
Summative and Formative Feedback and Gender: A Study of EFL Learners' Speaking Performance

Khodaverdi Alizadeh¹, Naser Ghafouri^{2*}, Touran Ahour³

¹Ph.D. Candidate, Department of English, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

^{2*}Assistant Professor, Department of English, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

³Assistant Professor, Department of English, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

Received: September 26, 2022

Accepted: November 03, 2022

Abstract

This study aimed to investigate the differences between the Iranian EFL learners' quality of speaking performance across genders. To this purpose, the use of formative and summative feedback among 40 female and 40 male EFL learners of a language institute in Tabriz, Iran, was examined employing a quasi-experimental method. A pre-test and post-test method were applied to the two groups of language learners to investigate the results of the feedback, and an independent *t*-test and a double-test method were used to analyze the amount of effectiveness of each of the feedback methods under investigation. The obtained results showed that both genders had a fairly close speaking performance. This finding implies that EFL teachers can adopt summative and formative feedback in order to enhance EFL learners' speaking performance.

Keywords: Education system, formative feedback, gender, speaking performance, summative feedback

INTRODUCTION

In every language, reading, listening, and speaking are considered crucial aspects. This is true in English. However, to be fluent, speaking skills are paramount important. Harmer (2007, p.284) states that speaking presupposes both knowledges of linguistics features and information processing ability and language "on the spot". Nunan (cited in Kayi, 2006) considers speaking as using the language quickly and confidently with few unnatural hesitations. Therefore, speaking is the ability to produce language and exchange ideas. Using Jack Richards' (2008) words, speaking skill skills be defined as conveying messages verbally from one person to another.

Efrizal (2012), and Pourhosein Gilakjani (2016) mentioned that speaking is considered of paramount importance to people to interact

since they speak everywhere and every day. It is the means to communicate ideas and messages orally. If students are encouraged to communicate in English, they should use the language in real communication.

Speaking it not meant merely uttering the words through the mouth. However, it means to convey ideas through words. Speaking skill is often ignored in some classes. Learners are not given enough opportunities either inside the classes or outside to speak English and it does not occupy an important part of teachers' exams. EFL Learners need lots of practice to learn to speak. They can develop their speaking skill via listening and repeating. Learners can be given some structures and asked to repeat them to remove their learners' shyness. As Bashir Azeem and Dogar, (2011) mention, short questions and short dialogues can be used in the classrooms to develop EFL learners' speaking skill

*Corresponding Author's Email:
ghafouri@iaut.ac.ir

One of the most principal problems in language classes is the lack of exposure to the target input. Language learner does not have enough opportunity to practice and improve speaking skills outside the classroom. To improve speaking skills, teachers should supply different opportunities in the classroom to help students enhance their speaking skills of the technique that teachers can use is reforming feedback. If there is no such feedback in classrooms, there would not be effective teaching (Hesami, 2013). Oral Corrective Feedback is a reactive move to make the learner attend to the grammatical accuracy of an utterance that someone has said (Sheen, 2007). Yoshida (2008) has argued that feedback is a response given either by a teacher or another learner to an inappropriate language item, by giving a clue for repairing or reformulating the form.

Regarding the importance of teachers' feedback on learners' learning, this study aims to investigate the impact of teacher feedback (formative feedback and summative feedback) on improving the quality of language learners' speaking, besides recognizing the most effective feedback (formative feedback and summative feedback) as an important tool to improve speaking skills of the learners and also to recognize the differences between the performances of either of the sexes, if there exist such differences. Speaking is known as a crucial aspect of learning a foreign language and development in learning a language is measured through speaking performance (Kazemi & Abbasian, 2019). Hinkel (2005) stated that the teacher has a critical role in helping students to achieve higher levels of success and knowledge gain in using English. The teacher can help learners to improve their learning through feedback. The feedback utilized by teachers in teaching the English language can be formative and summative (Hinkel, 2005).

Regarding gender differences in foreign language learning, Viriya and Sapsirin (2014) believe that male learners tend to be visual while female learners are auditory. Furthermore, as Natsir et al. (2016) put male and female learners have their learning styles relating to their abilities. Gender has also been considered

an important affective factor playing a fundamental role in foreign language learning (Zoghi et al., 2013). According to Zoghi et al. (2013), females and males differ in terms of cognitive ability and learning style. In addition, Zafar and Meenakshi (2012) add that gender is one of the influential causes of differences in language learning. Thus, language and gender contribute greatly to the learning process since male and female learners have different abilities affecting their progress in foreign language learning.

