

CLASSROOM FEEDBACK RATIONALES OF PRIMARY TEACHERS: A QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

Dr. Nazish Andleeb¹, Nafia Nisaar^{*2}, Hafsa Khanum³

¹Lecturer, Department of Education, University of Gujrat, Pakistan

^{*2}M.Phil. Education Scholar, University of Gujrat, Pakistan

³Associate lecturer, Department of Education, University of Gujrat, Pakistan

¹nazish.andleeb@uog.edu.pk, ^{*2}25011701-009@uog.edu.pk

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20566575>

Keywords

classroom assessment; feedback rationale; grounded theory; interview study; primary school

Article History

Received: 08 January 2026

Accepted: 20 February 2026

Published: 05 March 2026

Copyright @Author

Corresponding Author: *

Nafia Nisaar

Abstract

The feedback may be regarded as an element of the formative role of assessment as a part of the everyday classroom assessment of the teachers, and as a means of helping the students in the processes of learning. The constructive quality of teacher feedback is the primary topic of much research. Nevertheless, we should also get to know more about the reasons that teachers offer to give feedback to their students especially in primary schools so that we can better understand the nature of teacher feedback. Moreover, in the elementary school context, in particular, we should learn more about the motives of instructors to give feedback to their pupils.

Purpose

This research was aimed at exploring and theorizing the reasons why primary school teachers should give feedback to their students.

Sample:

Thirteen primary school teachers (10 women and 3 men) who had experience of 4-40 years in teaching students aged between 7-9 years-old (grades 1-3) in Sweden participated in the study. In the search of the teachers, open sampling method was applied

Design and techniques: Data were collected with the help of semi-structured interviews. We utilized a constructivist grounded theory design to code and analyze the transcribed data. Consequently, there was a constant comparison and evaluation of different demands by teachers. Some of the requirements were mentioned to be more important than others and this resulted in coming up with some justifications that were more important than others.

Conclusion and discussion: The present qualitative research offers the framework of collecting, understanding, and arguing about teacher feedback. It is grounded on a systematic analysis of primary teacher interview data. The general findings of the study proved that, routine classroom management and classroom assessment procedures were overlapping, which is important to understand classroom management, classroom assessment and the relationship between the two in teacher education.

INTRODUCTION

Feedback in the form of verbal comments, written remarks, gestures, and facial expressions are some of the form of feedback given by primary teachers. Such feedback practices are not arbitrary, as they are influenced by the beliefs, experience, professional knowledge, classroom experiences and the knowledge about the needs of students. There is a tendency that teachers make a fast decision on whether, when and why to give feedback during lessons. Nevertheless, although there is a lot of literature about the impact of feedback on the learning of students, there has been little emphasis on the causes and the logic of teachers when engaging in feedback activities especially in primary classrooms. It is significant to understand the rationales behind the feedback of teachers since such rationales determine the kind of feedback teachers give to students, the time, and the tone of such feedback. The teachers can give feedback on how to correct a mistake as soon as possible, such as others may emphasize working hard or thinking independently. It is also possible that teachers provide feedback depending on the ability, behavior, or emotional response of the students. The study of such decision-making processes can also provide valuable information on the practice in the classroom which is very often not seen, yet most powerful. The qualitative research method will be appropriate to analyze the feedback rationales of teachers because a comprehensive investigation of the views, experiences, and meanings of the teachers can be undertaken. Qualitative studies can be used to understand the complexity of the thinking of teachers as well as the contextual factors, which influence feedback practices in actual classroom settings through interviews, classroom observations and reflective discussions. Hence, the purpose of the study is to investigate rationales of primary teachers in offering classroom feedback. The study aims at developing further insights into feedback as a pedagogical practice by studying the way teachers discuss and rationalize their feedback responses. The results could be used in teacher training, professional growth, and enhancement of feedback techniques that help in efficient learning in the primary classrooms.

