INVESTIGATING FORMATIVE EVALUATION IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE CLASSROOM OF SECONDAY SCHOOLS IN PAKISTAN: A MIXED-METHOD TECHNIQUE

Mehak Jawed[*1], Sana Bint e Javaid [2]

[*1]Lecturer at Commecs College; [2]Lecturer English-Mgt. Sciences, Salim Habib University

[*1]mehak.g25315@iqra.edu.pk; [2]sana.javaid@shu.edu.pk

Corresponding Author: *

ABSTRACT

This study explores the employ of formative assessment in secondary school English lessons in Karachi's FL classrooms with the goal of learning more about these practices. The research employs a mixed-method retrospective analysis, gathering data from 120 alumni of different secondary schools in Karachi between 2021 and 2020 via questionnaires and a Likert scale. Gaining understanding of the number, type, and significance of assessments they encountered throughout their secondary education is the aim, especially when contrasting formative and summative evaluations for various FL skills and sub skills. The results show that formative assessment is not given enough weight in Karachi's EFL curriculum. About 20% of students said they had never received formative evaluations in the areas of practical skills, comprehension, and pronunciation. These answers demonstrate how well students comprehend the value of feedback and the consequences of providing it insufficiently. The findings clearly point to the need for improvements in pre-service and in-service teacher training programs as well as a better knowledge and application of formative evaluation in Karachi's EFL classrooms. By addressing these problems, Karachi, Pakistan's English language instruction could become much better.

Keywords: Formative Assessment, Pakistani English as Foreign Language's framework, subsidiary school education, mixed-method approach.

INTRODUCTION

As a continuous guidance for core curriculum and instruction, assessment is an essential part of the learning process. In order to fulfill the needs of each unique student and the assessment objectives, teachers use a variety of tactics in their classroom assessments. Experts in Pakistan agree that assessments are important in education, primarily because they promote literacy and point out areas that need more focus (Gafforov, I. & Abdulkhay, K. 2022; Paul Black and Dylan Wiliam, 2006). Different forms of assessment, including formative and summative evaluations as well as official and informal assessments are used in Pakistani schools. These kinds are contrasted according to their roles and assessed according to how well they support the literacy and teaching processes (Brown, 2004; Harris & McCann, 1994). Formative assessment (FA) is currently receiving a lot of attention from educational scholars because of its beneficial effects on learning

outcomes in a variety of topics (Black and Wiliam, 1998a; Scriven, 1988; Fontana and Fernandes, 1994). The benefits of formative assessment are acknowledged in Pakistan, especially when it comes to teaching and EFL instruction (Bachman, 1990; Bachman and Palmer, 1996; Brown, 2004; Gattullo, 2000; Radford, 2015). Regardless of how formative assessment was first incorporated into the educational system of Pakistan, it is imperative to look at how it is being used in secondary schools there, particularly in EFL programs. The purpose of this study is to shed light on how formative assessment is being used in secondary schools in Pakistan. The concept of formative evaluation is briefly introduced at the outset of the paper, with a focus on how it differs from summative assessment and how it might be used in EFL classrooms. The study then reports on an exploratory survey that was carried out among Pakistani high school graduates. It

also describes the research methodology, including the research questions, participants, tools, and techniques for gathering and analyzing data. Additionally, the survey's quantitative and qualitative findings are shown and discussed. The study concludes by summarizing the survey results and providing useful suggestions specific to the educational environment in Pakistan.

Formative Assessment vs. Summative Assessment
Summative evaluation is believed to place more emphasis on judgment and quality assurance purposes, whereas formative assessment, which emphasizes feedback, is linked to developmental assessment goals. Although the veracity of this dichotomy is debatable, there is a dearth of designs in health care education that successfully integrate formative and summative evaluations (Gunnel, 2022).

This study looked into how 72 Iranian EFL students' educational motivation, attitude toward learning, test anxiety, and autonomy abilities were affected by developmental and summative assessments. Two experimental groups—summative and formative—as well as a control group were assigned to participants. After doing pre-tests for motivation, autonomy, and anxiety, a 15-session treatment program was implemented. Both assessments were successful, according to post-test data, with formative assessment demonstrating superior outcomes in terms of academic motivation, anxiety about tests, and autonomy abilities. The participants felt favorably about the two forms of assessments. The results highlight how crucial it is to include developmental evaluation in EFL learning environments so that students may pinpoint their areas of weakness and strengthen them (Ehsan Rezvani, Sayed M. Ismail, D. R. Rahul, Indrajit Patra, 2022).

The effect of developmental speaking evaluations on Saudi students' performance on summative exams was investigated by Alahmadi et al. (2019). Their research sought to monitor students' learning, offer teachers useful feedback to improve performance, and solve difficulties with speaking. The findings demonstrated how developmental assessment successfully assisted students in resolving speaking exam difficulties.

Summative evaluation measures learning results; in contrast, constructive assessment fosters learning improvement. It entails regular, introspective assessments of students' growth and comprehension in order to pinpoint needs and modify instruction as necessary (Alahmadi et al., 2019). Constructive assessment, according to Glazer (2014), is defined as assignments that offer feedback throughout the course. It functions as a diagnostic tool in the classroom, enabling teachers to spot student misunderstandings and close learning gaps by giving insightful feedback at the conclusion of units or patterns (Dixson and Worrell, 2016). Regretfully, some instructors fail to see developmental assessments' teaching potential and instead see them only as a way to gauge student progress. This study will investigate the relationship between teaching and testing in more detail (Remmi and Hashim, 2021).