In addition, taking into account gender differences in speaking English, some scholars state that females are in a better position than males. Smith and Wilhelm (2002) state that female learners are more active and have better performance than male learners. Moreover, according to the Education Alliance (2007), females outperformed their male counterparts in reading, speaking, and writing. Similar to this study, Boyle (1987, as cited by Qian, 2015), conducted research on Hong Kong students' (233 females and 233 males) English learning, and realized that the females' English performances were nearly ten times higher than those of males, Ismiati (2013) found out that there male and female English learners are significantly different in English speaking skill. The research was performed at East Java, Indonesia, in the seventh grade. The results of her studies showed that male and female students are significantly different in their result of English-speaking skill. The total score of female students (%74.03) was higher than those of the male students (%64.42). Consequently, the female learners were in a better position in English speaking skills compared to the male learners. Halimah (2010) in a study at Semarang, Indonesia, concluded that female learners received a higher score than male learners, in which the average scores were 47.5 and 43.1 for females and males, respectively.

Moreover, the researchers in Banda Aceh, Indonesia concluded that the male learners actively and confidently answered to questions in the teaching-learning situation, were more active in tasks, guessed a lot, and called out answers when they got the speaking tasks. However, the female learners were more anxious and passive in their performance. The results of

this study contradict the findings of the previous research who claimed that female learners performed better than male learners. The present study was carried out to elicit the attitudes of EFL teachers towards the use of formative and summative feedback as important tools to promote their students' speaking skills, and it was carried out in an English institute in Tabriz (Dehkade-e-Jahani) in 2019.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Behavior psychologists are among the very first group of scholars to believe in feedback power as a stimulating effect (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Williams & Burden, 1997). Williams believes that any reaction to an action someone does is a type of feedback. Therefore, feedback can be carried out through encouragement, opinion proposal, or even silence. Kainvanpanah, Alavi and Sepehrinia (2015) state that teachers' reluctance to correct learners' mistakes might be contributed to their presupposition one of the learners' reaction to being corrected. They realized that about 22% of the Iranian instructors being interviewed believed their learners hate being corrected and 33% thought instructors should not correct learners' errors. Contrary to this, the students did not mention that they hate being corrected at all and in fact, anticipated even more feedback and corrections from the instructors.

Richards (2003) mentions that EFL learners evaluated their achievements in language learning and consider the effect of the English lessons to enhance their speaking ability. Therefore, five vital components contribute to students' proficiency in English speaking skills, including: pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, fluency, and comprehension. The first component of speaking is pronunciation. Boyer (2002) states that pronunciation is an important component of a speaking ability. Moreover, pronunciation is a crucial means in speaking skill since it determines whether the addressee comprehension is spoken or not. If learners mispronounce the words, the meaning will be changed and the listener will not perceive the meaning. Thus, pronouncing English sound correctly is a very crucial aspect of the speaking ability.

The second component is vocabulary. According to Hatch and Brown (2001), vocabulary is words of a language or a list of words that speakers of language use. In every normal life, the choice either in spoken or written form is of great importance. Vocabulary is a fundamental aspect of language acquisition, particularly in foreign language learning. To enhance student communication abilities, the learner ought to enrich their vocabulary because vocabulary is fundamental for learning any language text component is grammar. Every language has its own system and the grammatical rules are different. Grammar is the rules of language to produce appropriate grammatical sentences. According to Brown (2000), grammar consists of a system of rules which governs the appropriate arrangement and relationship of words in both spoken and written language. Furthermore, Locke (2013) mentions that vocabulary is unlimited and grammatical system is complex.

The next component of language is fluency. Fluency is the ability to speak at a normal speed without unusual pauses. Pfauwadel (1986) states "a speaker is fluent when he speaks easily, with smooth onsets and transitions, and at a relatively rapid clip" (as cited in Zellner, 1994, p. 48). Furthermore, eloquence in a language would help the addressee to grasp the meaning of the message, and if the learner speaks do not speak at a normal speed, the communication would not be successful. That is, if the learner speaks too quickly, comprehending the conversation would be difficult for the addressee.

The final component of a language is comprehension. Comprehension can be considered as understanding the meaning of spoken or written language. According to Richards and Schmidt (2010), comprehension can be defined as the realization of the meaning in language. It is safe to conclude that the ability to understand the message is an important factor to realize the proficiency level of the learner in a foreign language.