Rationale

This qualitative research examines the rationale of classroom feedback by primary teachers through an exploration of their understanding, justification and application of feedback in their normal classroom instruction. The article is founded on the assumption that feedback is a significant component of effective teaching and learning yet the decisions regarding when, how, and why it is to be provided by a teacher are marked by a multiplicity of complex factors such as curriculum requirements, student needs, time limitations, assessment policies, and beliefs about learning. The study does not aim at merely giving a definition of feedback but rather determine the motivators behind the practices of feedback by exploring deeply the perspectives of teachers and experiences in classrooms.

Research objectives

It is apparent that much discourse has already been held on the efficiency of interventions, different areas of focus on feedback, the way to enhance feedback, and the means of conveying feedback. Nevertheless, no research appears to be carried out with a particular focus on the way teachers conceptualize. Consequently, one is likely to find a lack of studies on the rationales of teachers to feedback and leave them to articulate their views and thoughts of what feedback means in their own words

Research questions

The following questions were asked:

What do teachers consider to be the key problems and reasons that inform their way of relaying feedback in the classroom?

What are the relationships between those main issues and justifications?

Literature review

A symbolic interactionist approach (Blumer 1969; Charon 2007) is based on the idea that the views of the instructors on the situation and the sense they derive out of that situation affect their behavior in the social setting. Charon (2007) suggests that there is a world people create, which

is defined by people, and what people create is much more significant to themselves than there may be a world out there (136). Charon (2007) observes that teacher feedback should be understood in the perspective of the instructor.

The most important aspect of how teachers feed back is the way they elucidate the situation and defend what is necessary. Thus, it is important to investigate this to understand more the common scenario of the teacher feedback in the classroom better. When included in the dialogic repertoire of teachers and routines of classroom assessment, feedback can be considered an essential element of formative assessment.

Based on its level of formative role, in turn, feedback may be addressed in terms of effectiveness (e.g. Gamlem and Munthe 2014; Jonsson, Lundahl, and Holmgren 2015; See, Gorard, and Siddiqui 2016). It is evident that the way teachers administer the classroom assessment will affect the learning of the students (Popham 2009) as well as their self-esteem (Gipps 1995). Hargreaves (2011) suggests that once feedback is well understood by the students, this creates trust between the teacher and the student, and when feedback is effectively linked to progress and criteria, teachers consider feedback the most effective.

Studies on the topic of formative assessment feedback have often noted the connection between teacher feedback and learning outcomes and academic achievement (Brookhart 2012; Hattie and Timperley 2007). Several large scale studies have been carried concerning the assessment for learning field in the UK (Black et al. 2003), Scotland (Hayward 2015), and Norway (Hopfenbeck et al. 2013).

It has already been noted that teachers struggled to balance between a formative approach and accountability demands (Hayward 2015), and some educators were sure that to develop their formative practices, they had to change the approach to teaching (Black et al. 2003).

Classroom-based research offers the opportunity to have an in-depth study of numerous areas of teacher feedback. Hargreaves (2014) observes the role played by teacher feedback in supporting children to become autonomous learners and

outlines and defines types of autonomy-promoting feedback.

At other locations, Boistrup (2015) developed feedback discourses, including the one that put the accent on the amount of tasks the student had done or the number of correct answers, a discourse of reasoning takes time that promoted a slower approach and concentrated on the topic matter and processes.

The feedback provided during teacher-student interactions (Ruiz-Primo 2011) and some of the classroom assessment mentioned in the study is non-verbal, implicit and informal in nature (Jordan and Putz 2004). Nonetheless, studies of feedback are not confined to aspects of academic accomplishment. Studies of student behavior and feedback connection can be traced back to at least White (1975).

who found that the teacher approbation was virtually nonexistent in the case of management behavior and most common in the case of instructional behavior. There were later researches examining behavior feedback that often considered praise (e.g. Brophy 1981; Chalk and Bizo 2004), or acceptance and disapproval (e.g. Swinson and Knight 2007). In fact, Torrance and Pryor (1998)

described the daily assessment protocols in teachers, which involve the assessment of academic as well as behavioral performance. Tunstall and Gipps (1996) in their typology defined the feedback that is related to assessment as relating to performance, mastery, and learning orientation along with classroom and also individual management.

