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Abstract

This research work establishes the teacher-educators’ conceptions about feedback and the feedback interaction patterns in our BA program. These two aspects are compared one to another to analyze the manner in which teacher-educators’ conceptions of feedback are consistent with their respective performance, through feedback interaction patterns, in the ELTE classroom. This case study research allows going deeper into the experiences and real occurrences of feedback dynamics in our program. By following two approaches of data analysis, Ethnomethodological Conversation Analysis and Narrative Analysis, findings demonstrate that interaction patterns of feedback happen in five manners. a) Corrective feedback patterns such as repetition and explicit correction (grammar or pronunciation), b) teacher-educator’s instruction or explanation giving; c) interaction pattern of question-answer-question between the teacher-educator and the students in this major; and d) positive feedback discourse without interaction. These patterns are not necessarily aligned with the teacher-educators’ reported conceptions of feedback. Discrepancies occur in the manner in which the interaction patterns reflect the said conceptions.

Key words: Feedback, conceptions, teacher-educator, interaction patterns, classroom consistence.

Resumen

Este trabajo de investigación establece las concepciones de los profesores -educadores acerca de la retroalimentación y los patrones de interacción de retroalimentación en nuestro programa de Licenciatura en lengua Castellana, Inglés y Francés. Estos dos aspectos se comparan entre sí para analizar la manera en que las concepciones sobre la retroalimentación de los profesores-educadores son consistentes con su respectivo desempeño, a través de patrones de interacción de retroalimentación, en el aula de enseñanza del inglés. Esta investigación de estudio de caso permite profundizar en las experiencias y hechos reales de las dinámicas de la retroalimentación en nuestro programa. Siguiendo dos enfoques de análisis de datos, Análisis de Conversación Etnometodológica y Análisis Narrativo, los hallazgos demuestran que los patrones de interacción de retroalimentación ocurren de cinco maneras. a) Patrones de retroalimentación correctiva tales como repetición y corrección explícita (gramática o pronunciación), b) instrucción del profesor-educador o explicación; C) patrón de interacción basado en pregunta-respuesta-pregunta entre el profesor-educador y los alumnos de este programa; y d) discurso de retroalimentación positiva sin interacción. Estos patrones no están necesariamente alineados con las concepciones de retroalimentación de los profesores-educadores. Las discrepancias se producen en la manera en que los patrones de interacción reflejan dichas concepciones.

Palabras clave: Retroalimentación, concepciones, profesores-educadores, patrones de interacción, consistencia en el aula.

Résumé

Ce travail de recherche établit les conceptions des enseignants-éducateurs à propos la rétroaction et les modèles d'interaction de rétroaction dans notre programme de BA. Ces deux aspects sont comparés l’un à l’autre pour analyser la façon dont les conceptions de rétroaction des enseignants-éducateurs sont compatibles avec leurs respectives performances, à travers des modèles d’interaction de rétroaction dans la salle de classe ELTE. Cette recherche d’étude du cas permet d’aller plus en détail dans les expériences et les occurrences réelles de la dynamique de
rétroaction dans notre programme. En suivant ces deux approches de l’analyse de données, l’analyse de la conversation Ethno méthodologique et l’analyse narrative, réussissant démontrer que les modèles d’interaction de rétroaction se produisent dans cinq manières. a) les modèles de rétroaction corrective comme la répétition et la correction explicite. (Grammaire et prononciation), b) les instructions ou explications de l’enseignant-éditeur; c) le modèle d’interaction question-réponse-question entre l’enseignant-éditeur et les étudiants dans cette matière; et d) le discours de rétroaction positive sans interaction. Ces modèles ne sont pas nécessairement alignés avec les conceptions de rétroaction rapportées des enseignants-éducateurs. Des incohérences se produisent d’une mode dont les modèles d’interaction reflètent les conceptions mentionnées.

**Mots clés:** Feedback/commentaires, conceptions, enseignant-éditeur, modèles d’interaction, cohérence dans la classe.
Teacher-Educators’ Conceptions of Feedback Displayed in English Language Teacher Education Classes

Introduction

Learning a second language demands constant interaction between English language teacher-educators and second language students in the English Language Teacher Education (ELTE) classroom. In that interaction, teacher-educators may perceive feedback as a relevant tool for sharing language knowledge and use. Feedback could make students in this major be aware of their learning process during classes.

Concerning about our role as pre-service teachers and future teachers, this research emerged from our experience as students in the courses of Interacción y Sociedad Anglófona I, II and III, when we observed how some teacher-educators, based on their conceptions, provided feedback in different manners to students during class activities, and how it might impact directly to the students’ performance, participation and interactions in the classroom of these courses.

In those experiences as students of a second language (L2), we saw how teachers-educators did feedback, seemingly affecting the students’ active role in classroom interaction. We perceived that a few students did not feel comfortable for the manner in which teacher-educators provided feedback, leading them to remain quiet. In addition, the constant use of the word “feedback” in teachers-educators’ speech, mostly when they were going to assess students’ performance or language use, made us wonder what feedback really means for them.

When we were constructing the interest for our research study, we also realized that teachers-educators have different ways to provide feedback. For example, teacher-educators may correct students’ language use and accuracy while the latter ones are speaking, others may correct
pronunciation or the coherence of students’ ideas, even their behavior in class. All above can mean that some teacher-educators may focus on students’ language use (such as pronunciation, grammar, and sentence structure), whereas others on general performance by giving students time to express themselves, without being concerned if English was used in a proper way because the interest is on communication and interaction. With the time and information that teachers-educators give, students in the major could reflect on the topic proposed and the way they are using English. All in all, providing feedback seems to follow a process attached to each teacher-educator’s pedagogical purposes. The use of a consistent conception of feedback provision within the ELTE classroom interaction could become fundamental for encouraging students’ participation in an academic space, or influence the whole students’ learning process, by generating confidence or insecurity.

Throughout this study and considering the abovementioned issues, we aim at first establishing what the English Language teacher-educators’ conceptions are about feedback, and secondly, at identifying what feedback interaction patterns appear during the interaction between these teacher-educators and their students in the courses of Lengua y Comunicación Inglesa II, Interacción y Sociedad Anglófona I, II and Fonética y Fonología Inglesa. An analysis about the manner in which the teacher-educators’ conceptions of feedback are consistent with their respective performance, the feedback interaction patterns become necessary to pinpoint the manner in which feedback happens in the indicated courses.

