

41-How well can differences in gender explain student reactions to written corrective feedback to multiple draft essays in an EFL context?

Vasfiye GEÇKİN¹

APA: Geçkin, V. (2020). How well can differences in gender explain student reactions to written corrective feedback to multiple draft essays in an EFL context? *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (Ö8), 511-522. DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.816988.

Abstract

This paper explores whether gender differences can account for reactions and preferences of tertiary level students to written corrective feedback (WCF) given to their multiple draft essays in an EFL setting in Turkey. The specific areas under investigation are (a) how much of the feedback given to the preliminary and final drafts are read and paid attention to, (b) the preferred (i) main feedback providing agent(s) (ii) method(s) of correction, (iii) language of feedback, (c) the beliefs on (i) the content of feedback (ii) what needs to be corrected in multiple draft essays and finally (d) students' self-evaluations of their writing skills in L2 English. By adopting a structured survey approach, the data were collected from 160 students (half females) who responded to a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire ($\alpha=.85$) adapted from Ferris (1995) and Lee (2008). Independent sample T-test results revealed that both groups read most of the WCF given to their preliminary drafts but only some of the WCF given to their final drafts, preferred English as the language of WCF and had no trouble comprehending the feedback given in English. The writing instructor was the preferred main feedback providing agent for both groups. The female students differed significantly from their male peers in that the females asked for more content related feedback to their first drafts, grammar and lexical feedback to their final drafts, preferred coded feedback and valued a combination of comments, corrections and teacher grades more than the males did.

Keywords: Gender differences, EFL, student beliefs, written corrective feedback, multiple draft essays

Yabancı dil olarak İngilizcenin öğretildiği bir ortamda çoklu taslak kompozisyonlara verilen yazılı düzeltici geribildirimine öğrenci tepki ve yeğleyişlerinin ne kadarını cinsiyet farklılıkları açıklayabilir?

Öz

Bu çalışma, Türkiye'de İngilizce'nin yabancı dil olarak öğretildiği bir ortamda, hazırlık okulu öğrencilerinin, çoklu taslak kompozisyonlarına aldıkları yazılı düzeltici geri bildirim (YDG) dair tepki ve yeğleyişlerinin ne kadarının cinsiyet farklılıkları açısından açıklanabileceğini araştırmaktadır. İnceleme altındaki araştırma alanları (a) öğrencilerin ilk ve daha sonraki taslaklarına verilen geribildirim ne kadarını okuyup ne kadarına dikkat ettikleri, (b) tercih edilen (i) ana geribildirim veren kişiler (ii) düzeltme metotları, (iii) geribildirim dili, (c) (i) geribildirim içeriğine (ii) çoklu taslaklarda nelerin düzeltilmesi gerektiğine dair inanışları ve en son olarak da (d) öğrencilerin yabancı dil olarak İngilizce'deki yazı becerilerini kişisel değerlendirmeleridir. Benimsenen desen Ferris (1995) ve Lee (2008)'den adapte edilen 5'li Likert tipi tutum ölçeğinin

¹ Asst. Prof., İzmir Democracy University, Faculty of Education, Foreign Language Education Department (Izmir, Turkey), vgeckin@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8532-8627 [Makale kayıt tarihi: 12.09.2020-kabul tarihi: 20.11.2020; DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.816988]

cevaplandırıldığı yapılandırılmış ankettir ($\alpha=.85$). 160 öğrenci (yarısı kadın) çalışmaya katılmıştır. İlişkisiz örneklem t-testi sonuçları her iki grubun da ilk taslaklara verilen YDG'nin çoğunu, daha sonraki taslaklara verilen YDG'nin sadece bir kısmını okuduğunu, geribildirim dili olarak anlamakta da güçlük çekmediği İngilizce'yi tercih ettiklerini göstermiştir. Akademik yazmadan sorumlu öğretim görevlisi tercih edilen ana YDG'nin kaynağı olarak görülmektedir. Kadın öğrenciler, erkek yaşlılarından, ilk taslaklarına, daha fazla içerikle alakalı YDG istemeleri ve daha sonraki taslaklarına da dilbilgisi ve sözcüksel hatalarına yönelik YDG istemeleri açısından ayrılmaktadırlar. Bu iki grubun bir başka ayrıldığı nokta, kadın öğrencilerin, YDG olarak kodlamayı daha fazla tercih etmeleri, yorum, düzeltme ve öğretmenin notuyla değerlendirilmenin harmanlandığı bir YDG kombinasyonunu erkek öğrencilerden daha fazla yeğlemeleridir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Cinsiyet farklılıkları, yabancı dil olarak İngilizce, öğrenci inanışları, yazılı düzeltici geribildirim, çoklu taslak kompozisyonlar