The term of feedback has several definitions. We use a loose definition of feedback in the current study, where Hattie and Timperley (2007) refer to it as the term feed back (response on performances), feed up (goal-oriented feedback), and feed forward (feedback about the next step). Feedback has been outlined as interpersonal, which is reporting about performances, academic and behavioural.

sociocultural theory and constructivism. To manipulate behavior, the initial behaviorist perspectives regarded feedback as a prime element of reinforcement whereby correct responses were

reinforced and incorrect responses remedied (Skinner, 1954). Under this perspective, the role of feedback was to strengthen the desired learning outcomes. However, these views have been criticized as not paying enough attention to the intellectual and metacognitive capacity of students and the simplicity of learning.

Constructivist and cognitivist theories shifted the focus of feedback towards information processing and meaning-making. Sadler (1989) defines feedback as the information through which students can compare their current understanding to the learning goals, identify gaps and adjust their course of action to align with the learning goals. Constructivist perspectives hold that feedback should be specific, significant, and in correspondence to the developmental stage of learners as students actively comprehensively decipher it grounded on their experiences and cognizance of the past. This is particularly important during the elementary education where the young learners require feedback that can be comprehended and stimulate development of self-regulation skills.

Sociocultural theory broadens our understanding of feedback when we put it in the context of social interaction and classroom conversation. Under this school of thought, feedback is a two-way process co-created as a result of interaction as opposed to the passing of information between the teacher and the student (Vygotsky, 1978). Consequently, the role of teachers as a source of learning mediators within a social and cultural context has a lot to do with their justification of providing feedback. This perspective makes stress on the usefulness of qualitative research in exploring the reasons and motivations of teachers to use feedback practices.

Based on research literature, feedback may be of evaluative, descriptive, formative, summative, oral, written, and non-verbal. Whereas descriptive feedback provides clear details of performance and feedback of improvement, evaluative feedback is mostly judgmental such as praises or grades or scores (Hattie and Timperley, 2007). Elementary school teachers often equalize these types based on age, subject matter and classroom norms.

Feedback has numerous applications other than correction of mistakes. Feedback may motivate the students, increase self-esteem, guide learning strategies, and enable self-assessment. Formative feedback is an important aspect of assessment learning,

Teachers often demonstrate a commitment to helping people learn processes instead of focusing exclusively on their results in their reasons behind the use of formative feedback.

It has been found that teachers could possess mixed or ambivalent reasons behind giving criticism. The feedback can, say, be intended to encourage the students and may thereby emphasize conformity or performance relative to others (Shute, 2008).

It has been found that the motives of teachers in offering criticism can conflict or be contradictory. One example of this is that the feedback may be intended to motivate the students but in reality it may just be compliance or performance based (Shute, 2008).

Teachers have a very strong impact on feedback and other processes in the classroom. The beliefs on learning, intellect, abilities of students, and the status of the teacher influence decisions on the type of feedback to provide and the methods of delivering it. Research studies indicate that teachers have higher chances of using formative and descriptive feedback when they interpret learning as a process-based and development experience (Timperley, 2011).

The awareness of child development by the teachers also shapes their arguments as they give them in the elementary school. Young learners need immediate, specific feedback that is emotionally supportive. Teachers often take the emotional needs and motivation of children as an excuse in order to make simplistic or praise-oriented remarks. As much as praise may be beneficial, excessive praise or unspecified praise may negatively affect learning because it does not involve providing feedback on how improvement may be done (Hattie and Timperley, 2007).