Urrutia and Vega (2010) state that learners' spoken performance was affected by limited vocabulary knowledge, poor self-confidence, and fear of being contemned. In addition, it was argued that learners' collaboration, self-confidence, vocabulary knowledge, and the class

environment heartened the learners improve their speaking abilities. Prieto (2007) unresearched cooperative learning tasks. The results of their study demonstrated that one way to develop speaking ability is interaction with others, learning from peers, and choice of tcs d on the learners' likes and dislikes.

Bozorgian (2012) studied the correlation between listening skills and other language skills. The findings showed that listening comprehension is closely correlated to language proficiency. To put it in another way, the higher the listening performance, the higher the speaking performance. Lukitasari (2003) investigated how learners use strategies to overcome their speaking problems. The findings showed that some of the difficulties learners come across in speaking classes including low participation, and interference from first lathe nguage. She also concluded that learners did not improve their speaking ability since they had not developed three components of speaking called vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation.

Many studies have compared formative feedback with summative feedback (Bloom & others, 1971; Gezer, Sunkur, & Sahin, 2014; Yaghoobi & Mashhadi, 2013; Abdullayeva, 2016; Özdemir & Özkan, 2017). Results of these studies show a direct and almost high correlation between these two types of feedback. Also, the results of some research (Fuchs, Fuchs, Hamlett, Walz, & Germann, 1993; Fuchs, Hamlett, & Stecker, 1991; Stecker, Fuchs, & Fuchs, 2005; Fletcher, Lyon, Fuchs, & Barnes, 2018) show that formative feedback receivers have had a better performance in learning a target language compared to those who have not received any formative feedback.

Research Questions

Based on what was stated above, in the present study the following research questions and hypotheses were addressed:

RQ₁: Does formative feedback affect the speaking performance of EFL learners?

RQ₂: Does summative feedback affect the speaking performance of EFL learners?

RQ₃: Which kind of feedback is more effective on the performance of EFL learners?

H₁: Formative feedback affects the speaking performance of EFL learners.

H₂: Summative feedback is more effective on the speaking performance of EFL learners.

H₃: Formative feedback and summative feedback equally affect the speaking performance of EFL learners.

METHOD

Design of the Study

To investigate feedback concerning the speaking performance of language learners regarding both sexes, a quasi-experimental method was employed.

Participants

The participants of this study included male and female students in an English institute named Dehkade-e-Jahani in Tabriz in 2019. They were selected from among the inhabitants of Baghmisheh and Valiasr townships in Tabriz whose native language was mainly Turkish, with some exceptions whose native language was Persian. They were mostly high school students who attended a private institute to learn English as a foreign language. 80 language learners (whose language proficiency performance in PET was average to high and were ready to cooperate with the researchers) formed the statistical population of the present research were chosen as our sample using a random method.

Instruments

To analyze the collected data, first a normality test was conducted by the researcher. Kolmogor's Smirnov normality test was employed to find out how normal the distribution of data was. Second, a homogeneity test was administered to determine the variance in the data. We calculated the average score or the mean in the second stage. Then, we analyzed the pre-test and post-test results from both experimental groups to obtain the mean score from each test. The final stage was testing the hypotheses using a t-test.

Procedures

The research was carried out by the regular institute teachers who taught in the institute and

the author of the paper was monitoring the activity being carried out through regular checks of the classes and through administering the tests in the institute with the help of each class teacher. This study was done during a term in the institute mentioned above and it took about two months. A speaking rubric adapted from Brown (2000) was employed to measure students' scores during the pre-test and post-test test activities. The measured elements of speaking were fluency, vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, and comprehensibility. The speaking performance of the students was the dependent variable, while students' proficiency level was the independent variable. The level of students was considered as a control variable and using the class teachers to carry out the study was considered a moderator variable.

Also, the time and place of taking the tests at the start and end of the project were noticed as confounding variables which caused some problems in the scores gained. To have reliable results, one researcher and a colleague examined the speaking performance of each student. Each student was given a score based on Brown's rubric for speaking by each evaluator. Cohen's Kappa statistic was employed to measure the inter-rater reliability, ranging from - 0.1 to +1.0.