Introduction

The task of writing in a second language (L2) is quite a cognitively demanding one requiring lexical, structural, content and linguistic information where one needs to get involved in a continuing cycle of planning, formulating, revising and rewriting. In order to help students improve their writing skills in the L2, the most widely used method employed by many writing instructors is providing written corrective feedback (WCF), which students are willing to receive (Ferris & Roberts, 2001). In this tiresome process, it is no surprise that many L2 writing instructors usually trust their intuition, experience and student expectations to overcome the immediate challenge of guiding these inexperienced writers (Ferris, 2011). When the comprehensiveness of the corrective feedback is taken into consideration, many students appreciate feedback given to all the errors they have committed (Hamouda, 2011; Leki, 1991). Although providing students with different methods of WCF is quite a common practice, it should be noted that the disputes on the usefulness of feedback regarding its role on the development of writing skills in a second/ foreign language is far from being settled (see Ferris, 1999; 2006; Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Truscott, 1996; Truscott & Hsu, 2008).

One understudied area in the literature is the interplay between gender and student beliefs about WCF. Research in this area can guide practitioners to gain insight into the psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic mechanisms shaped by gender differences so that the students can be given the necessary guidance in the course of becoming proficient writers in a second/foreign language. Among the very few studies investigating the role of gender on student preferences about WCF, the general conclusion is that the males and females do not differ in their perceptions of the WCF given to their academic writings (Alavi & Kaivanpanah, 2007; Al-Shammari, 2011; Kahraman & Yalvaç, 2015). The claim is that both groups of students hold similar beliefs about the WCF practices in the L2 writing classes. Research in student beliefs about WCF suggests that indirect forms of WCF including the use of symbols, codes or underlining the erroneous parts facilitate autonomous learning in which the students are involved in a hypothesis testing process of discovering and self-correcting their errors as long as they can understand what the codes or symbols refer to (Bitchener, 2008; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2013; Hartshorn & Evans, 2012). The use of direct WCF, on the other hand, can be opted for in cases of untreatable idiosyncratic errors (Ferris, 2011). Having been assigned grades and given coded feedback rather than being bombarded with teacher comments were considered to be more fruitful in the learning process (Radecki & Swales, 1988). Still, one needs to keep in mind that the use of both direct and indirect WCF would be the optimal strategy (Brown, 2012) and that the WCF needs to be timely,

constant, manageable and frequent (Hartshorn et al., 2010). Although teachers value the grammatical feedback given to improve student accuracy, students prefer to receive more content-related feedback (Agbayahoun, 2016). The teacher is considered to be the central feedback providing agent in the process-based approach to teaching writing (Harmer, 2004). Students are also reported to trust the feedback obtained from the teachers especially when they are native speakers of English (Liu & Hansen, 2002). In addition, many L2 students believe that peer feedback helps them to improve their writing skills (Jacobs et al., 1998).

Despite the lack of evidence on the role gender plays in WCF practices in L2 classes, it is reported to be one of the factors that determines proficiency in L2 writing with respect to genres (Franciset al., 2001), process and product (Kubota, 2003). In the Iranian context, for example, the males are reported to perform better on one-paragraph opinion essays and the females on descriptive ones after receiving ten sessions of writing instruction (Kamari et al., 2012). This difference can be attributed to the fact that the females rate themselves as more successful writers than the males and are reported to be more confident in writing detailed descriptions (Peterson, 2006). It is also acknowledged that the female students are more aware of the effect of self-beliefs in their writing potential and it directly influences their motivation and engagement in the writing process (Hawthorne, 2008). In the lack of comprehensive research investigating the role of gender in student beliefs about WCF to multiple draft essays, this study aims to fill the gap by examining the relationship between gender and student beliefs about WCF in the course of learning academic writing skills through a process oriented approach in an EFL context in Turkey. The outline of the paper is as follows. First, the methodology will be presented, followed by the results and finally a thorough discussion of the findings will be given with respect to the recent findings in the field.