Formative and summative assessments are the two different categories. Popham (2008), however, argues that the designation of a test as formative or summative is contingent upon the manner in which the test results are applied. Stated differently, the goal of evaluation is determined by its application and not by its classification. Summative evaluation is frequently linked to certain standards. According to Cizek (2010), summative assessment has two distinguishing features: (1) it is carried out at the conclusion of certain units; and (2) its main objective is to describe the performances of students or systems. Getting a measurement of accomplishment for use in decision-making is its primary goal.

According to Black and Wiliam (2006), summative assessments are occasionally used to gauge pupils' level of understanding. It provides an overview of the learning process and happens after learning objectives are decided. Apart from any discoveries made accidentally while completing the work, hardly much new learning usually happens at this point (Wuest and Fisette, 2012). Summative evaluation, which often takes place at the conclusion of a semester of teaching, measures the knowledge that students have acquired (Abeywickrama and Brown, 2010; Liu et al., 2021; Rezai et al., 2022).

In the words of Woods (2015), formative assessment results are utilized to enhance educational programs, whereas summative evaluation gives data to assess the overall advantages of educational programs. According to Shepard (2006), a well-crafted summative evaluation can successfully fulfill a secondary function of promoting learning even though its primary goal is to record what pupils know and are capable of.

According to Brown (2003), summative assessments are a measure of pupils' past performance and lack the depth needed to direct future development. This assessment, sometimes referred to as the evaluation of learning (Spolsky and End, 2008), is primarily concerned with summarizing results rather than offering recommendations for continued development and pinpointing particular areas of weakness. The necessity of developmental evaluation is emphasized by Pinchok and Brandt (2009) and Vadivel et al. (2021) in order to entirely understand student advancement and identify crucial areas for improvement.

In words of Brown (2003), formative evaluation is evaluating students as they are developing their skills in order to support their continued growth. According to Fox et al. (2016), it includes tasks completed by instructors or students in order to gather input for modifying instructional and learning activities.

The objective of formative assessments is to rapidly gather feedback on students' learning so that their strengths and weaknesses may be examined. Wiliam (2011) points out that formative classroom practices occur when teachers, students, or peers use evidence of students' accomplishments to elicit, interpret, and guide judgments about the next steps in education, improving upon decisions made in the absence of this data.

Based to this concept, formative assessment places a strong emphasis on student and teacher participation as a critical component of improving student performance. With this goal in mind, assessment for learning concentrates on assessing students' development (McCallum and Milner, 2021). To improve students' learning and success, the main concept is to collect data about students' accomplishments, identifying their growth in abilities, needs, and capacities—addressing both strengths and weaknesses—prior to, during, and following educational courses (Douglas and Wren, 2008).

The terms "summative" and "formative" assessment were first used to describe educational initiatives in the 1960s that were not concerned with assessing the academic achievement of students, claims Domingos Fernandes (2011). True formative assessment did not emerge until the 1980s, when evaluation began to center on the educational process itself. It's useful to contrast formative assessment with summative evaluation in order to better understand it. According

to Brian W. Radford (2015), the purpose of summative evaluation is to gauge student learning and make well-informed judgments of their aptitude or degree of accomplishment. It usually marks the end of a learning phase and evaluates the knowledge and abilities one has gained over a given time. Summative assessment results are frequently expressed quantitatively using percentages, points, or scores. Summative evaluation is different from formative assessment. Summative assessments, in contrast to formative assessments, typically do not give pupils more feedback, even though they may cause anxiety attacks and have a detrimental effect on performance. However, because educational institutions have traditionally required it and because it is simple to construct and administer, it is widely employed in education.

According to Domingos Fernandes (2011), in the 1960s, educational programs were the main source of information for the terms "summative" and "formative" evaluation. As explained by Brian W. Radford (2015), summative evaluation analyzes learning outcomes at the end of a certain time and produces quantifiable data. On the other hand, formative assessment gives pupils continuous feedback for growth while concentrating on the educational procedure itself. Summative assessments are still used in education today because of their ease of use, but they can cause anxiety and provide less thorough feedback than formative assessments.

Formative assessment, per Anthony J. Nitko (1993), has two main functions: it serves to improve the efficacy of teaching and learning processes and adapt learning tactics. According to Francesca Gattullo (2000), it is a multi-stage, continuous process that involves regular teacher-student interaction and instant feedback to modify instructional strategies for improved learning results. According to H. Douglas Brown (2004), a large portion of classroom evaluation is formative by nature, enabling students to mold their knowledge through the analysis and integration of instructor feedback. Formative assessment, according to the Evaluation Change Group (2007), is the most popular method for gathering and analyzing data to assist educators and students in understanding students' present learning status, future goals, and the most effective ways to reach those goals.

It's critical to understand that formative evaluations can be quantitative, just like summative evaluations. The use of the information obtained makes a difference. Formative assessment views the data as a source of information about students' strengths and limitations, leading to planning, feedback, and clear strategies for future learning objectives. Summative assessment uses the data to judge the level of skills and knowledge (Fernandes, 2011).