RESULTS

To study the normality of the distribution of the data collected from both groups of formative and summative feedback in both the pre-test and post-test test the Shapiro-Wilk test was used. The results are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1
The Shapiro-Wilk tests for speaking performance of FFG and SFG

Variable	Groups	Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.
Speaking Pre-test	Formative Feedback Group	.96	40	.16
	Summative Feedback Group	.90	40	.09
Speaking Post-test	Formative Feedback Group	.98	40	.19
	Summative Feedback Group	1.12	40	.26

As it is inferred from Table 1, the results of Shapiro-Wilk tests display that the data collected from the FFG and SFG participants in the pre-test and post-test were normally distributed ($p > 0.05$).

Answering Research Questions

Table 2
The descriptive statistics for of FFG

Variables		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Speaking Performance	Pre-test	148.18	40	5.82	.92
	Post-test	156.00	40	3.31	.52
Vocabulary	Pre-test	2.85	40	1.23	.19
	Post-test	4.00	40	.87	.13
Fluency	Pre-test	2.78	40	1.02	.16
	Post-test	3.85	40	.80	.12
Grammar	Pre-test	2.38	40	1.21	.19
	Post-test	4.10	40	.84	.13
Pronunciation	Pre-test	2.73	40	1.08	.17
	Post-test	3.85	40	.73	.11
Comprehension	Pre-test	2.65	40	1.12	.17
	Post-test	3.90	40	.98	.15

The first research question was about examining the effect of EFL teachers' feedback (formative or summative) on EFL learners' speaking performance. A within-group analysis was run independently, and then the speaking performances of learners in this group were compared in pre-test and post-test.

The descriptive statistics of the speaking performance of FFG participants are shown in Table 2. As can be seen, the speaking performance of FFG members, with all its aspects including vocabulary,

fluency, grammar, pronunciation, and comprehension, has increased from the pre-test to the post-test. To see whether these increases in scores are statistically significant, the t-tests were run.

Table 3
The paired-sample t-test results for FFG

Variables	Paired Differences			t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean			
Speaking Pre-test-Post-test	-7.82	4.60	.72	-10.74	39	.00
Vocabulary	-1.15	1.18	.18	-6.11	39	.00
Fluency	-1.07	1.40	.22	-4.84	39	.00
Grammar	-1.72	1.56	.24	-6.95	39	.00
Pronunciation	-1.12	1.20	.19	-5.91	39	.00
Comprehension	-1.25	1.00	.15	-7.85	39	.00

As Table 3 shows, FFG learners' speaking performance, with all its aspects of vocabulary, fluency, grammar, pronunciation, and comprehension, has significantly improved ($p < .05$). In other words, giving formative feedback by EFL teachers significantly improved EFL learners' speaking performance.

Regarding the second research question, "Does summative feedback affect speaking performance of language learners considerably?" a within-group analysis was run independently and using the t-test, and then the speaking performances of learners in this group were compared in pre-test and post-test, as shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4
The descriptive statistics of SFG

Variables		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Speaking Performance	Pre-test	149.35	40	6.53	1.03
	Post-test	152.18	40	5.07	.80
Vocabulary	Pre-test	2.68	40	1.32	.21
	Post-test	3.38	40	.89	.14
Fluency	Pre-test	2.63	40	1.03	.16
	Post-test	3.08	40	.76	.12
Grammar	Pre-test	2.60	40	1.17	.18
	Post-test	3.23	40	.86	.13
Pronunciation	Pre-test	2.75	40	1.17	.18
	Post-test	3.18	40	.87	.13
Comprehension	Pre-test	2.45	40	1.06	.16
	Post-test	3.05	40	1.17	.18

Table 4 displays the descriptive statistics of the speaking performance of SFG participants. Their speaking performance, in all its aspects, indicated an increase from the pre-

test to the post-test. To see whether such an increase is significant statistically, the paired-samples t-test was employed (Table 5).

Table 5
The paired-sample t-test Results for SFG

Variables	Paired Differences			t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean			
Speaking Pre-test-Post-test	-2.82	4.40	.69	-4.05	39	.000
Vocabulary	-.70	1.28	.20	-3.44	39	.001
Fluency	-.45	.71	.11	-3.98	39	.000
Grammar	-.62	.89	.14	-4.40	39	.000
Pronunciation	-.42	1.05	.16	-2.53	39	.015
Comprehension	-.60	1.29	.20	-2.92	39	.006

Findings in Table 5 show that SFG members' speaking performance showed a significant improvement ($p < .05$). That is, giving summative feedback by EFL teachers significantly developed EFL learners' speaking ability.