This research is organized as follows: first, we will take a look at the theory that gives foundation to this research. Further, we will have a sight into the research methodology, type of research, participant population, the data collection, and analysis process. The results from this study will be found next, giving it answers to the research objectives, and finally, the discussion
and conclusions will be stated.

**Conceptual Framework**

This section offers an overview of the background we used to support our research. We took into account different scholars’ points of view which guided us to develop and to find the four main concepts that lead this study: The feedback concept, teacher-educators’ conceptions, feedback as interaction within the classroom, and feedback patterns.

**The Feedback Concept.** Through time, feedback has been understood in different manners due to multiple possibilities to be given. To Hattie and Timperley (2007), feedback is seen as information provided by teachers to students; it must be clear, purposeful, meaningful, and compatible with student’s prior knowledge. These scholars state that, “Feedback is conceptualized as the information provided by an agent” (p. 81), in this case, by a teacher educator regarding aspects of students’ performance or understanding. Feedback is a consequence of performance (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Nevertheless, to Winnie and Butler (1995), feedback is not only information; because to have a powerful effect in students, there must be also a learning context to which feedback is going to be addressed. According to that, feedback should have deeper purposes and different consequences in its use within classroom interaction in one specific context. Winnie and Butler affirm that, “We believe broader scope, deeper analysis and a reviewed of the temporal location of feedback effect are necessary to capture feedbacks roles in knowledge construction” (p. 246).

As many conceptions of feedback have been underpinned, different feedback typologies exist. Within the classroom, teachers-educators have different manners to provide feedback. To Ellis (2009) it could be positive or negative:

a) Positive feedback affirms that the students’ response to an activity is correct. It
may signal the veracity of the content of a student utterance or the linguistic accuracy of the utterance, providing affective support and fosters motivation to the student continue learning.

b) Negative feedback appears when the students’ utterance absences veracity or is linguistically different. It refers specifically to corrective feedback.

Although corrective feedback is considered as negative feedback, because it is applied as a response when a student’s sentence contains a linguistic error (Ellis, 2009); that response is given to correct immediately student's utterance and to provide a solution to students’ error in different forms. According to Lyster and Ranta (1997), there are 6 types of feedback which are highly influential within the classroom:

1. In the Explicit correction, the ELTE clearly indicates that the student has said something incorrect, and provides the correct form.

2. Recast occurs when the ELTE reformulates the student’s utterance, maintaining its meaning but offering a correct rendition of the form.

3. A clarification request is offered to indicate that the student’s utterance has low intelligibility and a reformulation is required.

4. Metalinguistic feedback is provided when the ELTE offers comments, questions or information regarding the student’s utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form. It indicates that something the student has said is incorrect, without providing grammatical metalanguage indicating the nature of the error or, in the case of lexical errors providing a word definition.

5. Elicitation refers to techniques used by an ELTE to directly elicit the correct form from the student. This can be done by repeating part of the utterance, but pausing to allow the
student to complete the utterance correctly. It may also be done by asking questions to elicit correct forms, e.g. by asking “How do we say X in English?” A final form of elicitation is directly asking the student to try again.

6. Finally, in the case of repetition, the ELTE repeats the erroneous utterance, adjusting the intonation so as to highlight the error.

Feedback is often considered by scholars as the means by which teachers criticize students’ performance in the classroom and in most cases, even if is not the initial objective, it ends up being the source by which many students become discouraged in second learning acquisition. However, Black and William (2009) have argued that praise can enhance motivation on students and that judgments (even negative ones) can be viewed as challenges to overcome. According to this, feedback is given through positive words to motivate students, indicating that the discourse used by the teacher-educator can transform the error into challenges to be improved.

**Teacher-educators’ conceptions.** Teacher-educators’ conceptions have meaningful relationships to the knowledge that is constructed by theories, beliefs, ideologies, perceptions or experiences during their practices as teacher-educators. Thompson (1992) points out the term conception as one contributing factor toward the development of teachers’ philosophies of teaching, which in turn can shape their instructional, management and assessment practices. Studies in learning define feedback as part of the assessment that teacher educators use to teach in the English language classroom. These actions are often tied to their personal conceptions toward assessment, which are shaped by their educational and life experiences (Pratt, 1992). Even though our research is not interested in assessment purely, feedback can be considered by teacher-educators as an alternative to improve students’ learning process assessment.
To understand how the conceptions of feedback work in English language teacher-educators, we highlight that each type of feedback has specific purposes within the classroom. Each teacher may use feedback for specific reasons. Researches, as Black and William (2009), Irving, Harris, and Peterson (2011) have shown that teachers may also provide feedback for affective reasons, hoping to encourage student persistence and effort or to mediate negative evaluations of student work. According to Lotter (2006), those conceptions can be perceived as beliefs that are difficult to change, because they are based in part, on their practical teaching knowledge that has been learned over years of experiences in the classroom.

**Feedback as Interaction within the Classroom.** Interaction, according to Searle (1979) (as cited in Lucero, 2015) refers to the set of actions of talking to other people, in which people make statements that hold their ideas, points of view, thoughts, meanings, and intentions. In this research study, those actions involve a third component that is the classroom, which we determine as the academic space to share knowledge in the everyday learning-teaching process.

In the teacher-educator use of feedback, interactions emerge from the exchange of information in the classroom. For Hattie and Timperley (2007), the term classroom interaction refers to the interaction between the teacher and students and among the students, in the classroom. The success of feedback as interaction within the classroom corresponds to three main aspects: input, interaction, and output. According to Carter and Numan (2001), input refers to the language used by the teacher-educator, output refers to language produced by both teacher (educators) and students, and interaction refers to the interrelationship between input and output with no assumption of a linear cause-and-effect relationship between the two.

Teachers’ questions are a relevant dimension as well. Besides this type of questions, both turn-allocation and turn-talking contribute to opportunities to participate in the interaction (Van
Lier, L, 1996). This means that questions are important to involve and encourage students to participate. Those questions can also be transformed into the information given by teachers in order to provide feedback.

**Feedback Patterns.** Patterns are those consistent and recurring characteristics that help to identify a phenomenon (Bergin, 2006); and although patterns have been used so often; they are not step-by-step recipes (Bergin, Eckstein & Sharp, 2002), because each of these offers a different process for constructing knowledge that later can be used by other teachers-educators in many different ways.