Boons of Formative Assessment

The discoveries add to the comprehension of formative evaluation practices and discernments in schooling settings, underlining the significance of thinking about individual student advancement and consolidating intelligent practices

A paper proposes a system to help the utilization of computerized developmental evaluation in advanced education. The system is educated by key standards and approaches supporting compelling developmental evaluation and, all the more explicitly, by ways to deal with developmental appraisal that influence the functionalities of innovation. The general point is to give an organized conceptualization of computerized developmental evaluation that upholds the preparation of talks and other educating and learning exercises in advanced education study halls. Fundamental to the system, as introduced in this article, is a 12-cell framework containing 4 key developmental evaluation techniques (sharing learning goals and achievement rules, addressing and conversation, criticism, and companion and self- evaluation) crossed with 3 functionalities of innovation (sending and showing, handling and breaking down, and intelligent conditions). These functionalities of advancements are utilized as the premise to coordinate computerized devices into developmental evaluation for successful instructing and educational experiences. For every cell in the matrix, a commendable advanced developmental appraisal practice is depicted. This paper features the structure's true capacity for improving the act of advanced developmental appraisal and its importance considering the continuous computerized change. This paper closes with proposing a program of examination that may be embraced to assess its utility and effect in advanced education settings. (Sila Kaya-Capocci, Michael O'Leary and Eamon Costel 2022)

Formative evaluation and related processes keep on ending up a high-influence educational practice that can possibly uphold all students, particularly the individuals who exhibit misinterpretations with critical science ideas. Educators utilize developmental appraisal rehearses in changed ways and offer alternate points of view of the worth of these evaluations for understudy learning. This article will share review aftereffects of 65 educators across grade levels. Discoveries show educators find developmental appraisal valuable for recognizing holes in learning, offers a potential open door to increment understudy learning, and supports their instructing rehearses. These outcomes support earlier exploration; notwithstanding, there were remarkable discoveries that offer knowledge into working on the utilization of developmental appraisal. The review showed that developmental appraisal was utilized essentially to distinguish holes, yet not used to recognize qualities of the student. Formative evaluation prompts center around the student however does exclude impression of the adequacy of the apparatus that was utilized or guidance. Monetarily made materials, a huge cost for schools, was not distinguished as helpful. Educators recognized hindrances to utilizing developmental appraisal. Suggestions for further developing developmental evaluation rehearses are shared and preceded with research. (Christie Martin Maryann Mraz Drew Polly 2022)

This study explores the impression of educators and understudies toward developmental evaluation (FA) in advanced education settings. The scientists fostered a four-develop discernment scale, to be specific self-evaluation, intelligent proper evaluation, in-class demonstrative appraisal, and emotional evaluation. Information were gathered from 216 members — 91 instructors and 125 understudies. The discoveries showed that the two educators and understudies have indistinguishably seen intuitive and in-class symptomatic appraisals. In any case, they particularly saw self-evaluation and subject execution evaluation showing a huge distinction. The understudies announced self- appraisal more prominent than the instructors, though they saw the subject-execution evaluation lower contrasted with the educators. The discoveries recommend that English as an unknown dialect (EFL) or English as a subsequent language (ESL) student's benefit from developmental appraisal assuming educators assess understudies' advancement in view of their own improvement as

opposed to being assessed in contrast with other understudies' turn of events. (JawadGolzar 2022)

As per the survey, formative evaluation has been displayed to yield more prominent learning gains than customary summative appraisal. Various investigations, like those by Dark and Wiliam (1998a), Bachman (2005), Fontana and Fernandes (1994), and others, have shown thepositive effect of developmental evaluation on homeroom learning. It has been found that developmental evaluation upgrades learning results as well as assists educators with deciding the necessities and objectives of their understudies.

One of the vital components of developmental evaluation is input, which can emerge out of different sources, for example, educators, PC programs, or the actual understudies. Developmental appraisal enables students to perceive regions for development, subsequently raising their self-evaluation and self-checking abilities. This expanded mindfulness and independence in learning add to more prominent learning gains.

Formative evaluation contrasts from summative appraisal in that it not just permits understudies to pass judgment on their learning results yet in addition advances learning itself. With training and time, understudies become more exact in their self-appraisal. Bringing self-evaluation into the educational experience has been found to prompt more noteworthy learning gains and further developed making arrangements for future work.

Formative evaluation likewise assumes a part in making understudies dynamic members in the growing experience. By posing inquiries, for example, "Where am I going?", "Where am I currently?", and "How might I close the hole?", understudies become more aware of their learning goals and progress. Ordinary unmistakable input, self-evaluation preparing, and centered class exercises add to responding to these inquiries and working with understudy progress.

Besides, developmental appraisal emphatically influences understudies' inspiration to learn. Studies have shown that developmental evaluation relates with both outward and inherent inspiration. Inspiration is viewed as areas of strength for an of outcome in unknown dialect learning, and developmental evaluation can add to improving inspiration in language students.

Albeit the attention on developmental appraisal in unknown dialect educating was not as conspicuous before the year 2000, its facilitative nature had for quite some time been perceived by language educators and scientists. Criticism, particularly with regards to unknown dialect learning, is significant for students to confirm their theories and progress in their language abilities. Leaving evaluation exclusively as formal summative tests can prompt restraint and uneasiness, while input and developmental appraisal give students significant data about their language use and progress.