To answer the third research question: "Which formative feedback or summative feedback affects the speaking performance of language learners in Iran more?" a one-way

ANCOVA (analysis of covariance) was run, controlling for any possible intervening effect of the pre-test. The results of Levene's test, as an assumption of ANCOVA besides normality of distribution, showed that error variances for learners' speaking performance post-test as the dependent variable were equal ($p > .05$). The related descriptive statistics can be found below (Table 6).

Table 6
Descriptive statistics of ANCOVA

Groups	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Formative Feedback G.	156.00	3.31	40
Summative Feedback G.	152.18	5.07	40
Total	154.09	4.67	80

As shown in Table 6, the FFG's mean score was found to be 156.00 ± 3.31 , and that of SFG was 152.18 ± 5.07 , indicating FFG gained a higher

speaking score than its counterpart. To see whether this difference in speaking performance was significant, an ANCOVA was run (Table 7).

Table 7
The results of ANCOVA

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Speaking Pre-test	673.70	1	673.70	68.25	.00	.47
Treatment	380.70	1	380.70	38.56	.00	.33
Error	760.06	77	9.87			
Total	1901163.00	80				

According to Table 7, FFG and SFG are significantly different in speaking performance.

Table 8
Results of covariance analysis between formative feedback and summative feedback groups regarding the isolated 5 speaking performance dimensions

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Vocabulary Pre-test	9.51	1	9.51	14.12	0.00	0.155
Treatment	6.63	1	6.63	9.84	0.02	0.113
Error	51.86	77	0.674			
Total	1157	80				
Fluency Pre-test	3.41	1	3.41	5.91	0.017	0.017

Treatment	11.02	1	11.02	19.09	0.00	0.199
Error	44.45	77	0.577			
Total	1157	80				
Grammar Pre-test	3.64	1	3.64	5.29	0.024	0.064
Treatment	16.62	1	16.62	24.17	0.039	
Error	52.93	77	.687			
Total	1145	80				
Pronunciation Pre-test	6.33	1	6.33	10.94	0.001	0.124
Treatment	9.28	1	9.28	16.04	0.000	0.172
Error	44.54	77	0.578			
Total	1047	80				
Comprehension Pre-test	16.94	1	16.94	17.50	0.000	0.185
Treatment	11.59	1	11.59	11.97	0.001	0.135
Error	74.55	77	0.968			
Total	1072	80				

The data in Table 8 represent the results of covariance tests between formative feedback and summative feedback groups regarding vocabulary, fluency, grammar, pronunciation, and comprehension. Results showed that in all aspects mentioned, formative feedback has had a more meaningful effect than summative feedback.

Taking into account the results of the speaking test and regarding the fourth research question: “Q₄: Which of male or female learners of English have a better speaking performance of language in Iran?”. It was found that, the female EFL learners did not outperform the male EFL learners in speaking ability. There were slight differences in the marks, in which the female EFL learners obtained higher marks than the male EFL learners. Nevertheless, when the speaking test was administered to both male and female students, it was found that nearly all of the male EFL learners were more confident, in vocabulary, grammar, and fluency. Yet, the female EFL learners inconsiderably outperformed in comprehension and pronunciation.

Considering the pronunciation component, female EFL learners obtained higher marks than male ones. From the individual marks, only one male EFL learner received an ‘excellent’ mark in pronunciation, but the other male EFL learners received merely ‘good’ scores. Therefore, two female EFL learners achieved ‘excellent’ scores, but the other EFL learners received ‘good’ scores. Furthermore, the result demonstrated that some EFL learners having an

average value of ‘good’ marks had problems with pronunciation, particularly in producing the sounds or the English vocabulary in speaking.

Considering vocabulary use, only two female EFL learners who were asked to describe the picture of basic, personal, and survival tools had poor vocabulary. However, half of the male students had difficulties in using the relevant vocabulary to describe the tools, they tended to directly translate from their first language, or mix both languages (Persian and English). The rest of the male students could produce the language with sufficient words.

Regarding the components of grammar, comprehension, and fluency, the female learners were in a better position. Even though the range of marks between the male and female learners varied slightly, the result of this study demonstrated that the results were statistically significant because the t-test was lower than the t-table ($1.67 < 1.72$). Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. Similar to these findings, the research by Halimah (2010), Miami (2013), and Qian (2015) also found similar results. The gist of these studies was that female learners outperformed male learners in speaking ability, although they differed in their levels from major to minor.