Within the classroom there are interactions patterns which commonly appear allowing teachers-educators to try to establish any communicative channel to figure out the students’ utterances with the purpose that teachers-educator can achieve; not only constructing knowledge in their students but also building confidence as competent language users (Luk & Lin, 2007). Through them, as researchers, we can seek for those recurring characteristics from ELTEs’ interaction in the classroom especially when they are providing feedback to the students.

Feedback patterns refer to the language which proposes some successful techniques to assist with teaching and learning (Bergin, Eckstein & Sharp, 2002). Thus, feedback patterns provide a method for capturing and communicating knowledge and through them, teacher-educators construct different ways to learn and teach.

English language teacher educators can build the concept of feedback through patterns, which let them, offer a way to pass on their experiences, as well. Through those feedback patterns developed within the classroom, teachers-educators try to ensure themselves that the students understood the topic and the new information or improve subsequent performance, too.

This Conceptual framework connects different scholars’ understandings of feedback as
phenomenon that emerged from the interactions between teacher-educators and students within classroom contexts. Our study adds to previous researches by investigating on what feedback means according to teacher-educators' voice; that is, teacher-educators' conceptions of feedback, including patterns and types of feedback which contribute not only on the quality of itself but also on participating in interaction within the classroom.

**Research Methodology**

This research study follows the principles of a case study. According to Yin (2009), case study is a type of research that provides a unique example of real people, in real situations, in which as researchers, we can observe the effects of one phenomenon in real contexts. The phenomenon (*how teachers-educators do feedback in class and what conceptions underpin that performance*) is not isolated from its context; instead, it is connected to it by allowing the understanding of how its processes are influenced by a context. This type of research has the ability to answer *why* and *how* research questions rather than simply *what* and, therefore, it has the potential to *evaluate* or *explain* (Yin, 2009). Although feedback seems to be a practical tool to provide information or corrections, depending on how teacher-educators conceive it; the context is considered powerful in the causes and effects of the case (Yin, 2009). This is why case study is limited to “a particular representation given in context and understood in that context” (Thomas, 2011, p. 31).

According to this, case study is appropriate to our study because it places a focus on “the complex interaction of many factors in few cases” rather than on “few variables in a large number of cases” (Thomas, 2012, p.4). It is related to the three objectives of this current research study: (i) To establish what are the teachers-educators’ conceptions about feedback, (ii) to identify what feedback interaction patterns appear during the teachers-educators interaction with
the students within the classroom and (iii) to analyze the manner in which teachers-educators’ conceptions of feedback are consistent with their respective performance in classroom. Besides, this type of research allows us to go deeper into the experiences and the real context of ELTE in which we can identify the feedback patterns and those specific features used in second language classes. All the data collected came from real academic context, this makes the research strong in reality (see figure 1). Moreover, this type of research focuses on the individual actors (Teachers of L2) and seeks to understand their perception of events, which in this case is feedback (Hitchcock and Hughes, 1995). This type of research allows us to use narratives to collect information, by means of this, we can abstract easily the experiences and knowledge from teachers during the conversational interactions.

Yin (2009) proposes five steps to do a case study:

*Figure 1:*

**Case Study Process**

This graphic describes the case study method into five steps for organizing and conducting the research: (1) defining the case in terms of establishing the focus of the study by forming questions about the phenomenon to be studied and determining a purpose for the study,
(2) identifying the type of research which must be connected with approaches (theoretical framework) in order to be used in increasing the validity of the study; (3) designing instruments to collect data which will let the researchers create, formulate and organize all the factors and tools that are going to be part of the study; (4) identifying the strategies to collect the data, considering the instruments that will be used according to the objectives and the main of the study, thus the researcher must use the designated data gathering tools systematically and properly in collecting the evidence; and (5) analyzing and interpreting the results in a qualitative way, which refers to the analysis techniques which provide the research the opportunity to triangle data in order to strengthen the research findings and conclusions.

**Population and context.** The study was conducted at La Salle University – Chapinero Campus, Bogotá, within the program of B.A. Spanish, English and French with four English Language Teachers Educators (ELTEs) in the subjects of *Lengua y Comunicación Inglesa II, Interacción y Sociedad Anglófona I, Interacción y Sociedad Anglófona II, and Fonética y Fonología Inglesa*, which are part of the classes of third and fourth semester. We chose the subjects mentioned because we thought important to develop our research in the same context in which we as students had the experience of receiving a constant feedback from our teacher-educators. On the other hand, it was quite difficult to find teachers who wanted to be observed; however, after doing many invitations, we received a response from 4 teacher-educators, who, coincidentally, were teaching classes in the subjects in which we were interested in.

**Data collection instruments and research process.** In our research process, we collected data from two sources: conversational interaction interviews and non-participant observation. Each observation and conversational interaction was audio-recorded and note-down taken.
Conversational interaction interviews. According to Geis (1995), conversational interaction interviews are an orderly activity and a reciprocal undertaking in which participants jointly contribute to meaning understanding. This different way of doing an interview as a natural conversation must be connected with the significance of an utterance occurring in a given interaction. Instead of asking a set of pre-established questions, expecting an answer, this instrument is the face-to-face opportunity guided by emerging questions connected to a topic to obtain more in-depth information.

In our research, we established four initial conversational interactions with four different English language teacher-educators, belonging to the English Language Area, of the BA in Spanish, English, and French, La Salle University. In the conversational interactions, we could share knowledge and experiences about feedback with them. Lisa Michaud (2015) states that conversational interaction co-constructs utterances by asking each other questions, offering suggestions. In our research, we took into account general questions about our interest like “¿Para usted qué es el feedback?, ¿Cómo hace el feedback en sus clases?, ¿Tiene usted una estructura establecida de cómo hacer el feedback a sus estudiantes?

