of teacher learning is for PTs to focus on students' learning. Positive reinforcement with an explanation, made salient and visible for PTs to think on students' learning outcomes. For example, Kate was eager to try a cloze activity and expressed,
>
> Talk through the definitions of the words again. Have students read the passage, decide what word goes in the blank, physically place it in the sentence, and explain why they chose that word. Hopefully students include something about the definition of the word in their explanation. Have students each do one "by themselves" and work as a team for the other two. If students get stuck they can also work together.

Here, Kate not only described how to enact the task, she focused on the implications on students' learning and designed the task based on possible responses. I shared, "Very good! I appreciate you including instructional strategies from the program. Students would benefit from this cloze activity because they will reinforce how to use vocabulary and they will look into the sequence of the story, great job!" Positive feedback with an explanation allowed me to share how the cloze activity would further support her students' English language development.

For a math class, Helen wanted students to learn about "Patterns in products." Helen planned to start, "I will do a number talk with the students to elicit an understanding of how we can use patterns to help solve multiplication facts, especially with squares." Throughout the lesson, Helen planned the tasks based on how she expected her students to respond, and the tasks scaffolded students' understanding of the topic. I expressed, "This lay out looks really good. What I appreciate the most is that you are focusing on students' learning as opposed to focusing on your teaching. I consider it great that you are maximizing students' working and thinking in class rather than your teaching. This looks really good! Look forward to seeing you tomorrow." Positive reinforcement encouraged Helen to focus on students' learning.

3.2. Questions to ask in Planning Sessions

Before classroom observations, PTs and I debriefed each plan to facilitate the lesson. I started by asking questions such as "What's the plan for today?" or "Let's look at the lesson plan, let me know how you feel about it." Asking open-ended questions allowed

PTs to discuss modifications they made on lesson plans based on the feedback, and to articulate how they would enact instructional strategies. While PTs unpacked their thoughts, I encouraged them to reflect on how the instructional strategies and tasks focus on students' learning outcomes. I sought to move PTs away from using a top-down approach when teaching. In our planning sessions, I deconstructed feedback in two types, two-option and clarification questions.

3.2.1. Two-option questions. Provided PTs with two options for how to present instructional strategies in case they did not consider doing so. Two-option questions empowered PTs because they did not direct PTs on what to do. Instead, PTs made their own choices. For instance, Kate and I debriefed how to introduce the topic of 'cause and effect.' I asked, "When you talk about cause and effect, are you going to provide an example first? Or are you just going to elicit examples?" Kate took a few seconds to respond and said,

I'm trying to decide because a lot of the time I think, okay, I am going to ask them to give me examples. But then, I give an example right away. And then I am hey, students can do that too. So, when I started earlier this week, when I started the cause and effect discussion, I gave them an example, and then they gave me a lot more examples. So, I am wondering if I should let them just give me examples this time since they've been hearing my examples all week.

Two-option questions encouraged Kate to reflect on strategies that she used in previous classes, and on why to consider a different strategy building on previous experiences. For example, in a math lesson Helen wanted students to use plastic magnets to build 3-dimetional shapes. I realized that Helen did not consider wrap-up for the task and I asked, "Are students going to come to the front and share their shapes, or are they going to share with other groups?" Helen responded, "That's a good idea. Yeah! They can come to the front and share the shapes they built." This question made Helen aware of the need to encourage students to share their work with others and to think of ways to wrap up the lessons and look for ways for students to learn from that experience.

3.2.2. Clarification questions. Sought to encourage PTs to reflect on three dimensions of their teaching: knowledge, task or strategy, and unpack thoughts. Clarification questions allowed PTs to unpack their thoughts on how they intended to enact instructional strategies.

3.2.3. Knowledge. Encouraged PTs to reflect on using scaffolds, activating prior knowledge, and building on students' knowledge. For example, Helen's plan was to ask students to work on a task but the vocabulary on the task was complex. To

> make sure students were familiar with the language, I asked, "Do all the students know this vocabulary?" Helen responded,
>
> We talked about them a lot last week and we used them. Students made these little spinners. Not everybody got to it but they were able to identify, this is the sign, this is the vertex, and this would be the angle.