DISCUSSION

This study has dealt with investigating the impact of one of the key responsibilities of English instructors, i.e., feedback using formative or summative methods. This responsibility

of English teachers refers to identifying the mistakes of language learners and presenting criticisms, directions, and suggestions to enhance language learners' speaking. Therefore, an English teacher is responsible to use the target language and the proper way of speaking in it regarding the elements of speaking through appropriate feedback (formative and summative) to make sure of improvement in the process of learning and stimulate language learners to establish communications with others. In this way, the English teacher can help learners in resolving speaking problems and revise the mistakes in the target language.

An important message for teacher training programs, particularly, continuous teacher education is that they need support in making more complicated decisions relating to corrective feedback in speaking (Busch 2010; Mackey et al. 2004). Vásquez and Harvey (2010,p.421) believe that after considering the cognitive aspects of corrective feedback in teacher training programs and the factors involved in producing effective learning through feedback, teachers reconsidered their practice leading to "a decreased emphasis on the affective dimension of error correction, and a more sophisticated understanding of corrective feedback, as well as an appreciation for the relationship between corrective feedback, student uptake, and error type". This emphasizes the fact that teacher training programs are practice-based, as realized by Ball and Forzani (2009), who focused both on the results of studies on how to produce efficient learning also on the obstacles (and limitations) of implementation. To put it in another way, it would be effective if scholars take into account the role of affective and practical classroom factors in considering the ways learners are involved with and use feedback produced (Pawlak, 2014).

The results of this study are in line with those reported by Rahimi and Zhang (2014). In their research, the subjects (learners) significantly favored receiving frequent corrective feedback in English conversation classes when the purpose, significance, and types of corrective feedback were clear to them (Rahimi & Zhang, 2014). It is worth mentioning that there is a consensus considering the need for

corrective feedback across different language proficiencies. Rahimi and Zhang (2014) stated that the learners expressed positive attitudes towards corrective feedback in English conversation classes when they knew the aims, importance, and kinds of corrective feedback at the beginning of the course. Most of the previous studies reported that almost all corrector in classroom settings is teachers (Van Lier, 1988; Yang et al, 2006; Allwright et al, 1991; Ellis, 2008; Hyland & Hyland, 2006).

CONCLUSION

The results demonstrated that there was a significant difference between the deployment of formative feedback compared to the implementation of summative feedback for teaching speaking skills. This proposes that although the use of formative feedback or summative feedback could help students develop their speaking abilities, the implementation of formative feedback by the teachers is preferred to the use of summative feedback because all the aspects of speaking evaluated enhanced to a higher degree. Considering the results of this study, it is recommended that EFL teachers ought to remember and practice eliminating gender bias in EFL classes and allocate the time in the class to all student learners to build self-confidence, overcome the anxiety and fear of making mistakes, and further encourage students to be active in class to express their beliefs and thoughts, and in English classes. It is suggested that English teachers should use the combination of feedback (formative as well as summative), in speaking classes specifically, as a supportive learning facilitator.

The findings can urge EFL teachers to promote EFL learners' speaking performance with the aid of summative and formative feedback. To achieve such goals, EFL teachers are recommended to customize different types of feedback to find the most appropriate model based on their learners' requirements and inclinations. Along with feedback, teachers should be sensitive to providing different types of activities and assignments by interestingly modifying them to diminish students' anxiety and stress. This will make the activities more accessible to a wider range of learners, particularly

introverts. Taking the results of this study into account, EFL syllabus designers and curriculum developers may also be persuaded to adapt English textbooks and other instructional resources for effective implementation of the summative and formative feedback techniques in EFL classrooms.