Although they might subscribe to the idea of respecting formative feedback in theory, educators might be under pressure to ensure that they finish

the given tasks and give correct answers rather than learn properly (Harlen, 2007).

Compared to the one-way flow of information, recent studies put more emphasis on feedback as a dialogic process. Dialogic feedback includes interaction, questioning and the opportunity of students to respond and act upon feedback (Carless, 2019). It is an approach that will enhance metacognitive and self-regulatory skills in elementary schools and aligns with child-centered pedagogy.

Methodology;

The qualitative analysis of the teachers justification in offering feedback to their students was carried out through grounded theory analysis and interviews. Qualitative research methodology attempts to comprehend the world of the participant by placing the researcher with all his or her values and assumptions in the world.

The ethics and criteria identified by the Swedish Research Council (2017) have been followed. All the participants provided their informed consent. Also, the students were informed that they could quit the study at any time. To preserve the privacy of the participants, it has been ensured that all participants such as those quoted in interviews, schools, and places have been assigned pseudonyms in transcriptions, field notes, and publications.

The principles and principles of ethical guidelines and standards that were established by the Swedish Research Council (2017) have been adhered to strictly. Each of the study participants was informed and gave their consent.

It was also communicated to students that they could come out of the study anytime they wanted. In order to preserve anonymity of all participants, fictitious identities were assigned to all participants, including mentioned in interviews, schools and locations, in transcription, field notes, and publications.

Participants

The teachers that were included in the study were thirteen (10 women and 3 men) with a four to forty years experience in teaching in Swedish primary schools with children aged one to three years of age.

The teachers were recruited using open sampling because this technique aims at maximizing differences in experiences and descriptions, where the subjects involved belong to different milieus and backgrounds (Hall). True to this quote, we aimed at defining and categorizing such phenomena among people who belong to a diverse range of settings.

The participating teachers taught in eight towns and eleven schools. Others worked in larger inner city schools and others in smaller rural schools, schools in low-income and mixed-socioeconomic areas, schools having mixed-ethnic student bodies, and schools having almost exclusively non-ethnic minority children. Consequently, the outcomes were informed by a diverse student population, in regard to socioeconomic status, ethnicity, and geography.

Data collection

The former author undertook interviews. The interview questions were designed based on the field notes, classroom observation, and audio recordings of 4 classrooms of the instructors that were reported in a previous study). At first, two out of four educators of the school, and researchers g were interviewed in pairs, whereas the remaining two were interviewed individually. The professors were interviewed again in three instances because new questions were raised during the analysis.

These interviews were supplemented by interviewing nine additional teachers. The interviews were conducted in Swedish. Semi-structured interviews were conducted on 15 participants where the mean time was fifty five minutes. To investigate the developed codes and categories, coding and analysis were carried out parallel to the collection of the data, which resulted into the new interview questions and re-interviews (this recursive process is called a theoretical sampling in grounded theory;

The teachers were also questioned during the interviews on the situations under which they believed that they gave feedback to students and how they defined their feedback based on goal, focus, tactics, and priorities and what they thought influenced their feedback. The interviewer adopted a nonjudgmental position and asked

probing and follow-up questions including the ones like, How come? "What do you mean?" and "Tell me more".

The interviews of the first four teachers had some of the questions, which were contextualized and related to the classroom remarks. All the interviews were tape recorded and transcribed word-to-word. The findings are translated into English to allow the writers to reveal the quotes of the recorded data.

Data Analysis

When using grounded theory, we tried to adopt an open mind as compared to an empty head to the data when analysing the data and this meant that we could not be too close to what we already knew during the analysis. In so doing we succeeded in generating codes that were generated out of data as well as being realized in terms that were true to data.

Consequently, most comparisons were drawn among codes and categories and even within the data of the interview.

The use of symbolic interactionism as an open-ended theoretical view along with curiosity and openness was used in compliance with a constructivist grounded theory approach. Consequently, the situational term was opined in the light of how the participants perceive a circumstance that influences their behavior; main concern is the major concerns of the participants when it comes to feedback.