Our third objective looks for analyzing the manner in which teacher-educators’ conceptions of feedback are consistent with their respective performance in the classroom. This one demands a second conversational interaction. But in this opportunity, we ask the participant teacher-educators about the emerging feedback interaction patterns observed in their classes and their consistency with the answers in the first interview. Some examples of the questions used in this opportunity are: “¿Cómo sabes que el feedback ha sido constructivo para tus estudiantes?, ¿Por qué crees que el feedback ha sido aplicado a tiempo?” By means of this, we complement the teacher-educators’ conceptions about feedback.
Non-participant Observation. We used this kind of instrument to check for nonverbal expression of feelings, determine the interaction between teacher-educators and students, and check for how much time is spent in various activities (Schmuk, 1997). Observations can often reveal characteristics of groups or individuals that would have been impossible to discover by other means (Bell, 2005). Due to our second objective is to identify what feedback interaction patterns appear during the teacher-educators’ interaction with the students within the classroom, four observations to the four English language teacher-educators participants were made. The purpose of observing them was to identify common patterns while feedback provision. All the observations were direct and non-participant; we were not part of the group observed; we observed the natural interactions that emerged from the different sessions. The whole process that we have to do to collect the data within our research is represented in the following figure:

**Figure 2.**

Data collection process
TE CONCEPTIONS OF FEEDBACK IN ELTE CLASSES

This graphic describes how data was collected. The first step was to do conversational interaction to the four participant teacher-educators in order to know the way in which feedback was understood (their conceptions). The second step was to observe each teacher-educator (audio or video recorded) in order to identify what feedback interaction patterns appeared during the teachers-educators’ classroom interaction with the students. Finally, we did a second conversational interaction in order to clarify emerging conceptions about feedback and the way it was provided. The types of observation and conversational interaction used are described in the graph.

Data Analysis Methodology. In our research process, we analyzed data following two methodologies: Narrative Analysis and Ethnomethodological Conversation Analysis (ECA).

Narrative Analysis. It is the study of experience understood narratively (Clandinin & Huber, 2006). In other words, it is the manner of studying and analyzing someone’s experience that creates knowledge, a way how experience can be studied and thought. Narrative analysis studies individuals’ experiences, through the analysis of them, the voice of the participants in a particular place, time and space. According to Kohler (2000), narrative analysis allows for the systematic study of personal experience and meaning. It enables to study the “active, self-shaping quality of human thought, the power of stories to create and refashion personal identity” (p. 24).

The Narrative analysis methodology is explained by the following these three steps:

Figure 3:

Narrative Analysis Methodology
The first step is identifying teachers-educators feedback experiences which became feedback knowledge gathered by means of conversational interaction. Those experience and knowledge are shaped by three main aspects: the specific moment when feedback emerged (time-at the beginning or the end of some activity), the participants involved in the interaction (people-ELTE/SLL/University) and the different activities proposed and developed by the agents who are part of this experiences (place-exam/presentation/etc.). The second step was to figure out the differences and similarities within teacher-educators’ voices to organize them into common conceptions of feedback in order to understand the significance of the experiences in the context under study.

**Ethnomethodological Conversation Analysis.** It is a methodology for investigating the structure and process of social interaction between humans (Perakyla, 2008). It focuses primarily on talk but integrates also the nonverbal aspects of interaction in its research design. ECA main interest is in social acts; understood as all those utterances, or set of utterances, that serve as a function in communication and that are packaged and delivered in linguistic terms (Seedhouse, 2005). For this study, we used ECA in order to identify communicative functions (feedback
interaction patterns) from the interaction in a specific context (the indicated courses observed).

Seedhouse (2005) (as cited in Lucero, 2015) proposed five stages of data analysis, which are related with this current research process:

**Figure 4:**

*Ethnomethodological Conversation Analysis (ECA) Methodology*

1. **Unmotivated looking for discovering new phenomena in interaction:**
   - Class observations and transcripts to identify interaction patterns.

2. **Inductive search for a collection of instances of the phenomenon:**
   - Establishment of instances when the feedback interaction patterns.

3. **Establishment of regularities and patterns:**
   - Description of feedback interaction patterns.

4. **Detailed analysis of the phenomenon:**
   - Explanation of the emergence of the interaction patterns and their characteristics (when and why).

5. **Generalized account of the phenomenon (matrix of the interactions)**
   - Determining the incidence of the interaction patterns in language, teaching & learning characteristics.

ECA steps for analyzing the data collected through observations are: 1) unmotivated looking for discovering the phenomenon through class observations then transcriptions, 2) inductive search for collecting the instances of the phenomenon, in this study we collected instances where feedback patterns appeared within interaction; 3) establishment of patterns in order to describe those feedback interaction patterns; 4) detailed analysis of the phenomenon doing an explanation considering the *What* and *Why* of the emergence of the feedback interaction patterns; and 5) generalized account of the phenomenon to determine the impact of the interaction patterns characteristics in language teaching and learning.
Finding those similarities and differences, allowed us to do a detailed analysis of those conceptions and how they were put in practice within the classroom, thus to understand how much they are consistent or inconsistent considering the conception of feedback.

Results

The findings in this study point to establish the teacher-educators’ conceptions about feedback, their feedback interaction patterns, and the manner in which their conceptions are consistent with the identified patterns. By following the two approaches of data analysis, ECA and Narrative Analysis, the following results were found:

Table 1: Types of Teacher’s Feedback (No. of educators = 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPTIONS OF FEEDBACK</th>
<th>FEEDBACK INTERACTION PATTERNS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• As information to build knowledge</td>
<td>• Corrective Feedback Patterns such as Repetition and Explicit Correction (grammar or pronunciation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• As activity-depending</td>
<td>• Teacher-Educator’s Instruction or Explaining Giving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• As an error-corrector</td>
<td>• Interaction Pattern of Question-Answer-Question between the Teacher-Educator and the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• As a tool for encouraging students.</td>
<td>• Positive Feedback Discourse without Interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Feedback is the way as teachers-educator feed the learning process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table represents the main conceptions and the feedback patterns that we obtained from the teacher-educator participants from the conversational interactions (for conceptions) and the observations (for the feedback interaction patterns).
**Conceptions of Feedback.** Participant teachers-educators’ conceptions emerged from a range of beliefs and experiences that they have built along their practices. As Lotter (2006) explained, those conceptions can be perceived as beliefs that are difficult to change, because they are based in part, on their practical teaching knowledge that has been learned over years of experiences in the classroom. We discovered many conceptions that the teacher-educators have about feedback. They are conceived from teaching experiences in varied contexts. However, during the conversational interactions, we particularly found five conceptions about: Feedback as information to build knowledge, as activity-depending, as an error corrector; as a tool for encouraging students, and as a way to feed the students’ learning process.