References

- Abdullayeva, M. (2016). Specificity of training future teachers to work with gifted children in the secondary educational school. *Путь науки*, (7), 69–71.
- Allwright, D., Allwright, R., & Bailey, K. M. (1991). Focus on the language classroom: An introduction to classroom research for language teachers. Cambridge University Press.
- Bashir, M., Azeem, M., & Dogar, A. H. (2011). Factor Effecting Students' English-Speaking Skills. *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 34-50.
- Boyer, S. (2002). Understanding English pronunciation: An integrated practice course. Glenbrook: Boyer Educational Resource.
- Boyle, J. P. (1987). Sex differences in listening vocabulary. *Language Learning*, 37(2), 273-284.
- Bozorgian, H. (2012). The Relationship between Listening and Other Language Skills in International English Language Testing System. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(4), 657-663.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy. San Francisco: Longman.
- Busch, D. (2010). Pre-service teacher beliefs about language learning: the second language acquisition course as an agent for change. *Language Teaching Research* 14, no. 3: 318–37.
- Efrizal, D. (2012). Improving Students' Speaking through Communicative Language Teaching Method at Mts Ja Shaq, Sentot Ali Basa Islamic Boarding School of Bengkulu, Indonesia. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(20), 127-134.
- Fletcher, J. M., Lyon, G. R., Fuchs, L. S., & Barnes, M. A. (2018). *Learning disabilities: From identification to intervention*. Guilford Publications.
- Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Hamlett, C. L., Walz, L., & Germann, G. (1993). Formative evaluation of academic progress: How much growth can we expect? *School Psychology Review*, 22, 27–27.
- Fuchs, L. S., Hamlett, D. F. C. L., & Stecker, P. M. (1991). Effects of curriculum-based measurement and consultation on teacher planning and student achievement in mathematics operations. *American educational research journal*, 28(3), 617–641.
- Gezer, M., Sunkur, M., & Sahin, I. F. (2014). An evaluation of the exam questions of the social studies course according to revised bloom's taxonomy. *Education Sciences & Psychology*, 28(2).
- Halimah, S. N. (2010). Male and female students' speaking ability (A comparative study in the fourth semester of the English Department of IAIN Walisongo in the academic year of 2009/2010). (Bachelor), IAIN Walisongo, Semarang.
- Harmer, Jeremy. (2007). *How to Teach English*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hatch, E. M., & Brown, C. (2001). Vocabulary, semantics, and language education. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hesami, A. (2013). *The Comparative Effect of Peer Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback on Elementary and Intermediate EFL Learners' Speaking Ability* (Master's Theses). Islamic Azad University Central Tehran Branch Faculty of Foreign Languages English Department. Retrieved from <http://ganj-old.iran-doc.ac.ir/articles/596065>
- Hinkel, E. (2005). Identity, culture, and critical pedagogy in second language teaching and learning. *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*, 4(3), 891–893.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues. Cambridge university press.
- Ismiati, A. N. (2013). A comparative study of English speaking skills between male