This question allowed Helen to reflect on the importance of making connections with prior knowledge, and for me to learn about classes I did not observe. Similarly, when I asked Kate to reflect on a character from a book students read, I asked, "Do students know who Tomás Rivera is?" Kate responded, "No (sigh). We read it yesterday, but I am going to read it again. I looked it up and I am going to give students more background knowledge on who he is today." By asking Kate to reflect on the main character of the book students read, I helped her reflect on the importance of providing context to what she teachers. Additionally, clarification questions allowed me to make connections to classes I did not observe.

3.2.4. Task related. PTs discussed how to present and carry out tasks or strategies and encouraged PTs to reflect on narrowing down the questions that they planned to ask. For instance, I asked, "Food like, are you going to be specific about food? Because students can say pizza or ice-cream." Kate explained,

> Oh well there is like two stories that we usually read each week that has a boy eating pizza. So I think if they say pizza, well what goes on the pizza? Trying to get them to think, okay, there might be pizza but there is cheese on it, there is sometimes meat on it, there is veggies on it. If they still don't get to that point, I may say, what about broccoli? What about when you have to eat eggs? Or those kinds of things.

Kate reflected on how to respond in case students come up with responses she was not prepared for. Task-related questions also encouraged PTs to reflect on how to enact strategies. For example, I asked Helen, "Are the questions going to be on the board?" Helen did not consider having the questions on the board, but she considered the idea and responded,

> Yes, I can do that. And then, students have to figure out like if they want, like for some of these they have to get 3 for $10. So they have to get at least 3 or 3 whatever it is. And they will do estimates with these. So, some of these numbers are like big whole numbers, so they want to get like 5 of these boxes doing the estimation of like, what kind of strategies can we get. So, I know that 1.80 is really close to 2. So, I can do 2x5, so if I have $10 I know I have enough. So my estimate can be $10.

Task related questions encouraged Helen to enact a strategy and to unpack how she would enact it based on students' responses.

3.2.5. Unpack thoughts. Are open-ended questions (e.g., how, why, what, etc.) that encouraged PTs to reflect and elaborate on how they planned to enact tasks. For instance, for a reading comprehension task Kate considered asking pre-reading questions. Unpack thoughts questions encouraged Kate to share the questions she intended to use and how she would follow up. I asked, "And what are the questions that you have?" Kate responded,

> Um, what kind of story is this? Who the characters may be? We'll talk about it before I read it. And then read it, talk about those again, write their answers. Leave it up there, talk about these words. And do it again.

Kate verbalized what she intended to do and together revised the questions and the enactment plan. For example, Kate shared that she planned on scaffolding students' knowledge. I asked, "Alright, and how are you going to scaffold that?" Kate reflected for a minute and responded, "Um uh, I am going to start with talking about more just where does food come from? Asking them, where does our food come from? Do you know? Do you get it from the store?" This question encouraged Kate to reflect on what questions to ask and to be prepared for students' responses.

Unpack thoughts questions encouraged Helen to reflect on how she would wrap up her mathematics session. I asked, "How are we going to check this? How are we going to bring students together to check if they actually did it correctly?" Helen responded,

> Um… well, I will be seeing students in front of me in my groups. So I can check as it goes. And if there is anything that comes up, um that repeatedly that they are misunderstanding; I will try to put them together at the end. It is hard (sight) we have a time crunch that between the beginning. I do struggle with the summary at the end a lot. Um… and I kind of will try to summarize within a small group and not with the whole group.

Helen shared what she struggled with and provided an opportunity for us to reflect on different ways to summarize the lesson. At the end of the academic year, on a focus group interview, I asked Helen and Kate to share their perceptions of feedback on lesson plans and planning sessions.