*Feedback as information to build knowledge.* Feedback is a process directed to construct knowledge from information that a speaker gives to a receiver in a certain context. This process involves the receiver to internalize the information and to reflect on it and the presence of a context where the construction of the new knowledge takes place. The information given by the speaker helps the receiver, through feedback, generate learning strategies and take in knowledge which can be applicable in everyday contexts.

In here, we perceive that feedback is not simply ephemeral information that replaces a momentary need without construction; it is to internalize the knowledge and to adapt it for the improvement of the performance of the receiver. The following chart exemplifies this conception of feedback:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence 1: Teacher-Educator No. 2</th>
<th>Evidence 2: (Teacher-Educator No. 3)</th>
<th>Evidence 3: (Teacher-Educator No. 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The participants explain that feedback is not just a concept or a process that is given in one way; it means that feedback is not a limited process. Feedback is conceived as the construction of knowledge in which you can interact giving or/and receiving information that could be useful for students and teachers-educators through their learning performance. It happens in a specific context; it is not referring to a place but the interaction context. Feedback is not the grade, it is all those comments that teacher-educators give in order to help students improve, think, reflect, correct and construct new knowledge to progress in the English learning process.

As Activity-depending. Teachers-educators have different conceptions about what feedback is and they put all these conceptions into practice in their daily teaching. In this particular conception, the participant teachers-educators relate feedback with classroom activities, it means that they agree that feedback only appears after doing a classroom activity.

For teachers-educators, classroom activities are the main context because, based on the students’ performance in the activities, teacher-educators can know what they will tell the students, in what way they will do the feedback and why. In fact, the teacher-educators imply to some extent that doing feedback requires a classroom activity. The following conceptions
demonstrate it:

**Table 3: Feedback as Activity-Depending**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence 1: Teacher-Educator No. 1</th>
<th>Evidence 2: Teacher-Educator No. 2</th>
<th>Evidence 3: (Teacher-Educator No. 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Yo creo que en todo ejercicio, sesión ehhh, en toda actividad, en todo aspecto metodológico tiene que haber feedback”.</td>
<td>“Es una información que se le da al estudiante con respecto a alguna actividad que haya realizado”</td>
<td>“Debe haber una actividad primero, para que yo pueda realizar el feedback, sino no hay feedback”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Pues para mí el feedback emm es simplemente retroalimentar al estudiante sobre alguna actividad ¿no?, lo que la misma palabra indica: es retroalimentar, es dar una retroalimentación al estudiante”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three out of the four participant teacher-educators coincide that feedback is dependent on a classroom activity, which has been planned to explore the students’ competence. When the activity is over, the teacher-educators do feedback on students’ general performance. This feedback doing aims at making the students improve in the aspects highlighted during feedback.

*As an error-corrector.* The teacher-educators also conceive feedback as a form to correct the students’ errors when using the L2. In this case, feedback becomes a word, a sound or a grammatical structure to correct any incorrect use of language. This conception is a form to immediately correct the students’ verbal responses or written work. It is based on linguistic issues during the development of a classroom activity. This way to conceive feedback is explained by the teacher-educators as a piece of advice to improve the students’ performance during the activity. The following extracts are evidence of the conception of feedback as an error-corrector:
Table 4: Feedback as Error - Corrector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence 1: Teacher-Educator No. 2</th>
<th>Evidence 2: Teacher-Educator No. 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “Lo hago cuando veo que las cosas no van por buen camino, entonces para que hagan los correctivos del caso” | “Cuando el profesor ve que el estudiante tiene algo por mejorar, con respecto a una tarea que ha realizado, el profesor brinda la asesoría para que esa tarea sea mejorada. Ese es el feedback para mí”.  
“El estudiante tiene que haber hecho algo, para que el profesor note si lo que hizo ehh, digamos que tiene o es una tarea completa o si necesita ser reevaluada para mejorarla”.

The data reveals similarities about the conception of feedback as an error-corrector. According to this evidence, the teacher-educators become observers with the experience and knowledge to correct what the students have just produced by looking for what is right or wrong in the students’ responses; so to indicate how to improve or change it, or simply to correct it in line with the established conventions of the classroom activity.

**As a tool for encouraging students.** For the participant teacher-educators, feedback is as well a powerful tool that helps them keep their students motivated to achieve the classroom activities goals. The teacher-educators agree with feedback as a tool for gaining valuable information that allows them to improve their students’ learning process. Therefore, when the teachers-educators provide feedback to their students, they expect the students feel motivated with the comments and the activities. However, in some cases, the teacher-educators perceive their students feeling unmotivated with their feedback. For one of the teacher-educators, it depends mostly on each students’ personality and the manner in which they receive the feedback. Another teacher-educator thinks that all depends on the class atmosphere. Both, the use of words and the creation of a suitable environment, reinforce the conception of feedback as a tool for
encouraging the students. The following extracts are evidence of the conception of feedback as a tool for encouraging students:

**Table 5: Feedback as a tool for encouraging students.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence 1: Teacher-Educator No. 1</th>
<th>Evidence 2: Teacher-Educator No. 3</th>
<th>Evidence 3: Teacher-Educator No. 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Un buen ambiente de retroalimentación, ya que a veces no se construye sino que se destruye, tanto el docente como el estudiante ehh ojalá no pase mucho pero sí ha habido casos en los que el feedback se vuelve destrucción”</td>
<td>“La motivación definitivamente es intrínseca ehh uno puede ayudar a motivar al estudiante pero si el estudiante no quiere después que no ha hablado y ha mediado pues considero que ya, sobretodos con estudiantes adultos, tienen que ehh cumplir con la responsabilidad de entenderlo”</td>
<td>“La idea del feedback no es ahm... darle la respuesta al estudiante, esa no es la idea. La ideal del feedback es hacerlo pensar”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the previous excerpts from the interviews, the teacher-educators seem to maintain a conception about feedback and its impact in the classroom. Although, during the talks they commented that feedback can be demotivating for some students “Feedback not as a builder, but as a destroyer”, during the observations, the teacher-educators do not seem to be too concerned about the students’ motivation. In our observations, we confirmed that, in effect, the students take seriously all the comments their teachers make regarding their performance in
Feedback as the way teacher-educators feed the learning process. To the participant teacher-educators, feedback becomes also as a way through which they can guide and feed the students’ learning process. It means that feedback is conceived as a timely constructive process, whose provision must be clear and punctual (referring to “on time”), letting the students modify, reflect or improve their knowledge. This conception denotes to a way in which the teacher-educators are immersed in the students’ learning process, considering strengths and weaknesses, and trying to understand and guide the students. The following extracts are evidence of the mentioned conception:

Table 6: Feedback as the way as teachers-educator feed the learning process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence 1: Teacher-Educator No. 1</th>
<th>Evidence 3: (Teacher-Educator No. 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Algunas de las literaturas que hablan del tema que los estudiantes recuerdan más fácilmente cuando el feedback se hace en el momento”.</td>
<td>“El feedback debe ser puntual...debe ser constructivo. Es decir que la persona pueda entender y comprender por qué se hace el feedback, para qué se hace el feedback y cómo puede tomar el feedback para mejorar lo que está haciendo y... no sé, puntual me refiero a claro y constructivo, me refiero a eso... y debe ser digamos a tiempo(...) cuando uno recibe una actividad de pronto y hace un feedback mucho tiempo después a veces no sé... no es... valioso o pertinente”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This conception of feedback, as part of the students’ learning process, happens not only to focus on correction but also reflection. The participant teacher-educators explain that when they provide feedback to the students, they may clarify doubts about the task done, how it was done and why it was done in that way. It then seems to be part of a constructive process, guided by
comments to encourage students to identify their failures and improve. It is not about giving an exact answer only, but to generate in the students, at the indicated moment, an interest to improve on what has been done.

**Feedback interaction patterns.** In this research study, after making the observations to the four teacher-educators, we analyze the occurring interactions in order to identify the feedback interaction patterns. Four patterns were found: corrective feedback patterns such as repetition and explicit correction (grammar or pronunciation), teacher-educators’ instruction or explaining giving, interaction pattern of question-answer-question between the teacher-educator and the students and positive feedback discourse without interaction.

**Corrective feedback patterns such as repetition and explicit correction (grammar or pronunciation).** Corrective feedback takes the form of a response to a student’s utterance containing a linguistic error. Error refers to the result of lack of knowledge that affects some elements in a sentence (Ellis, 2009). We found in this pattern that the teachers-educators focused on providing the students with a response about what was said in terms of grammatical structure or pronunciation. Through the repetition of the error, the teacher-educators seek to repair the utterance that contains the error. In this way, the student can listen to the correct way to pronounce the sound or the specifically form to write in the L2. We considered relevant to highlight that one of the teacher-educators did not focus on correcting the meaning or the intention in the students’ utterance; his purpose was avoiding the errors that affect overall sentence organization.

The extracts in Table 7 and 8 below are transcribed examples of Corrective Feedback obtained from the observations (S= student TE: teacher –educator):

**Table 7: Interaction patterns within Corrective feedback**
Corrective feedback in terms of repetition and explicit correction was found with a focus on form and pronunciation. This pattern reveals how feedback works in the observed classes: a) it clearly indicates the error when the student’s utterance was incorrect, so the teacher-educator
provides the correct form (explicit correction) and b) signaling an error by repeating the erroneous utterance (repetition).

In those exchanges, the teacher-educator repeats the exact structure of the response given by the student in order to correct what was said. In one example the teacher-educator asks the students to repeat the exact pronunciation of the sentence; through this, the students are receiving an explicit form to say the idea in the L2. In the other example, the structure involved the teacher-educator repeating student’s responses, followed by prompts about how the word must be pronounced. The teacher-educator adjusts intonation to guide student's attention to the error.

**Teacher-educator’s instruction or explaining giving.** One pattern found when the teacher-educators provided feedback was the consistent instructions about the activity or task to work on. The teacher-educators have the main role within the interaction with students. There is not a space in which the students can interact. The teacher-educator is in charge of asking the questions about the activity and answering them by himself.

On the other hand, we observed that, when teacher-educators are asking about something that is not clear enough for the students, they try to guide them within the topic, giving them the response. Although we detected patterns that seem not to be well received by the students, the teacher-educators made their best for the students to understand the lesson contents. In some cases, the students did not respond as they expected. Due to this, the teacher-educators need to change their discourse and the interaction with them. The following extracts in table 9 and 10, are examples of this pattern:

**Table 9: Instruction or Explaining Giving as feedback**

*Example 1: (Teacher-Educator No. 1).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERACTION</th>
<th>FEEDBACK PATTERN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 TE: So, Diego how about “read”?</td>
<td>Request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10: Instruction or Explaining Giving as feedback

*Example 2: (Teacher-Educator No. 4)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERACTION</th>
<th>FEEDBACK PATTERN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 TE: you have improved in a certain way in here, right?</td>
<td>Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 S: (no answer)</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 TE: Did you understand?</td>
<td>Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 TE: we are going to find these changes in three different aspects (…) like a paper describing what happens with your pronunciation.</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 TE: Do you understand me?</td>
<td>Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 S: (silence)...Yes (laugh)</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 TE: so, the first one has to do with vowels pronunciation (…)</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The examples above describe how teacher-educators developed the class, most of the time by providing instructions for an activity, an evaluation or a final project. Being a moment of only instructions and giving processes to develop the exercise, the students remained silent, attentive to what the teacher-educator said. Through this pattern of feedback, teacher-educators make sure students understand what they should do without having a margin of error. The interaction between teacher-educators and students is minimum; due to teacher-educators have an active role in which they explain the topics and activity while students passively receive the instruction to develop the task.

*Interaction pattern of question-answer-question between the teacher-educator and the*
students. This pattern happens during the explanation of a topic, before an activity (reading, writing, watching a video, etc.). The teacher-educators use the topic of the explanation to establish interaction with the students through related questions, although the students have a little time in order to answer the question.

The dynamic happens in this way: the teacher-educator asks the question, the students take a short time to think the answer, and then, a student starts to talk. The teacher-educator does not intervene during the student’s answer but after the student has finished talking, the teacher-educator asks another question based on the answer given.

This pattern is dynamic because it is not rigid, it means that it starts with a question but it does not have a determined turn to finish. The ending of this pattern depends on the interaction that each participant wants to establish.