After six interviews, we came up with a set of focused codes that were then further explained by the three interviews that followed and strengthened and justified by the last six interviews, ensuring that we saturated and were reliable. The different categories of feedback rationales were present in the description of all the participating teachers, but they varied slightly in frequencies. Of course, it should be noted that the schools in which the teachers got to work might have influenced the rate at which some of the feedback rationales are used. Nevertheless, it was not the primary point of this study; we wanted to characterize the common explanations of the feedback by the teachers.

Findings

Based on the analysis of the data, we concluded that the ways of teachers to deliver feedback depended on their ideas of needs. Perceived needs were also described as any needs that were identified by teachers and needed to be addressed in classroom environment by feedback. Thus, it emerged that the realization of perceived requirements in the continuing classroom context was the main point of focus in the practice of feedback by instructors. The language employed in defining the feedback rationales was developed based on the data according to the grounded theory. In this way, they are not the terminology that have already been applied to the research area. To this extent, the findings offer authenticity in the meaning of grounded theory approach in the clear sense of explaining the reasons of participating teachers.

The individualizing rationale is the personalizing the feedback to the individual students and this was when the teachers provided the students with feedback that was designed according to their unique academic needs and the student academic encouragement rationale was founded upon the perception that the students needed positive and encouraging support.

Cited that to meet the needs of every student, the teacher has to be receptive to his or her knowledge and learning processes. The main theme that was noted by teachers in this justification was that every student possesses a different set of information and thus he or she should acquire and develop different kinds of skills.

Just like in the above passage, the rationale of individualizing was based on the individual academic growth of the students. The educators argued that to manage such a feedback, they needed to ensure that they were conversant with their students and the type of feedback that each child reacted to in the most positive manner.

Peer learning by feedback justification modeling. The teacher also used peer learning modeling as a factor to give out feedback by identifying the desirable knowledge and skills of the students. This they attained by focusing on the performance or educational activity of a student or a group of

students as a model to the rest of the students or to one student.

The argument became as obvious when teachers merely stressed the advantages of cooperating with colleagues and discussing their work. According to Alex, it was imperative to move away the focus on me as the teacher who knows best and the teacher concurred and added, It is not as though it [the feedback] has to be all me. This would require you to say things differently, said, explaining the advantages of using peer learning modeling.

Then, they could have learnt faster due to the expression of the peer. It was argued by teachers that students would resort to help of fellow students more often when they saw them as knowers.

The teachers also considered peer learning modeling as an aspect that could provide them with motivation and inspiration. An example that was given is that Techer said that the students seemed to enjoy reading to their peers and said, "Hopefully they got a little inspired by one another to continue working on their texts. Dr ali says that children would be more keen to accomplish a work when they are aware that there is a recipient. Peer learning modeling was consequently believed to be interesting and effective to both the model and the observer.

Task control (4): the rationale behind feedback.

The aim of the teacher to oversee the feedback rationale task was to ensure that the students were doing what was planned as well as listening to what was intended. Task controlling appeared to be common in group discussions as shown in the clip below where the instructor made remarks in an attempt to keep the conversation focused on the topic of discussion:

I think it is because of the way the group operates together when you lose the subject and the group takes a different turn. You are able to adhere to what you wanted to think and make those considerate conversations with some groups.

The management of tasks is also depicted in the passage where the instructor reflects about the various types of groups that need the input in order to ensure that the students are focused on the subject or task and that they do not go out of control in the classroom environment. According

to the teacher reports, steering was extensively employed to achieve feedback, which was a product of task controlling where the teachers gave the students instructions and controlling questions as feedback.

Reason to feedback (5): flowing of classwork.