Method

The study adopted a structured survey approach investigating student reactions and beliefs through a 5-point Likert scale. In this study, the following research questions were addressed:

1. Is there a relationship between gender and expectations from the instructor to correct each and every mistake the student makes?
2. Do males and females differ in their preference regarding the language of feedback and its comprehension?
3. Is there a relationship between gender and how much of each essay is read over when the instructor returns it?
4. What kind of comments and corrections do male and female students prefer to their multiple draft essays?
5. How much attention do male and female students pay to the WCF given to their essays?
6. What method(s) of WCF do male and female students prefer?
7. What content do male and female students prefer to be included in the WCF?
8. Is there a relationship between gender and the favored feedback providing agent?
9. Is there a relationship between gender and self-evaluations of proficiency in general and academic writing skills in L2 English?

Participants

160 students doing a preparatory year to qualify for the departmental studies in an English medium university in Turkey took part in the study. An equal number of male and female students across four

different proficiency levels (i.e. beginner, pre-intermediate, intermediate and advanced) responded to the given questionnaire. The males and females had a mean age of 18 (see Table 1). The male participants did not differ from their female counterparts in terms of their chronological age, $t(158) = .55, p = .58$ or the age they reported to have gained fluency in writing in a foreign language, $t(158) = 1.47, p = .14$.

Table 1. Demographics of participating students

Participants	Age				Fluency in L2 writing		
	n	\bar{X}	SD	Range	\bar{X}	SD	Range
Male	80	18.85	.71	18-21	10.19	2.35	6-18
Female	80	18.93	.99	18-25	10.76	1.58	5-18

Instrument

The instrument used in this study was adapted from Ferris (1995) and Lee (2008). The validity of the instrument was constructed by three expert opinions in the field with an acceptable alpha reliability coefficient of .85. Ferris (1995) explored student reactions and beliefs on WCF to multiple draft essays and Lee (2008) aimed to investigate student preferences about the frequency they would like to be corrected, the main feedback delivering agent(s), the language, the method(s) and the content of the WCF and students' evaluations of their (academic) writing skills in L2 English. The instrument categorized the preferred main feedback providing agent(s) as (i) the writing instructors, (ii) peers, (iii) students themselves and (iv) the writing center instructors. The beliefs regarding the content of feedback included (i) the structural (ii) grammatical, (iii) lexical (iv) content-related feedback and (v) general comments such as praises. The methods of correction were presented as direct (i.e. direct correction, metalinguistic feedback) and indirect (i.e., use of symbols, codes and underlining) forms of feedback. Student responses were obtained on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 meant *never, very poor* or *none of it* and 5 meant *always, excellent* or *all of it*. Student beliefs on the content of feedback ranged from receiving grades, corrections and comments to a combination of those with respect to their preliminary and final drafts. Finally, students' self-evaluations of their general and academic writing skills in L2 English were reported.

Data collection procedures

The necessary ethics clearance was taken from Boğaziçi University Board of Ethics (ID:2019/15). Participation to the study was on voluntary basis and the participants were recruited through convenience sampling. Data collection took place in class with the help of the writing instructors who were given a training on how to implement the questionnaire which was conducted in English. It took around 15 minutes for each participant to complete the beliefs questionnaire which was piloted on 20 students prior to its large-scale administration.

Data analysis

Both descriptive and referential statistics were reported. A series of independent sample t-tests were run on the statistical software SPSS (version 25) to explore the differences and similarities in the beliefs the male and female tertiary level students held about WCF practices.

Results

This section presented findings regarding each research question.

Gender and student expectations of WCF for each and every mistake

Table 2 presented descriptive statistics on whether the students preferred their each and every mistake to be corrected. Both groups stated that they would like their mistakes to be usually corrected.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for frequency of WCF

Group	n	\bar{X}	SD	Level
Male	80	3.93	1.07	Usually
Female	80	3.98	.99	Usually

In this respect, the male and female preferences did not differ significantly, $t(158) = .30, p = .56$.

Gender and the language of feedback and its comprehension

Both groups preferred to be given feedback in English most of the time, and they reported that they usually understood the feedback given in English (see Table 3).