> H: I thought it was really helpful. It definitely helped me think a lot more specifically about the steps that I was taking, and what I really wanted them to get at the end of the lesson. I think that it is easy to get carried away with what you want them to do. Know what you want them to have at the end, and just being a lot more specific and a lot more efficient. That was the biggest thing that I got from feedback on lesson plans.
>
> K: Feedback helped me put into words what I was really doing. Because initially I was like just okay. This is what I am doing to help this kid do that. I didn't really say why. It was more like, this is what's going on, and that was kind of it. But then,

> I was able to get more detail of I am scaffolding this by doing this, which is why I am going to do this, kind of thing. I am focusing more.

Both PTs expressed that feedback supported them in being specific and to focus on what they intend to accomplish in the lesson. Planning sessions enabled PTs to verbalize and unpack their thoughts on why and how instructional strategies would support students achieve their learning goals. PTs expressed why their dispositions changed toward feedback:

> R: We walked through the lesson plan. I can give you suggestions, but you make the final decision. And, from my experience it is hard to change your beliefs until you are proof wrong. So, if you don't want to change it, go ahead, and you will see.
>
> K: That you are wrong! (laugh)
>
> H: It will come back at you (laugh). Trust me!
>
> R: You have to try things out, I could suggest…
>
> K: [Yeah,] but you have to feel if it works or not.

In this conversation, PTs shared their need to try out what they belief would work in their teaching despite the feedback they received. My role was to support their decisions and provide spaces for them to reflect on improvement based on their successful or failed experiences.

4. Discussion

This study explored the types of feedback provided in lesson plans and planning sessions, and connected this feedback to what happens in PTs' teaching practice in their field experiences. Data suggests that feedback in lesson plans and planning sessions played a role in PTs' enactment and systematic appropriation of instructional strategies because they guided PTs throughout the learning process. In most cases enacting instructional strategies can be challenging because PTs may prefer enacting teaching practices they are familiar with. By receiving feedback on lesson plans and having the opportunity to engage in dialogue, PTs had supports to add instructional practices to their repertoire. These feedback supports contributed to the systematic appropriation of instructional strategies because PTs had a clear sense of what they needed to do to improve in the context of developing their teaching practice. Further, balancing written feedback with interactions and dialogue during planning sessions was a turning point that supported PTs' enactment of strategies.

As outlined in Stage One and Two of IDEAL, PTs participated in a PD program and participated in iterative cycles of representations of practice, approximations of practice, and coaching during classroom observations (Hinojosa, 2022 a). Throughout Stage Three, PTs received feedback on lesson plans and on planning sessions. Feedback, as described in this study, was closely related to PTs' enactment of instructional strategies. Feedback on lesson plans was in the form of thought-provoking questions. These questions did not

aim to tell PTs which instructional strategies to enact, rather promoted self-reflection, engagement, and made PTs responsible of their own learning. Feedback on lesson plans was personalized and sought to support PTs' development (Ferguson, 2011). Further, it was balanced, provided suggestions on how to improve the current lesson plan, and it was positive. Data suggest that feedback as described in this study encouraged PTs to continue enacting desired instructional strategies that promoted student learning.

PTs' perceptions of feedback played an important role their response to it. For example, PTs' perceptions of feedback can positively or negatively influence their decision to enact it in their field experiences. Data suggest that for PTs to be receptive to feedback, they have to hold positive perceptions toward it. Phrasing of feedback was a key component in PTs' receptiveness, confidence, motivation, and encouragement to continue their professional growth. Feedback was specific in the form of constructive suggestions and positive reinforcement which was easy to understand. Positive feedback explained how and why instructional strategies supported students' learning. Consistent with literature (Hattie & Timperley, 2007) in this study, feedback informed PTs about their improvements and supported teacher development.