All in all, the writing survey underlines the positive effect of formative appraisal on study hall learning. It advances more prominent learning gains, enables understudies to become self-evaluating and intelligent students, and upgrades inspiration. Developmental evaluation is especially significant in unknown dialect educating, where successive criticism and self- appraisal assume imperative parts in language procurement and progress.

Formative Assessment in Pakistan

Formative assessment is a highly regarded tool that is widely recognized for its ability to monitor academic progress, enhance student learning, and bridge gaps in understanding. Multiple studies have been conducted to explore the experiences and practices of formative assessment in Pakistan. The studies discussed in this research delve into the perceptions of teachers and students, the impact on academic achievement, the quality of assessment practices, and the role of formative assessment in language learning. The findings highlight the benefits and challenges associated with formative assessment and provide valuable insights for improving its implementation in the educational contexts of Pakistan. It emphasizes the need for a enhanced understanding of the practices and experiences of formative assessment in Pakistan, to fully leverage its benefits in enhancing the quality of education in the country.

In one study, the application of formative assessments by teachers in English classes in primary schools was investigated. Five teachers from a semi-government organization took part in interviews that were semi-structured using a case study methodology. The participants struggled with misunderstanding at first, but over time they came to grasp the informal evaluation. Lack of time and problematic student behavior were obstacles to implementation. The results indicated that teachers were going to have benefit from training that placed

a strong emphasis on setting learning objectives at the start of a lesson (Ahmed, Akhtar, & Aslam.2022). A review researched the effect of developmental evaluation on the scholarly accomplishment of optional school understudies. The exploratory review utilized a pretest/posttest control bunch plan with an example of 60 class tenth understudies. The exploratory gathering got developmental evaluations during guidance, while the benchmark group didn't. The outcomes showed that developmental appraisal decidedly affected understudies' accomplishments, exhibiting its capability to upgrade learning results (Mehmood, Hussain, Khalid, and Azam. 2012).

Assessing the quality of formative assessment practices in physics education, another study examined perceptions of principals, physics teachers, and 10th-grade science students. The findings revealed that the quality of formative assessment was poor. It was suggested that teachers need training to improve the feedback process provided to students, ultimately enhancing their learning (Khan, Zaman, & Saeed.2022).

In the context of language learning, a mixed-method study explored formative assessment practices in two universities in Pakistan. Questionnaires were administered to 134 teachers, and interviews were conducted to validate the result. The study exposed inadequacies in the formative assessment practices of teachers, highlighting the need for improvements. Recommendations were provided to amend these practices and enhance formative assessment in language education (Shahzad, Hussain, & Habib.2022).

Moreover, a study analyzed students' perceptions of formative assessment and feedback in the development of English writing composition skills. The findings indicated that formative assessments in English language learning positively impacted students' writing skills by providing effective learning opportunities. The study proposed strengthening and promoting the formative assessment system in both private and public education sectors across all levels of education in Pakistan (Zia, Sarfraz, & Mufti.2019).

As per above studies, formative assessment has the potential to improve academic progress and bridge gaps in understanding in Pakistani educational contexts. However, there are challenges that need to be addressed, including the need for teacher training, better time management, and improving feedback processes. By implementing the recommendations provided in the reviewed studies, Pakistani educational contexts can improve the quality and effectiveness of formative assessment, ultimately leading to better academic achievement andlearning outcomes.

Methodology
Starting with the research objectives and going into extensive detail on the study participants and the research instrument used for data collection, this section offers a thorough summary of the study design.

Study Objective
This study's primary objective was to investigate whether English teachers in Karachi, Pakistan's secondary schools are actually implementing formative assessment (FA), as it is highly advised. Prime interest is to to find out which language skill sets are assessed the most or least and how frequently FA is employed in comparison to summative assessment (SA). In addition to gathering data in the form of quantitative statistics, I also gathered qualitative data by questioning students about their perceptions of the high school assessment process.

The particular queries we attempted to address are listed below:

1. With what frequency do English classes in Karchi high schools conduct formative and summative assessments?
2. Which language skills are evaluated through formative and summative assessments the most and the least?
3. What sorts of assignments are given for formative and summative evaluation?

4. How do students feel about various forms of feedback and assessment?
a) Do they believe there is enough formative assessment?
b) Do they believe that some linguistic skills are not evaluated or provided with adequate feedback?
Do they think that their attitude toward learning English, their connection with the teacher, and their ability to succeed in learning a foreign language are influenced by the frequency and type of assessments they receive in high school?

Study Participants

For the study, about 120 10th grade students from a private school in Karachi, Pakistan, are asked to complete a survey. These pupils were all from the two primary disciplines of biology and computer science. The largest metropolis in Pakistan, Karachi, is home to the school. Every student in the class was a native of Karachi, having grown up in various parts of the city.

Of the students, 54% were studying biology and 46% were pursuing computer science. This indicates that pupils at Karachi's private schools are drawn to these two topics.

In terms of education, 95% of the pupils completed high school, 4% enrolled in technical colleges, and 1% attended a secondary art school. This indicates that the majorities of pupils prioritize their academic education and complete their high school education in conventional secondary schools.