This type or pattern is shown in the Table 11 and 12 with examples taken from the observations:

Table 11: Interaction Pattern of Question-Answer-Question to provide feedback

Example 1: (Teacher-Educator No. 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERACTION</th>
<th>FEEDBACK PATTERN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 TE: According to the video, people normally could have different sense when they are in contact with other culture, but normally at the beginning everything is ok, but when they are a long time, people begin to miss their country.</td>
<td>Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 S: (raising the hand)</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 TE: Yes (giving time to express the idea)</td>
<td>Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 S: For example, when I arrived to USA, first weeks I feel a little strange but everything was new for me and was awesome, but then there were some moments went I felt so alone and I wanted</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to be with my family, I missed the food, I missed my country
05 TE: Yes, exactly, it is a good example, when you travel abroad you know new things for example me, when I went to Sweden… some weeks later I started to feel so strange … it’s really hard, what do you think?
06 S: Yes, teacher sometimes is so hard.  
07 TE: Yes!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12: Interaction Pattern of Question-Answer-Question to provide feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERACTION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 TE: November the 18th is the last class and we are going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to have an oral evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 02 S: oral?  
03 TE: yes oral. You have to speak. So in order to have | Request                                    |
| this oral evaluation, you are going to submit the project | Request through instruction                |
| in here (...)  
04 S: The oral evaluation is about what?  
05 TE: what do you think Sabrina?  
06 S: well. I know!  
07 TE: give me ideas, give me ideas  
08 S: it’s about the project or should we talk about the | Request                                    |
| general of the..?  
09 TE: What do you think I want to see?  
10 S: I don’t know teacher (laugh)                             | Request                                    |
| TE: yes, about the project.                                  | Confirming information                     |

In the first example, we can observe the interaction established between the teacher-educators and the students. The teacher-educator used a video to ask questions related to the video and making connections with the real life. These questions allowed both parties to share their ideas and opinions through turning talks, letting each one of the participants add more information to strengthen the opinions. In the second example, we can observe how both interact when the teacher-educator speared a question. In this example, the intervention is mediated by
many questions from the teacher-educator and students. In both cases, the interactions last to have an end.

*Positive feedback discourse without interaction.* It appears finishing one classroom activity of writing, reading, listening or speaking. This pattern corresponds to positive words, comments or indications that the teacher-educators give about students’ performance in the activity. There is no interaction between the teacher-educator and the students because the former provides feedback in order to close the presentation, asking the other students to present their task. The students do not participate in this discourse interaction.

The teachers-educators conceive that the feedback is all those comments that they give to the students in order to improve their performance. This type of feedback has to be clear and punctual as soon as the students present something in writing, reading, listening or speaking activities. In the Table 13 and 14, we give examples of an oral presentation of a BA program which describe this pattern:

**Table 13: Positive feedback without interaction**

*Example 1: (Teacher-Educator No. 2).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERACTION</th>
<th>FEEDBACK PATTERN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 SS: Some students finish their presentations</td>
<td>Positive feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 TE: Good, thanks, good job! For the following groups, remember that you have control the time, it is important, also you have to take into account Introduction of the topic, explanation of the topic, the activity and the conclusion, Please! Don’t forget the conclusions.</td>
<td>Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 TE: The next.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Example 2: (Teacher-Educator No. 3).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERACTION</th>
<th>FEEDBACK PATTERN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both examples, students do oral presentations in English by groups about different topics. In the first example, the students finish the performance and the teacher-educator closes their intervention giving general comments (the feedback) and advice to the following intervention, so that they would avoid making the same mistakes. With these suggestions, the teacher-educator continues with the presentations. In the second example, we can notice also that the teacher-educator closes the presentation with positive comments in order to give place to the next group. Here, no interaction occurs, only the teacher-educator’s comments.

Discussion: What the teacher educators say about how feedback agrees with what they do in class?

After analyzing all the results, and without judging the teacher-educators who participated in this study, we say that they partially do in class what they say about feedback in the conversational interactions. By contrasting their ideas with their interactional practices, we found that the conception of feedback as activity depending and error corrector is congruent with what they do in class. While, the conceptions of feedback as information to build knowledge, as a tool for students’ encouragement, as the way to feed the students’ learning process are not consistent with their interactional practices in class. We construct the following discussion under this contrast.

We want to start the debate on the feedback interaction patterns. According to the
observations and the interviews that we did throughout this research, we identified four feedback interaction patterns: 1) corrective feedback patterns of repetition and explicit correction on grammar or pronunciation; 2) teacher-educator’s instruction or explaining giving; 3) question-answer-question sequence between the teacher-educator and the students; and 4) positive feedback discourse without interaction. These four feedback interaction patterns emerge mostly because of teacher-educators’ experiences in order to help the students overcome their difficulties. Teacher-educators usually identify the moment and the space where it is necessary to provide feedback so as to guarantee the students at-the-moment responses in terms of language accuracy, pronunciation, and activity performance or interaction flow.

The four feedback interaction patterns converge when the teacher-educators give immediate information related to students’ performance during class activities. This information could be, as Ellis (2009) says, positive or negative. The positive feedback sustains that students’ response to an activity is correct and the negative feedback appears when the students’ utterances have errors, here the corrective feedback emerges.

In our collected data, we prove that teacher-educators provide feedback in agreement with students’ language needs within the classroom and do it from their conceptions and experiences about feedback provision, which is part of their pedagogical knowledge. According to De Tezanos (2007) who affirms that teacher-educators construct pedagogical knowledge from a systematic and rigorous reflection on their practices and is in the permanent research work, where it opens the way to the critical revision of old ideas. In addition, Goodyear (1991) states that language teachers operate with an explicit representation of the knowledge that is required for a successful performance. Teacher-educators seem to imply that when they provide feedback they do it in order to help students develop language accuracy, perform the ongoing activity,
improve pronunciation or keep the flow of the interaction. It means that teacher-educators give feedback by thinking about the coming performance and by seeking to ensure that students improve in the mentioned aspects.