The problem that was mainly encountered by teachers in the classroom was a number of students simultaneously expressing their need to receive individual feedback on their academic requirements. This was seen by the teachers as a continuous plea of services and this led to justification of falling of classwork. According to the teachers, students can seek help as they are not sure what to do, how to complete a task or just want confirmation. The teachers believed that in the event that these needs were not met, there would be increased possibilities of off-task behavior and work and learning disruption.

Justification of feedback (5): flowing of classwork.

There were often cases in the classroom when several students at once expressed their wish to receive an individual feedback on their academic needs. This was viewed as a constant plea of help by the teachers thus leading to the justification of falling of classwork. The teachers assert that students can request help since they are not certain of what to do, how to achieve something or just to be reassured. The teachers had the feeling that unless such requirements were fulfilled, there would be increased possibilities of off-task behavior and work and learning interruptions.

The rationale of classwork flow required teachers to be time-efficient and this often motivated teachers to use feedback methodologies such as steering where the teacher would take a student through a task by providing a solution to the student or they would correct or verify the work of a student.

The necessity to use a brief-answer feedback mechanism to serve as many pupils as possible in a limited amount of time discouraged teachers taking the more time-consuming and metacognitive supporting of the form of feedback of deliberating. Also, when the teachers in such classroom environments applied intentional feedback by posing a question that would make

the student ponder, there was a possibility that the teacher would not follow up since he or she would have to go and support another student.

They also highlighted the importance of giving time to reason to each student, irrespective of their needs when opportunities arose. What is more, as Toni herself described in the case of math education and learning: I can just feel it is not enough to see [the answer]; you need to hear them out. Reasoning time was also associated with giving a just judgment. Just by looking at these duties, one would not be able to complete them on time. Nevertheless, I am convinced that in order to make a proper evaluation, you also desire to know their way of thinking. Besides, you have to take into account the ways in which the students would come to the solution; you cannot just shuffle numbers.

The relationships among the reasons why the instructors use feedback.

The teacher may have chosen different feedback strategies depending on the relative weight of different demands with respect to each other and, therefore, which justifications the teacher opted to implement. In the ongoing classroom situations, teachers needed to take into account and plan various feedback rationales based on their constant analysis of the existing intellectual, emotional, and behavioral needs. The rationales of feedback were concurrently engaging each other in this process with the three predominant ones emerging to be without-order-no-learning, classwork flowing, and individualizing. The other rationales were adopted by the teachers on the basis of the alignment between the three rationales.

Addressing individual needs of each student at the time The teachers were keen on teaching, supporting and providing feedback according to the individual needs of the students. They mentioned that they were trying to be in a position to cater to the individual needs of students simultaneously. It was not based on the academic and behavioural and emotional needs but on all the needs defined at a certain point in time. However, this was mostly related to the academic needs of students in accordance with the teaching task. The teachers proceeded to do this by working

towards this based on various rationales: the rationales that were applied relied on the needs that were established. There were minimal acute needs found when there was order in the classroom and people appeared to be working.

It was believed that fulfillment of those needs may be quite easy at that time. Where various hands were held up together, the teacher worked with the groups or pairs, with two learners at once, or ran about the pupils, attempting to provide short, specific criticism, in an endeavor to make the students individual.

The evaluation showed that the scholar promoting feedback reasoning, which is driven by the individualizing rationale, was informed and influenced by the academic encouraging rationale. According to the teachers, they believed that even though there were better performing pupils who did not need extra attention, performing poorly pupils did. One of the main aspects of the work of teachers who tried to meet the needs of all students at the same time was individual differences concerning the amount and the number of feedbacks demanded.

It was considered to be quite simple to meet such needs. When multiple hands simultaneously went up, the instructor worked with students in pairs, groups, swapped between two students simultaneously, or dashed between them to give focused feedback within a short time in an effort to individualize the teaching process.

It was also analyzed that the individualizing rationale determined and guided the academic encouraging feedback thinking. The teachers claimed that students who were not doing well required more frequent assistance as compared to those who were doing well. The variation of feedback amount and frequency required by different individuals was of paramount importance to the teachers as they tried to meet the needs of every student at the same time.