The results of the secondary school exams taken by the participants were also analyzed, and all of them had passed. A total of 43% of these tests were carried out in 2017, 35% in 2016, 15% in 2015, and 6% in 2014. It can be seen from this that the participants were heading into their first year of college having just completed high school. Despite the fact that all of the participants were Karachi-based students, their origins varied. Of the total, about 38% were graduates of Karachi high schools, and the remaining 62% were from different areas of Karachi, including North Nazimabad, Gulshan-Iqbal, and Saima Arabian Villas. Due to their diverse origins, the students in the study provided their perspectives from all across the country.

In summary, students from private schools in Karachi, Pakistan who studied biology and computer science participated in our study. They offered us a diverse perspective on schooling in Karachi since they were from different areas of Karachi.

Instruments

While investigating formative assessment, a Polish study about the frequency and kinds of formative assessments used in high school English as a foreign language classes is discovered. Małgorzata Baran-Łucarz, the study's author, kindly offered a questionnaire that can be modified for usage in Karachi, Pakistan. The feedback procedures, time management, and teacher prepa ration will all benefit from this modified questionnaire. The researcher created a customized version of the questionnaire with the author's consent, tailored to the study's requirements. We will gain important knowledge about the use of formative assessment in Pakistani schools by taking part in this project. It will enable us to make adjustments to increase its efficacy in our educational setting and assist us in understanding its advantages and difficulties.

First, the poll included a few background questions about the participants, like where and when they took their last high school exam, what kind of school they finished, and which institution they attended.

Two categories of questions made up the majority of the questionnaire. Participants in the first type of survey answered each of the four questions on an 8-point Likert scale. These inquiries concerned:

1. How often were their various language skills evaluated (and graded)?

2. How frequently they got ungraded comments from their teacher regarding their proficiency in a foreign language, along with an assessment of their strengths and shortcomings.

3. How frequently their teachers assessed their development in various language abilities using particular methods or assignments (along by a grade).

4. How many times their teachers gave them comments on what they did well, what required work, and how to evaluate themselves without assigning a grade using certain methods or assignments.

Participants completed a table for the first two questions by placing a number next to each skill or sub skill. This made it easier to compile data on how frequently they received various evaluations and comments for different language proficiency levels.

Table 1
Assessment and Response Timing for Language Skills

Skills	Half-Yearly Examination	Annual Examination
Reading Comprehension	**3**	**5**
Grammar		
Vocabulary& Pronunciation		
Speaking/communication skills writing (e.g. e-mails, essays) Reading comprehension		
Listening comprehension		
Grammar		

The respondent's choice of one of the following values, ranging from 1-8 meant:

8. Nearly all of the lessons
7. Approximately once every seven days
6. Twice a month, around
5. A few of times per semester.
4. Roughly every semester
3. Infrequently, roughly twice annually
2. Infrequently, once or twice in a few years
1. I have no memory of ever having this subskill evaluated.

For question 3 and 4 regarding how frequently students receive various forms of assessments and feedback, a table with numbers ranging from 1 to 8 is utilized. For instance, to inquire about the frequency of language proficiency grades and feedback given to students without grades, they also included tasks that teachers employ for evaluation, such as translating or responding to comprehension queries.

In order to make sure to gain accurate and helpful information, questions concerning all language proficiency levels are being included.

The regularity of evaluations and comments for various grades and the final test was inquired from the students. This was done to look for variations according to grade level and the effect of the approaching final test.

They examined the frequency with which each number between 1 and 8 showed up in the tables for the assessment-related questions in order to evaluate the responses.

Following the four closed questions, there were five more 4-point scale questions and an open-ended question for each.

Figure 1
Samples of rhetorical questions used in the questionnaire.

1.   1. In your high school English classes, were any of the sub skills mentioned in Q.1 and Q.2 evaluated with a credit too infrequently?
      - ❑ Definitely yes
      - ❑ Yes
      - ❑ No
      - ❑ Definitely not

      Which sub skills were they? …………….………………………….…………

      ……………………………………………………………………………………

2.   Were you given enough feedback (without credits) on the progress of all the English sub skills?
      - ❑ Definitely yes
      - ❑ Yes
      - ❑ No
      - ❑ Definitely not

      If not, which sub skill(s) did you receive too little feedback on? ……………… ......

The study asked questions about whether the frequency, way of testing, and skills being tested affected how well students learned English (Q.7). It also asked if the way feedback and assessments were given affected students' attitudes towards learning English (Q.8) and their relationship with their English teacher (Q.9). The answers were analyzed by counting how many times each response was chosen and looking for patterns in the open-ended responses. The results are explained in the next section.

Presenting and Discussing the Findings
The study's findings are given and briefly discussed in this section, with a focus on quantitative data first and then a look at qualitative findings through thematic analysis

Quantifiable Analysis
The first set of data shows how frequently participants' progress in learning different foreign language (FL) skills and sub skills is formally assessed using credits. Table 2 presents the results, with a focus on FL sub skills such as grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. The responses that got the most votes have been bolded.