- and female students on the first-grade students of State Junior High School 5 Purworejo in the Academic Year 2011/2012. *Scripta: Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*, 1(2), 1-5.
- Kainvanpanah, S., S.M. Alavi and S. Sepehrinia. (2015). Preferences for interactional feedback: differences between learners and teachers. *The Language Learning Journal* 43, no. 1: 1–20.
- Kayi, H. (2006). Teaching speaking: Activities to promote speaking in a second language. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 7(11). Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Kayi-Teaching-Speaking.html>
- Kayi, H. (2012). Teaching speaking: Activities to promote speaking in a second language. *Новейшие научные достижения*, 12(2012).
- Kazemi, F., & Abbasian, G.-R. (2019). Incorporating Assessment-based Feedbacks into EFL Speaking Class: Metalinguistic Feedback vs. Explicit Correction. *Foreign Language Research Journal*, 9(2), 539-564. <https://doi.org/10.22059/jflr.2019.260230.524>
- Locke, A. (2013). *Teaching speaking and listening: One step at a time* (revised edition). London: Bloomsbury Education.
- Lukitasari, N. (2003). *Students' Strategies in Overcoming Speaking Problems in Speaking Class*. University of Muhammadiyah Malang.
- Mackey, A., C. Polio and K. McDonough. (2004). The relationship between experience, education, and teachers' use of incidental focus-on-form techniques. *Language Teaching Research* 8, no. 3: 301–27.
- Natsir, Y., Yusuf, Y. Q., & Huri, A. D. (2016). The male and female EFL students' language learning styles. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the First Reciprocal Graduate Research Symposium between University Pendidikan Sultan Idris and Syiah Kuala University (pp. 66-73). Banda Aceh.
- Pawlak, M. (2014). Investigating learner engagement with oral corrective feedback: aims, methodology, outcomes. In *Awareness in Action: The Role of Consciousness in Language Acquisition*, eds. A. Lyda and K. Szcześniak, 69–84. London: Springer.
- Pfauwadel, M.-C. (1986). *Etre bègue*[To stutter]. Paris: Retz.
- Pourhosein Gilakjani, A. (2016). What Factors Influence the English Pronunciation of EFL Learners? *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods (MJLTM)*, 6(2), 314-326.
- Prieto, (2007). Improving Eleventh Graders' Oral Production in English Class through Cooperative Learning Strategies, *PROFILE*, 8,75-90. Bogotá, Colombia
- Qian, W. (2015). A study of the influence of gender differences on English learning of senior high school students. *Higher Education of Social Science*, 8(6), 66-69.
- Rahimi, M., & Zhang, L. J. (2015). Exploring non-native English-speaking teachers' cognitions about corrective feedback in teaching English oral communication. *The system*, 55, 111-122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.09.006>
- Richards, J. C. (2003). *Teaching listening and speaking*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2008). *Teaching listening and speaking*. Cambridge university press Cambridge, England.
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge university press.
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2010). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (4th Ed). London: Pearson Education
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effects of corrective feedback, language aptitude, and learner attitudes on the acquisition of English articles. In A. Mackey (Eds.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: a collection of empirical studies* (pp. 301-322). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Smith, M. W., & Wilhelm, J. D. (2002). Reading doesn't fix any Chevys: Literacy in the lives of young men. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Stecker, P. M., Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (2005). Using curriculum-based measurement to improve student achievement: Review of research. *Psychology in the Schools*, 42(8), 795–819.
- Urrutia León, W., & VegaCely, E. (2010). Encouraging Teenagers to Improve Speaking Skills through Games in a Colombian Public School, *PROFILE*, 12(1), 11-31. Bogotá, Colombia.
- Van Lier, L. (1988). The classroom and the language learner: Ethnography and second-language classroom research. Longman London.
- Vásquez, V. and J. Harvey. (2010). Raising teachers' awareness about corrective feedback through research replication. *Language Teaching Research* 14, no. 4: 421–43.
- Viriya, C., & Sapsirin, S. (2014). Gender differences in language learning style and language learning strategies. *Indonesia Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(2), 77-88.
- Williams, M., & Burden, R. L. (1997). *Psychology for Language Teachers: A Social Constructivist Approach*. ERIC.
- Yaghoobi, M., & Mashhadi, J. (2013). Probing the impact of formative testing in Iranian English language learners upon their enhancement. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 3(2), 252–256.
- Yang, M., Badger, R., & Yu, Z. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of second language writing*, 15(3), 179–200.
- Yoshida, R. (2008). Learners' perception of corrective feedback in pair work. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41(3), 525-541.
- Zafar, S., & Meenakshi, K. (2012). Individual learner differences and second language acquisition: A review. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3(4), 639-646.
- Zellner, B. (1994). Pauses and the temporal structure of speech. In E. Keller (Ed.), *Fundamentals of speech synthesis and speech recognition* (pp. 41-62). Chichester: John Wiley.
- Zoghi, M., Kazemi, S. A., & Kalani, A. (2013). The effect of gender on language learning. *Journal of Novel Applied Sciences*, 2(S4), 1124-1128.

Biodata

Khodaverdi Alizadeh is a Ph.D. candidate at Islamic Azad University, Tabriz Branch. He has taught courses related to language teaching, General English, and ESP courses for different groups of learners at Islamic Azad University, Ahar Branch, and Tabriz Payam-e-Nour University. Also, he has taught several courses in other branches of Azad University such as Ilkhichi, Khamenei, Bostanabaad, and Horand. He has published a textbook for General English has published some articles in local and international journals and has participated in some national and international conferences as a presenter. His interests are TEFL and discourse research. Email: khodaverdializadeh@gmail.com

Dr. Nasser Ghafouri holds a Ph.D. in TEFL and is an Assistant Professor at IAU, Tabriz Branch. He has taught postgraduate courses in applied linguistics, research methodology, testing, and teaching for more than 20 years in IAU, Tabriz, Sarab, and Maragheh Branches. He has also been a part-time lecturer in English translation Master's Programs at Azarbayjan Payame Noor University for more than 10 years. He has supervised more than 50 M.A. theses and Ph.D. dissertations and has published several articles in local and international journals and participated in many international conferences. His research interests are Applied Linguistics, EFL teaching, testing, and translation. Email: ghafori.nasser1968@gmail.com

Touran Ahour is an assistant professor in TEFL and an academic staff member at Islamic Azad University, Tabriz branch, Iran. She has published books and articles in scholarly journals and presented at national and international conferences. Her research interests include materials evaluation, reading-writing connection, writing assessment, teaching skills, and ELT issues. Email: torahour2@yahoo.com