The major feedback rationale without-order-no-learning pushed teachers to push towards returning to class work flowing and firefighting as rationales to provide feedback to minimise disorder and off-task behaviour. Consequently, they constituted efforts to maintain interest of students and focus on on-task classroom behavior.

The social learning argument of peer order modeling was also inspired by the without-order-no-learning argument. Moreover, without-order-no-learning rationale appeared to dominate in comparison with individualizing, academic encouragement, and time-for-reasoning feedback rationales, which were destined to satisfy academic needs, in situations where educators found themselves in classroom disarray or otherwise thought there was a high demand to create classroom order conducive to learning (e.g. conceived that order was weak).

A. Likewise, need-for-order reasons and trying to keep all students concentrated on academic activities at the moment were more crucial than reasons related to other needs in the case the three primary feedback rationales used that are without-order-no-learning, classwork falling, and individualizing.

Discussion

This paper examined the conceptualization of why elementary school teachers should give feedback to their students. The basis of our overall approach was the symbolic interactionist paradigm (according to which we cannot understand concepts of an instructor without first establishing his or her perspectives in everyday contexts, such as offering feedback).

We examined the main concerns and reasons that the primary teachers have why they continued to routinely offer classroom based feedback. By examining their reports, we were able to make a set of feedback justifications. These were found to be three feedback rationales; without-order-no-learning, classwork flowing and individualizing, which were the most important. The teachers were mostly concerned with addressing the needs of students regarding the academic, emotional, and behavioral aspects.

The results contribute to the literature as they offer a paradigm that can be further tested to understand the reasons why instructors should provide feedback to learners.

The awareness of teachers regarding the possible impact of feedback on self-esteem was proved by the mentioned feedback. Another way they showed this understanding was their wish to be

receptive to the way students understood and implemented remarks. This transparency was often claimed to be best fulfilled when there was order within the classroom such that justifications such as individualization and time-for-reasoning could be applied there.

So, academic learning, and externalization of behavioral problems in the classroom appeared to mean more to the teachers than internalization of emotional problems in the children. According to the research, positive emotions mean positive academic achievement, whereas negative emotions mean negative academic achievement and internalization problems denote negative academic achievement (their review). This implies that educators should be more sensitive and offer comments to the emotional needs of students other than low self-esteem.

In terms of the main issues and reasons of instructors to provide classroom feedback, we established an overlap between classroom evaluation and classroom management in the present research. We found that in the case of precariousness of classroom order or its existing condition within chaos the without-order-no-learning type of feedback rationale only tended to suppress a multiplicity of other justifications. Order and focused behavior were considered by teachers as the norm and established it as the basic learning precondition in the classroom. It was even thought that putting more emphasis on academic requirements and justifications like time to reason as well as individualization would do justice to the best possible feedback. The classroom management must be regarded as an aspect of and connected with classroom instruction.

As can be observed, the teacher often employed the steering input and gave short and specific responses to maintain the classwork. This time-efficient yet instructionally sparse method was believed to fulfill a lack of time and a high student demand simultaneously and provide a conducive learning classroom environment (or, at least, in-task behavior). This is analogous to the rationale time-for-reasoning, which the teachers described as enabling communication on the processes such as inquiry, reasoning but also as something which

was often impossible. the two evaluation discourses of do it quick and do it right, and reasoning takes time are analogous to this irrationality clash.

Conclusions

We suggest that the implications of the findings to the teaching fraternity and teacher training have been addressed despite the limitations and cautions on generalizability mentioned above. The study is useful to teachers, teacher educators, and literature by offering a systematic conceptualization of reasons given by instructors to offer feedback to students in the classroom. The present work gives a model of evaluating, understanding, and interpreting the teacher feedback. It is founded on a logical analysis of data of qualitative interviews with primary teachers. It utilizes a couple of clear concepts that may come in handy in the professional lingo applied by educators when talking classroom assessment and feedback.