Table 2

Rate of recurrence of summative assessment provision in the case FL sub skills

	Gram. annual	Half-yearly	Voc. annual	Half-yearly	Pron. annual	Half-yearly
1	0%	2%	2%	4%	**34%**	**36%**
2	0%	1%	2%	1%	6%	5%
3	14%	5%	1%	2%	8%	9%
4	7%	8%	1%	6%	13%	12%
5	26%	**34%**	23%	**27%**	10%	11%
6	35%	**34%**	**40%**	**38%**	6%	12%
7	13%	**14%**	**22%**	**15%**	8%	6%
8	5%	2%	10%	8%	14%	8%

Note: Gram. – Grammar; Voc. – vocabulary, Pron. – pronunciation

When examining the results shown in all the tables, it seems important to keep in mind that the large percentages in the rows from 1 to 3 should be taken seriously because they indicate that FL (sub) skills assessments are either not provided at all or just occasionally. Grammar and vocabulary formal assessments appear to have been given to participants on average, around just the once or two times per month, or even once per week. Pronunciation is a sub skill that sticks out, yet many participants—up to 34%–36%—do not remember ever receiving a credit for it throughout their secondary school career.

Data on the summative evaluation of FL skills, including speaking, listening, reading, andwriting, are mentioned in Table 3.

Table 3

Rate of recurrence of summative assessment provision in the case of FL skills Spk.

	Annual	half.e	Writ. annual	half.e	Rd. annual	half.e	List. annual	half.e
1	10%	**18%**	4%	12%	8%	9%	8%	11%
2	7%	6%	0%	1%	1%	2%	3%	3%
3	8%	13%	5%	10%	6%	8%	7%	8%
4	**15%**	**16%**	14%	15%	10%	15%	9%	12%
5	*18%*	*18%*	*32%*	*30%*	*25%*	*23%*	*24%*	*22%*
6	12%	11%	**35%**	22%	17%	**21%**	**21%**	**21%**
7	11%	6%	8%	8%	17%	13%	17%	16%
8	**18%**	12%	2%	1%	16%	9%	12%	7%

Note*:* Spk. – Speaking, Writ. – Writing, Rd. – Reading, List. – Listening, annual- Annual Examination, half.e -- Half-yearly examination

This point, the majority often chosen responses were 4, 5, and 6, representing that the majority of the respondents had their formative evaluation of these skills performed once totwice a month or once to twice a semester.

Table 4

How repeatedly formative assessments are given for FL sub skills

	Gram. annual	Half.e	Voc. annual	Half.e	Pron. annual	Half.e
1	13%	16%	16%	**19%**	**25%**	**28%**
2	8%	6%	4%	6%	4%	5%
3	12%	14%	13%	12%	12%	9%
4	11%	14%	9%	10%	13%	15%
5	11%	14%	10%	15%	8%	10%
6	**20%**	16%	**25%**	**19%**	11%	12%
7	9%	11%	9%	11%	8%	7%
8	15%	8%	13%	8%	**20%**	13%

Note: Gram. – Grammar; Voc. – vocabulary, Pron. – pronunciation; Annul examination-annual, Half-yearly examination-half.e

The dataset focuses on how often English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms use formative evaluation, particularly feedback. Participants' impressions of the frequency of formative evaluations pertaining to language abilities and sub skills are shown in Tables 4 and 5.

Response patterns are very different from summative exams. The most popular option for grammar and vocabulary evaluation was number 6 (evaluation once or two time per month), however almost half of the participants chose numbers 1-4, which indicates infrequent input. The data about pronunciation assessments was noteworthy. While 20% of

respondents reported regular formative assessments, a noteworthy 25% to 28% reported no assessments at all during their secondary schooling.

The amount of feedback across language skills is shown in Table 5, which shows a worrying trend:

20% to 27% of students acknowledge that they never received credit for formative assessments while in subsidiary school.

Table 5

Rate of recurrence of formative assessment provision in the case of FL skills

	Spk. annual	Half.e	Writ. annual	half.e	Rd. annual	half.e	List. annual	half.e
1	**20%**	**25%**	22%	**27%**	**23%**	**25%**	22%	25%
2	4%	5%	2%	5%	4%	6%	6%	4%
3	12%	8%	12%	13%	15%	13%	12%	12%
4	10%	10%	14%	14%	11%	9%	13%	13%
5	11%	**20%**	19%	19%	17%	20%	16%	17%
6	18%	14%	**24%**	15%	12%	11%	15%	13%
7	8%	6%	4%	3%	8%	8%	7%	8%
8	17%	11%	4%	4%	10%	8%	9%	7%

Note: Spk. – speaking, Writ. – Writing, Rd. – reading, List. – listening; annual-Annualexamination, half.e- half-yearly examination

Formative assessment was significantly less common than summative evaluation in carrying out the aforementioned duties, which is consistent with the third study question. The data that was presented indicated that the least popular tasks were those that involved pronunciation, such as role-plays, presentations, discussions, or other speaking activities to gauge clarity; scanning a passage or word bank to concentrate on word articulation; or marking stressed syllables in words, were the summative exams that were used the least frequently. Depending on the tests, anywhere from 45% to 72% of respondents chose responses 1 to 3.

Even less encouraging results came from formative examination of pronunciation. Regarding the tasks that permit for remarks on comprehension, 24% (annual exams) and 30% (half- yearly exams) of the participants marked the digit 1, which stands for "I can't recall being evaluated for this sub skill." Regarding the tasks that permit for feedback on word pronunciation, 31% (annual exams) and 34% (half-yearly exams) of the participants marked the digit 1. A large number of participants, 86% in the annual exam and 85% in half yearly, stated that they had never received feedback regarding how to emphasize syllables in words. The study found that students were less likely to be assessed on their pronunciation skills compared to other skills. This could be because pronunciation is often not taught very well in English classes, which is a big problem in Pakistan and other

places. The study suggests that this needs to be addressed because pronunciation is an important part of learning a language.