Table 3. Descriptive statistics for student comprehension and preference of feedback in L2

Group	Preference			Comprehension			
	n	\bar{X}	SD	Level	\bar{X}	SD	Level
Male	80	4.36	.85	Usually	4.43	.60	Usually
Female	80	4.44	.76	Usually	4.48	.60	Usually

Although the female participants appreciated feedback in English more and reported to comprehend it pretty well, gender did not play a significant role in student preferences in receiving feedback in English, $t(158) = .59, p = .56$ or in comprehending the feedback given in English, $t(158) = .53, p = .60$.

Gender and how much of each essay is read over when the instructor returns it

Table 4 summarized the amount of attention both groups paid to the WCF on their preliminary and final drafts. Both groups stated that they paid more attention to the preliminary drafts than the final drafts.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics for student attention given to WCF in multiple drafts

Group	Preliminary drafts				Final draft		
	n	\bar{X}	SD	Level	\bar{X}	SD	Level
Male	80	3.95	1.16	Most of it	3.20	1.42	Some of it
Female	80	4.20	1.08	Most of it	3.46	1.27	Some of it

The female group reported to pay a lot more attention than the males to the WCF provided to their preliminary drafts and reported not to pay as much attention as the males did to their final drafts. Still,

no statistically meaningful difference existed between the males and females in terms of the attention they gave to the preliminary, $t(158) = 1.41, p = .16$ or the final drafts, $t(158) = 1.23, p = .22$.

Gender and the kind of comments/corrections the male and female students believe to be effective in their multiple draft essays

The questionnaire also addressed what components of the essay needed to be corrected and how much of such corrections were believed to contribute to their L2 writing skills in the preliminary and final drafts. The students were asked to rate how much of the feedback given on structure, content, use of grammar and lexis along with the general comments (i.e. praise) to their preliminary and final drafts.

Table 5. Descriptive statistics for student beliefs on WCF to multiple drafts

Component	Group	Preliminary drafts				Final drafts			
		n	\bar{X}	SD	Level	n	\bar{X}	SD	Level
Structure	Male	80	4.56	.74	Always	80	4.33	.90	Usually
	Female	80	4.63	.82	Always	80	4.45	.86	Always
Content	Male	80	4.18	.87	Usually	80	3.95	1.02	Usually
	Female	80	4.43	.74	Usually	80	4.16	.99	Usually
Grammar	Male	80	4.74	.52	Always	80	4.31	.95	Usually
	Female	80	4.86	.38	Always	80	4.70	.64	Always
Lexical	Male	80	4.54	.76	Always	80	4.18	1.12	Usually
	Female	80	4.66	.57	Always	80	4.53	.86	Always
General	Male	80	4.34	.84	Usually	80	4.06	1.12	Usually
	Female	80	4.39	.86	Usually	80	4.23	1.06	Usually

Across all the dimensions given in Table 5, the female students believed that receiving structural, grammatical, lexical, content-related and general feedback both to their first and subsequent drafts contributed to the improvement of their academic writing skills more than the males did. The female students held the opinion that corrections/ comments on the structure, grammar and vocabulary use needed to be included into their drafted essays all the time. Yet, the males preferred a similar feedback pattern to their preliminary drafts merely. The only significant difference existed in terms of the content related feedback the two groups believed to be effective in the development of their preliminary drafts. The female participants desired more feedback related to the content of their first draft essays more than the male students did, $t(158) = 1.96, p = .05$. The female students had the idea that the WCF on structure, grammar and lexis was indispensable in their final drafts. The males, on the other hand, usually appreciated feedback on all of these five components. The female students believed that feedback in their use of grammar, $t(158) = 3.02, p = .003$ and vocabulary, $t(158) = 2.22, p = .028$ was crucial.

Gender and the amount of student attention given to WCF

The table below visualized the amount of attention the students paid to the structural, content-related, grammatical, lexical feedback and general comments to their multiple draft essays in the preliminary and subsequent drafts.