For feedback on lesson plan to be enacted, PTs engaged in dialogue in planning sessions. Planning sessions enabled PTs to capitalize on feedback provided on lesson plans and allowed PTs to make sense of written feedback and to bridge the gap between the desired level of performance and the desired enactment of instructional strategies. From a sociocultural perspective, feedback was perceived as facilitative (Carless et al., 2011). Following this stance, PTs learned through dialogue and participation of shared experiences in which PTs took an active role to develop awareness on their strengths and areas of improvement, as well as developed awareness on their own performance. This was achieved by the researcher-coach raising questions, and providing comments and suggestions that enabled PTs to take responsibility of their own revisions and decisions building on the understanding of the dialogue, and without dictating what the understandings have to be. In this study, planning sessions opened a collaborative discussion about feedback (Gibbs & Simpson, 2004; Nicol, 2010) from lesson plans. These discussions enabled PTs to share their understanding on how and why to enact instructional strategies.

Finally, planning sessions scaffolded feedback by checking PTs' understanding. PTs elaborated on the implementation of lesson plans, and the coach elicited how PTs would enact instructional strategies in their field experiences. Feedback allowed PTs to make connections between feedback provided on lesson plans and planning sessions to encourage its enactment. In this study, feedback had a direct impact in PTs' enactment of instructional strategies because PTs implemented the feedback in their current and forthcoming learning session even when the coach was not there.

5. Conclusions

Teacher preparation programs ask PTs to write lesson plans. However, instruction on how to provide feedback on lesson plans is limited. For PTs to enact desired teaching practices, they need to make connections between the feedback they are receiving, and the ways in which they are developing their teaching practice. This study contributes to the guidance on how to provide feedback on lesson plans followed by feedback on planning session to promote PTs to enact what they learn in teacher preparation programs in field experiences. PTs benefit from feedback that is clear, positive, constructive, and guide them toward future improvement. Further, PTs benefit from a more participatory planning session which allow them to learn through dialogue (Gibbs & Simpson, 2004; Hounsell et al., 2008; Nicol 2010; Rust et al., 2003). In other words, provide PTs with an active role in which they expand on their ideas, raise questions, seek for clarification, and defend their position on why they may, or not, enact the suggested instructional strategies.

Acknowledgements

This study was supported by the College of Education at Michigan State University and the Michigan State University Graduate School.

References

Ball, E.C. (2010). Annotation an effective device for student feedback: A critical review of the literature. *Nurse Education in Practice, 10*(3), 138-143.

Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2013). Decision-making for feedback. In D. Boud & E. Molloy (Eds.), *Feedback in higher and professional education* (pp. 202-217). London: Routledge.

Butler, D.L., & Winne, P.H. (1995). Feedback and self-regulated learning: A theoretical synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 65*(3), 245–281.

Carless, D., Salter, D., Yang, M., & Lam, J. (2011). Developing sustainable feedback practices. *Studies in Higher Education, 3*(6), 395-407.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S.L. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. *Review of Research in Education, 24*(1), 249–305.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Constructing 21st-century teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*(3), 300-314.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Sykes, G. (2003). Wanted, a national teacher supply policy for education: The right way to meet the "Highly Qualified Teacher" challenge. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *11*(33).

Ellery, K. (2008). Assessment for learning: A case study using feedback effectively in an essay-style test. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 33*(4), 421-429.

Erickson, F. (1984). What makes school ethnography 'ethnographic'? *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 15*(1), 51-66.

Ericsson, K. A. (2002). Attaining excellence through deliberate practice: Insights from the study of expert performance. In M. Ferrari (Ed.), *The pursuit of excellence in education* (pp. 21–55). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Evans, C. (2013). Making sense of assessment feedback in higher education. *Review of Educational Research, 83*(1), 70–120.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record, 103*(6), 1013-1055.

Ferguson, P. (2011). Student perceptions of quality feedback in teacher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 36*(1), 51-62.

Gee, J.P. (2014). *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (2nd Ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Gibbs, G., & Simpson, C. (2004). Conditions under which assessment supports students' learning. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education, 1*, 3–31.

Grossman, P. (2005). Pedagogical approaches in teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education* (pp. 425-476). New York, NY: Routledge.

Grossman, P., Hammerness, K., & McDonald, M. (2009). Redefining teaching, reimagining teacher education. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 15*(2), 273-289.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(1), 81-112.