The three most common tasks used to evaluate students (numbers 5 to 8 chosen by between 65% and 70% of respondents) officially demonstrated to be completing a phrase with the accurate form of the verb, filling in blanks with omitted words, and translating sentences and words. Answering reading command check questions including a written passage and a report was the second popular choice (numbers 5 to 8 were selected by around 43% and 65% of respondents). Regrettably, the same exercises were not as popular as they once were as a basis for giving feedback to learners, with just 35% of participants choosing the numbers 5 to 8.

Categorical Data

When interpreting qualitative data gathered from open-ended questions, thematic analysis is utilized. The first questions were designed to find out what participants thought the assessments were adequate. Unexpectedly, 68% said they were unhappy, with 31% strongly stating and another 31% agreeing.

In response to inquiries concerning abilities evaluated seldom, 92% of respondents named pronunciation as the most overlooked talent, ahead of speaking (51%), listening (7%), and writing (5%). In Question 6, which explored formative evaluation that may be disregarded, this trend persisted, with

61% of respondents feeling that high school feedback was insufficient. In particular, 54% categorically said they didn't receive enough input, and 7% specifically said they did.

The same pattern of responds can be noticed for Question 6, which deals with the subject of potentially underutilized formative evaluation. In high school, 61% of the participants reported getting too little feedback. More specifically, 7% of respondents said "No" in response to the query i.e. "Is there adequate input available regarding the advancement of every English sub skill (non-credit)?"

Up to 54% of respondents claimed that this was definitely not the case. When asked which are those sub skills they thought that they had received insufficient response, participants the majority frequently mentioned pronunciation (75%). The second FL ability that didn't get enough attention in terms of criticism was speaking (19%). Speaking was the second FL skill that got the least amount of attention. Speaking was the second FL ability that received the least amount of criticism (20%), followed by listening (10%) and writing (10%).

These conclusions were highly supported by qualitative data. Using statements like

Participants voiced dissatisfaction with the evaluation procedure in general and with vocabulary, pronunciation, and writing in particular. Among their worries were:

❑ "Assessment of language, word pronunciation, and writing skills was limited to a mere credit, lacking in providing insights into my areas of weakness and strategies for improvement."

❑ "We received insufficient comments for any of the sub skills. Practically speaking, we were not given any guidance regarding our strong and weak points or how to strengthen the ones that we found challenging."

❑ "Only grades were used to describe my abilities."

❑ "It is clear that I did not receive enough feedback on my writing or progress, not enough on word pronunciation."

According to 58% of respondents, the type, frequency, and method of assessment influenced their ability to learn English. A noteworthy 79% of respondents felt that receiving inadequate criticism

would have major negative effects, particularly in the areas of speaking abilities (38%), and pronunciation (41%). Individuals expressed dissatisfaction and expressed worries about things like:

❑ " Participants shared a range of worries and personal experiences about the lack of assessment and correction on pronunciation:

❑ "I was unaware that my pronunciation needed enhancement as there was no assessment or feedback provided on this aspect."

❑ "I instinctively overlooked the language areas that were not assessed in my conscious studying."

❑ "Pronunciation was not verified by anyone, making it more challenging to correct poor pronunciation habits."

❑ "The lack of feedback on speaking skills resulted in a significant deficiency in my ability to converse."

❑ "Due to the emphasis on reading and vocabulary, my pronunciation is terrible."

Thematic analysis also revealed that, according to 52% of participants, their attitude toward teachers was impacted by the frequency, mode, and choice of language skills assessed. A weak rapport was linked to unfair, ambiguous, or unhelpful comments, a lack of respect from the teacher, and too difficult or frequent assessments. Participants gave particular examples:

❑ "A parent claims that a instructor who solely focuses on grades and tests is wasting class time and not helping the pupils learn.
Students' specific answers include:

❑ "I appreciated having an instructor evaluate my speaking and pronunciation abilities and provide helpful criticism. I didn't like when teachers just taught grammar."

❑ "I had a negative impression of a previous instructor who consistently emphasized and evaluated areas I was not interested in."

❑ "My teacher was amazing; she stressed speaking, gave us detailed comments on our mistakes, and offered substitutes for words."

Conclusion
The study underlines the substantial importance of formative evaluation in language erudition, especially given the complexity involved in learning a second language. Summative evaluation is also important in language learning. The study discovered that whereas formative assessment was less

frequently utilized for these skills, summative assessment was widely used to evaluate pronunciation abilities, especially in tasks pertaining to intelligibility and word pronunciation. It indicates that teaching pronunciation more effectively overall, as well as placing more emphasis on formative assessment of pronunciation skills, is necessary in English language instruction. The study also emphasized the significance of regularly employing formative assessment, which can reduce anxiety, increase motivation, and offer direction on learning practices and developing into an independent learner. Pronunciation study results showed a disregard for both formative and summative evaluation.

It is crucial to keep in mind the study's limitations, such as its small sample size, when measuring the results. Future research might include a bigger and more varied sample of students and create a more thorough evaluation instrument that focuses on formative assessment functions in order to boost the reliability of the findings. Furthermore, triangulating data through an examination of instructors' viewpoints and a comprehension of the causes of formative assessment's low use in FL classrooms may yield informative data. Notwithstanding these drawbacks, the study emphasizes how crucial it is for pre- and in-service teacher preparation programs to give formative and summative assessment greater consideration. It also highlights the necessity of providing educators with further training in pronunciation assessment and instruction.