Table 6. Descriptive statistics for student attention on WCF to multiple drafts

Component	Group	Preliminary drafts				Final drafts			
		n	\bar{X}	SD	Level	n	\bar{X}	SD	Level
Structure	Male	80	4.49	.80	Always	80	4.31	.99	Usually
	Female	80	4.53	.87	Always	80	4.44	.93	Usually
Content	Male	80	4.26	1.04	Usually	80	3.95	1.15	Usually
	Female	80	4.54	.66	Always	80	4.41	.84	Usually
Grammar	Male	80	4.68	.63	Always	80	4.43	.91	Usually
	Female	80	4.81	.45	Always	80	4.74	.57	Always
Lexical	Male	80	4.46	.87	Always	80	4.29	1.05	Usually
	Female	80	4.75	.66	Always	80	4.56	.87	Always
General	Male	80	4.25	1.05	Usually	80	3.95	1.31	Usually
	Female	80	4.45	.84	Always	80	4.26	1.03	Usually

The female students reported that they paid attention to all of the five forms of feedback given to their first drafts all the time. The male students paid less attention to the general comments and feedback related to the content when they received corrections to their first drafts. The only significant difference existed in terms of the content of the feedback the two groups reported to pay attention to in their preliminary drafts. The female participants paid more attention to the feedback related to the content of their essays than the male students, $t(158) = 2.0, p=.047$. Similarly, they valued corrective feedback to their lexical errors more, $t(158) = 2.35, p=.020$. Both groups exhibited a similar pattern of focus to the feedback given to their subsequent drafts in which they usually concentrated on the structural, content-related feedback and general comments. Yet, the female students still paid a lot more attention to the content related feedback, $t(158) = 2.91, p=.004$ and to the feedback on their use of grammar, $t(158) = 2.60, p=.010$ than the male students did.

Gender and the preferred method of WCF

Table 7 listed the direct and indirect feedback types along with student preferences which were believed to contribute to the academic writing skills in L2 English.

Table 7. Descriptive statistics for student preferences on corrective feedback types

Feedback type	Group	n	\bar{X}	SD	Level
Direct feedback: Direct correction	Male	80	4.10	1.06	Usually
	Female	80	4.01	1.24	Usually
Indirect feedback: Underlining	Male	80	3.84	1.10	Usually
	Female	80	4.10	.98	Usually
Indirect Feedback: Use of symbols	Male	80	3.14	1.24	Sometimes
	Female	80	3.13	1.17	Sometimes
Indirect Categorized Feedback: Use of codes	Male	80	3.46	1.22	Usually
	Female	80	3.91	1.05	Usually
	Male	80	4.44	.86	Always

Direct oral metalinguistic feedback	Female	80	4.56	.74	Always
-------------------------------------	--------	----	------	-----	--------

Among all the direct and indirect feedback forms, both groups appreciated direct feedback in the form of a metalinguistic discussion about their essays the most, followed by direct corrections provided by the writing instructor. The male students preferred indirect feedback in which the instructor underlined the erroneous parts and used symbols more often than the females who reported to have benefitted more from the coded feedback. The only statistically meaningful difference between the two groups existed in that the female students preferred more coded feedback than their male counterparts, $t(158) = 2.50, p = .013$.

Gender and the content to be included in WCF

As given in Table 8, for both groups, just being assigned a grade to their essays was the least favored WCF content. Especially, the female students did not believe that having been assigned grades only helped them improve their writing skills in L2 English.

Table 8. Descriptive statistics for student beliefs in the content of WCF

Feedback content	Group	n	\bar{X}	SD	Level
Grades	Male	80	2.13	1.12	Rarely
	Female	80	1.69	.74	Rarely
Corrections	Male	80	3.19	1.09	Sometimes
	Female	80	2.90	.97	Sometimes
Comments	Male	80	3.20	1.13	Sometimes
	Female	80	3.06	.92	Sometimes
Comments + corrections	Male	80	4.23	.83	Usually
	Female	80	4.28	.84	Usually
Comments + corrections + grades	Male	80	4.30	.86	Usually
	Female	80	4.60	.70	Always

The male students believed that grades, comments and corrections on their own could still help to improve their writing skills in L2 English. The females also manifested a similar pattern of beliefs. In general, a combination of corrections, comments and grades was appreciated by both groups. The male students differed significantly from their female peers in that they were still satisfied when they got grades only, $t(158) = 2.92, p = .004$, and viewed it as an effective form of WCF. The female students asked for a combination of feedback in the forms of comments, corrections and grades, $t(158) = 2.41, p = .017$ more often than the males did.