Moreover, our findings also revealed that there are intersections between the routine activities of classroom management and assessment, a fact agreeable to. This has underscored the importance of classroom assessment and classroom management training in the training of teachers. The overlaps and integration between them with regard to the rationales and the feedback mechanism described and discussed in our study could be useful to teachers and individuals engaged in the development of teachers to facilitate the process of professional development.

References

- Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B., & Wiliam, D. (2003). *Assessment for learning: Putting it into practice*. Open University Press.
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. University of California Press.
- Boistrup, L. B. (2015). *Assessment in mathematics classrooms: A discursive perspective*. Routledge.
- Brookhart, S. M. (2012). *How to give effective feedback to your students* (2nd ed.). ASCD.
- Brophy, J. (1981). Teacher praise: A functional analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 51(1), 5-32.
- Carless, D. (2019). Feedback loops and the longer-term: Towards feedback spirals. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44(5), 705-714.
- Chalk, K., & Bizo, L. A. (2004). Specific praise improves on-task behaviour and numeracy enjoyment. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 20(4), 335-351.
- Charon, J. M. (2007). *Symbolic interactionism: An introduction, an interpretation, an integration* (9th ed.). Pearson.
- Gamlem, S. M., & Munthe, E. (2014). Mapping the quality of feedback to support students' learning. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 43, 21-30.
- Gipps, C. V. (1995). *Beyond testing: Towards a theory of educational assessment*. Falmer Press.
- Hall, B. (Year). [Complete source details required].
- Hargreaves, E. (2011). Feedback and assessment for learning. In J. Gardner (Ed.), *Assessment and learning* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Hargreaves, E. (2014). *Primary teachers' classroom feedback practices*. Routledge.
- Harlen, W. (2007). *Assessment of learning*. Sage.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112.
- Hayward, L. (2015). Assessment is learning: The preposition vanishes. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 22(1), 27-43.
- Hopfenbeck, T. N., Flórez Petour, M. T., Steffensen, K., & Tolo, A. (2013). Balancing trust and accountability? Assessment for learning in Norway. OECD.
- Jonsson, A., Lundahl, C., & Holmgren, A. (2015). Evaluating a large-scale implementation of assessment for learning in Sweden. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 22(1), 104-121.

- Jordan, B., & Putz, G. (2004). Assessment as practice. *Educational Assessment*, 9(1-2), 1-21.
- Popham, W. J. (2009). Assessment literacy for teachers: Faddish or fundamental? *Theory Into Practice*, 48(1), 4-11.
- Ruiz-Primo, M. A. (2011). Informal formative assessment: The role of instructional dialogues in assessing students' learning. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 37(1), 15-24.
- Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, 18(2), 119-144.
- See, B. H., Gorard, S., & Siddiqui, N. (2016). Teachers' use of feedback and its impact on learning. *Oxford Review of Education*, 42(5), 1-17.
- Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on formative feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(1), 153-189.
- Skinner, B. F. (1954). The science of learning and the art of teaching. *Harvard Educational Review*, 24(2), 86-97.
- Swinson, J., & Knight, R. (2007). Teacher verbal feedback and classroom behaviour. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 23(3), 241-255.
- Timperley, H. (2011). *Realizing the power of professional learning*. Open University Press.
- Torrance, H., & Pryor, J. (1998). *Investigating formative assessment: Teaching, learning and assessment in the classroom*. Open University Press.
- Tunstall, P., & Gipps, C. (1996). Teacher feedback to young children in formative assessment. *British Educational Research Journal*, 22(4), 389-404.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- White, M. A. (1975). Natural rates of teacher approval and disapproval in the classroom. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 8(4), 367-372.
- Swedish Research Council. (2017). *Good research practice*. Swedish Research Council.