Through time and with the teaching practice, teacher-educators have acquired a pedagogical knowledge due to their experiences in their teaching practice. They have adopted a way of providing feedback according to the students’ needs, that is to say, if the teacher-educators identify that the student's errors in language make difficult the second language learning process, they must intervene in a corrective way. Although the intention of teacher-educators is to build knowledge in the students and help them to improve their language accuracy, the feedback that they always give aims to eradicate the error and ensure that the student will not make the same mistake again in the next presentation. In the interviews, we noticed that teacher-educators see feedback as a tool to build knowledge and to encourage students in their English learning process. Nevertheless, the observations show that, although the feedback interaction patterns aim to correct students’ use of English errors, the teacher-educators want to encourage students to improve their English learning process, but teacher-educators correct students’ use of English errors unconsciously (e.g. see table 8 above).

We agree with Winnie and Butler (1995), who say that feedback, is not only information; however, in the identified feedback interaction patterns described in this article, teacher-educators, unfortunately, limit the interaction patterns to corrective feedback. This has a powerful effect in students because this type of feedback does not give relevant information that makes students’ performance improve because, in consonant with Ellis (2009) who says the corrective feedback occurs when the students’ expressions have errors, this feedback is no longer significant and students may repeat the same mistakes in further class activities.
Analyzing the data, we identify that feedback interaction patterns in the teacher-educators’ performance occur because of the teacher-educators’ experiences. They have probably developed, unconsciously, different ways to provide feedback and they have consequently internalized them according to their pedagogical knowledge, which has been acquired during their teaching English practices. The teacher-educators, spontaneously, use the patterns when they think that students need to receive comments related to the class activities developed; and when they see that an error is so repetitive. This is why they think that they have to intervene immediately. A question remains: are teacher-educators aware of the feedback interaction patterns that they use within the classroom? From the results presented in this article, we venture to say that teacher-educators have conceptions about feedback but what they do at the moment of providing it is inconsistent with what they say they do at those moments.

Feedback has been understood in different manners and its applications correspond to how teacher-educators interpret it. To Hattie and Timperley (2007), feedback is conceptualized as the information provided by an agent (p.81), in this case, by a teacher-educator, regarding aspects of students’ performance or understanding. Feedback is then a consequence of performance (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). However, as our results show, we cannot fall in the trap of seen feedback only as a consequence of performance, because it is also procedural. With this, we mean that feedback is a set of interactional practices that occur in patterns, during the development of classroom activities, and permeated by different factors. These factors could be the moment of giving or receiving information that may well be useful through students and teacher-educators’ performance. Another factor is the dependence of feedback from planned classroom activities to explore the students’ competence. Feedback then works as a tool for students’ encouragement to accomplish the goals of the classroom activity as it contributes to the
form of correcting students’ errors. Thereupon, feedback is a piece of advice to improve students’ performance any time during the activity that they are developing; it can happen at any point of the process and not only in the end.

In addition, Lotter (2006) argues that conceptions can be perceived as beliefs which are based in part on teacher-educators' experiences in the classroom and practical teaching knowledge. We can expand this argument because the conception of feedback that the teacher-educators have constructed with their experience is actually applied in the classroom and affected by context. This context is the activity where teacher-educator and students are involved. Those conceptions are what produce the way in which teacher-educators construct and provide feedback. In the conversational interactions for this research, the teacher-educators reported a belief that feedback must contribute to the construction of knowledge and the promotion of reflection on students’ own learning process. However, in the observations, we detected that although this belief, in the classroom, they do not provide feedback by following it, but by the occurring circumstances of students’ error during the class activities. Therefore, their belief of feedback as a tool to build knowledge is eclipsed by the emergent happenstance of the activity.

It is only in this specific moment of the class activities in which the teacher-educators do not put into practice their disciplinary knowledge (what feedback is) but they are apparently driven by the students’ errors and the way they should be corrected through established feedback interaction patterns and the purposes of the activity and communication issues. All of this means that feedback is context-situated, process-oriented and disciplinary-content-acknowledged. In other words, feedback is not to demonstrate what the teacher-educators know about it but what they do while they are providing it. As our results show what teacher educators do is correcting
students' utterance and providing them with a series of instructions and explanations about how the activities should be developed in the classroom (e.g. see tables 7 to 12).

The results of the observations of this study demonstrate that feedback mostly happened in the classroom because teacher-educators seemed to look for it. They promoted it and not necessarily because the students asked for it, but teacher-educators incorporated it as part of their interactional practices.

Conclusion

In order to give an account of the research objectives proposed for this study, findings demonstrate that there are five common conceptions of feedback among the participant teacher-educators. In consonance, they point to conceptions in which feedback is mainly given for contributing to the construction of knowledge and generating reflection on students’ learning process. In classes, these conceptions present four different feedback interaction patterns which are mainly focused on correcting students’ utterance and providing them a series of instruction and explanations about an activity. By this, our study reveals, in most of the cases, inconsistencies in the application of the disciplinary knowledge (what feedback is), due to what teacher-educators did during their performance was modified according to the context, defined as the activity classes, and the contents of a specific subject.

In our study, teacher-educators have different conceptions about feedback, all those conceptions are created based on disciplinary knowledge, and more, they emerge from teacher-educators’ experiences. In the analysis of the data collected, we identified that the pedagogical knowledge acquired is based on know-how, an intangible and proper way of teaching. In addition, the way in which teacher-educators provide the feedback lies in the experience gained in their teaching practice. Because of this, the belief that teacher-educators have about feedback
is not followed within the classroom, due to the occurring circumstances of students’ errors during the class activities. Therefore, their belief of feedback as a tool to build knowledge is overshadowed by the emergent situations of the activity. All of this means that feedback is context-situated, process-oriented and disciplinary-content-acknowledged.

Teacher-educators’ conceptions about feedback, the feedback interaction patterns and the consistence of their conceptions of feedback on their performance in our BA program lead us to the conclusion that teacher-educators are not aware of feedback as process-oriented that is aimed at improving the students’ learning process, but they see it as the intervention they must do as a result of an activity proposed in class and done by students; thus, teacher-educators provide feedback as activity-dependent. Our study serves as a call for teacher-educators who need to re-evaluate if actually what they say, in this case in terms of feedback, is what they do during their performance.

Future research studies should investigate if teacher-educators’ conceptions of feedback displayed in ELTE classes, and its application within the performance, are equal or similar to other BA programs, and why it can happen. Additionally, this kind of study can create new ways of conceiving feedback from the perspective of which model teachers-educators and pre-service teachers want to acquire and reflect in their performance, majorly considering that those interactions could be the beginning of new relations that strengthen students’ learning process.
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