Hinojosa, D. M. (2018). *Coaching during workshops and classroom observations: Promoting the appropriation of instructional strategies to teach emergent bilinguals.* Individual paper presented at American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Baltimore, MD: AACTE) 70th Annual Meeting.

Hinojosa, D. M. (2022 a). Practice what you teach: Onsite coaching and dialogic feedback to promote the appropriation of instructional strategies. *Teaching and Teacher Education Journal, 111(2022)*, 103582. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103582

Hinojosa, D. M. (2022 b). Professional Development Program Designed to Support Prospective Teachers' Enactment of Instructional Strategies to Differentiate Instruction for English Learners. The Teacher Educator, *(2022),* 1-23. DOI: 10.1080/08878730.2022.2088914

Hounsell, D., McCune, V., Hounsell, J., & Litjens, J. (2008). The quality of guidance and feedback to students. *Higher Education Research and Development, 27*(1), 55–67.

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), 254–284.

Korthagen, F.A.J. (2010) How teacher education can make a difference. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 36*(4), 407-423.

Laurillard, D. (2002). *Rethinking university teaching: A conversational framework for the effective use of learning technologies* (2nd Ed.). London: Routledge Falmer.

Leont'ev, A.N. (1981). *Problems of the development of the mind*. Moscow: Progress Press.

Margolis, J. (2007). Improving relationships between mentor teachers and student teachers: Engaging in a pedagogy of explicitness. *The New Educator, 3*(1), 75-94.

Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd Ed.). SAGE Publications.

Mutch, A. (2003). Exploring the practice of feedback to students. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 4*(1), 24-38.

Nicol, D.J. (2010). From monologue to dialogue: Improving written feedback processes in mass higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 35*(5), 501–517.

Nicol, D.J., & 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.

Orsmond, P., Merry, S., & Reiling. K. (2005). Biology students' utilization of tutors' formative feedback: A qualitative interview study. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 30*(4), 369–386.

Pendleton, D., Schofield, T., Tate, P., & Havelock, P. (2003). *The new consultation: Developing doctor-patient communication* (2nd Ed). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Prins, F., Sluijsmans, D.M.A., & Kirschner, P.A. (2006). Feedback for general practitioners in training: Quality, styles, and preferences. *Advances in Health Sciences Education, 11*(3), 289–303.

Remler, D.K., & Van Ryzin, G.G. (2015). *Research methods in practice* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Rust, C., Price, M., & O'Donovan, B. (2003). Improving students' learning by developing their understanding of assessment criteria and processes. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 28*(2), 147–164.

Sadler, D.R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science, 18*(2), 119–144.

Sadler, D.R. (1998). Formative assessment: Revisiting the territory. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice, 5*(1), 77–84.

Sadler, D.R. (2010). Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 35*(5), 535–550.

Scheeler, M.C., Ruhl, K.L., & McAfee, J.K. (2004). Providing performance feedback to teachers: A review. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 27*(4), 396-407.

Schön, D.A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Showers, B. (1985). Teachers coaching teachers. *Educational Leadership, 42*, 43–48.

Smagorinsky, P., Cook, L.S., & Johnson, T.S. (2003). The twisting path of concept development in learning to teach. *Teachers College Record, 15*, 1399-1436.

Thomas, J. (2013). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics* (2nd Ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

van der Schaaf, M., 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.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Yıldırım, Ş. &Uzun, Ş. (2021). An overview of dialogic teaching and its impact on learning. *International Journal of Education, Technology and Science,1*(2), 135–153.

Yin, R.K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th Ed.). SAGE Publications.

Yuan, J., & Kim, C. (2015). Effective feedback design using free technologies. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 52*(3) 408–434.

Zeichner, K. (1996). Designing educative practicum experiences for prospective teachers. In K. Zeichner, S. Melnick, & M. L. Gomez (Eds.), *Currents of reform in preservice teacher education* (pp. 215-234). New York, NY: Teacher College Press.

Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1-2), 89-99.

Zeichner, K. (2012). The turn once again toward practice-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 63*(5), 376-382.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the Journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (**CC BY-NC-ND) (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/**).