References

Mehmood, T., Hussain, T., Khalid, M., & Azam, R. (2012). Impact of Formative Assessment on Academic Achievement of Secondary School Students. InternationalJournal of Business and Social Science, 3(17), September. Retrieved from: https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=aee14b4537b501f98a6e22fb12c7388c87021c90

Khan, M., Zaman, T. U., & Saeed, A. (2022). Formative Assessment Practices of Physics Teachers in Pakistan. Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 16(2). https://doi.org/10.15294/jpfi.v16i2.25238

Zia, F., Sarfraz, S., & Mufti, N. (2019). Students' Perceptions of the Effectiveness of Formative Assessment and Feedback for Improvement of the English Writing Composition Skills: A Case Study of Secondary Level ESL Students of Private Schools in Lahore, Pakistan. Journal of Education and Practice, 10(6). ISSN 2222-1735 (Paper), ISSN 2222-288X (Online), DOI: https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/234642407.pdf

Baran-Łucarz, M. (2019). Formative assessment in the English as a foreign language classroom in secondary schools in Poland: Report on a mixed-method study. Journal of Education Culture and Society, (2_2019), 309. University of Wrocãaw; Institute of English Studies, ul. KuĮnicza 22, 50-138 Wrocãaw, Poland. E-mail address: malgorzata.baran-lucarz@uwr.edu.pl. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9310-0606.

Shahzad, K., Hussain, B., & Habib, A. (2022.). Analyzing Formative Assessment Practices of English Language Teachers in Pakistan. National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad. Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research, 4(1). https://doi.org/10.52567/pjsr.v4i1.345

Alderson, J. C., Brunfaut, T., & Harding, L. (2015). Towards a theory of diagnosis in second and foreign language assessment: insights from professional practice across diverse fields. *Applied Linguistics, 36, 2,* 236-260.

Assessment Reform Group. (2007). *Assessment for learning.* Retrieved from https://www.nuffieldfoundation.org/assessment-reform-group.

Atkin, J., Black, P., & Coffey, J. (Eds.) (2005). *Classroom assessment andthe national science edu- cation standards.* Committee on Classroom Assessment and the National Science Education Standards,

Center for Education, National Research Council. Washington, DC: National Aca- demy Press.

Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. (1996). *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sebatane, E. M. (1998, March). Assessment and Classroom Learning: a response to Black & Wiliam. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 5(1), 123–130. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050108

N. Hopfenbeck, T. (2018, November 2). Classroom assessment, pedagogy and learning – twenty years after Black and Wiliam 1998. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 25(6), 545–550. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594x.2018.1553695

Brookhart, S. M., & Durkin, D. (2003). Classroom assessment, student motivation, and achievement in high school social studies classes. *Applied Measurement in Education*, *16*, 27-54.

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: principles and classroom practices.* New York: Pearson Education.

Butler Y., & Jiyoon, L. (2010). The effects of self-assessment among young learnersof English. *Language Testing, 27*, 5-31.

Crooks, T. (1988). The impact of classroom evaluation on students. *Reviewof Educational Research*, *58*, 438-481.

Czura, A. (2010). *The influence of assessment type on the development of autonomy in lower secondary school learners* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Wrocław, Poland.

Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (2015). Pronunciation fundamentals: Evidence-based perspec- tives for L2 teaching and research. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Harlen, W., & Winter, J. (2004). The development of assessment for learning: Learning from the case of science and mathematics. *Language Testing*, *21*, 390–408.

K. (2017). On the misreading of Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) and the need to balance anxiety research and the experiences of anxious language learners. In: C. Gkonou,

M. Daubney, & J. M. Dewaele (Eds.), *New insights into language anxiety: Theory, research and educational implications* (pp. 31–47). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Gattullo, F. (2000). Formative assessment in ELT primary (elementary) classrooms: an Italian case study. *Language Testing, 17 (2)*, 278–288.

Geeslin, K. (2003). Student self-assessment in the foreign language classroom: The place of authentic assessment instruments in the Spanish language classroom. *Hispania*, 86, 857-868.

Ketabi, S., & Ketabi, S. (2014). Classroom and formative assessment in second/foreign langu-age teaching and learning. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 4(2)*, 435-440.

Lewy, A. (1990). Formative and summative evaluation. In: Walberg, H. & Haertel, G. (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of educational evaluation* (pp. 26-28). Oxford, England; New York: Pergamon Press.

MacIntyre, P. D., & Gregersen, T. (2012). Emotions that facilitate language learning: The posi- tive-broadening power of the imagination. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 2,* 193-213.

McDonald, B., & Boud, D. (2003). The impact of self-assessment on achievement: The effects of self-assessment training on performance in external examinations. *Assessment in Education, 10*, 209-220.

Radford, B. W. (2015). The effect of formative assessments on language performance (Unpublished- shed doctoral dissertation). Birmingham YoungUniversity, Provo, USA.

Rea-Dickens, P., & Gardner, S. (2000, April). Snares and silver bullets: disentangling the construct of formative assessment. Language Testing, 17(2), 215–243. https://doi.org/10.1177/026553220001700206