Gender and the favored feedback providing agent

Both groups favored the writing instructors as the main feedback providing agents. All the participants rarely asked for feedback from the writing center instructors who were rated as the least favored feedback providing agents by both groups (see Table 9).

Table 9. Descriptive statistics for student preferences on the feedback providing agents

Group	Writing instructors			Peers			Writing center instructors			Students themselves		
	<i>X</i> ⁻	SD	Level	<i>X</i> ⁻	SD	Level	<i>X</i> ⁻	SD	Level	<i>X</i> ⁻	SD	Level
Male	4.44	.86	Usually	2.85	1.19	Sometimes	1.54	1.21	Rarely	2.92	1.07	Sometimes
Female	4.56	.74	Always	2.88	1.13	Sometimes	1.51	1.09	Rarely	2.81	1.05	Sometimes

The two groups had a similar pattern of preference in terms of the main feedback providing agents and no statistical difference existed across groups. More specifically, the females trusted feedback from the classroom instructors, peers, themselves followed by the writing center instructors. The male students also trusted the classroom writing instructor as the main feedback providing agent, followed by the students themselves, peers and finally the writing center instructors.

Gender and self-evaluations of proficiency in general and academic writing skills in L2 English

Both groups rated their general and academic writing skills as adequate as summarized in Table 10 below.

Table 10. Descriptive statistics for student self-evaluation in L2 writing

Group	Writing in L2 English				Writing essays in L2 English			
	n	<i>X</i> ⁻	SD	Level	<i>X</i> ⁻	SD	Level	
Male	80	3.39	.96	Adequate	3.28	.86	Adequate	
Female	80	3.23	.93	Adequate	2.98	.86	Adequate	

The male writers judged themselves as better writers than the females both in terms of their general and academic writing skills in L2 English. No meaningful difference existed in the way the two groups rated their writing skills in L2 English in general, $t(158) = 1.08, p = .28$. However, the male students rated their academic writing skills in L2 English more advanced than the females, $t(158) = 2.22, p = .028$.

Discussion

This paper examined student beliefs about the WCF to the multiple draft essays in an EFL context in Turkey. From many aspects, the male and female students exhibited a similar pattern of feedback preferences which were believed to have contributed to their academic writing skills in L2 English. For instance, both groups believed in the necessity of WCF which validates the other findings in the literature (e.g., Kahraman, 2013; Lee, 2005). They also preferred feedback in English which was reported to be easily understood and trusted the classroom instructor as the main feedback providing agent. Followed by the classroom instructor, the females trusted peer feedback and the males trusted themselves more in the correction of errors in their academic essays. This finding is slightly different from that of Motlagh (2015) which reported that the females were cited to opt for teacher feedback whereas the males preferred a combination of feedback from the teachers and peers. Similar to the findings reported by Hamouda (2011), both groups appreciated essay-specific comments rather than general comments such as praises.

The observed similarities between the two groups in this study could be related to the fact that both groups were quite homogenous with respect to their proficiency in L2 English since they completed an intensive process-based writing program for two semesters (30 weeks) when they were given the questionnaire. Thus, it is no surprise that similar patterns of student preferences were observed in terms of their beliefs about the WCF. These similarities go hand in hand with the other findings in the literature (e.g., Alavi & Kaivanpanah, 2007; Al-Shammari, 2011; Kahraman & Yalvaç, 2015). In addition, both groups reported that they read most of the feedback given to their preliminary drafts whereas only some of the feedback given to their final drafts. This finding contradicts with that of Chiang's (2004) reporting that only 13% of the students always and only 10% of the students usually read over their compositions after receiving the instructor corrections. The finding that the female students asked for more content-related, grammar and lexical feedback verify the findings of Chiang (2004) and Hamouda (2011). Along with the findings of Black and Nanni (2016), this study also reported that metalinguistic feedback was the most preferred direct form of feedback that both the male and female students desired to receive on their written work. Self-assessments of L2 students' writing ability were reported to be affected by the grades assigned by the teachers rather than students' independent self-assessments on a particular writing task (Oscarson, 2009). In this study, the female students rated their performance in academic writing in L2 English more poorly than the males. However, the classroom instructors reported that the females were better off writers than the males. The female students' poorer self-perception of their academic writing performance can be related to their perfectionism or lack of self-confidence. Since students' self-confidence in their writing ability was cited to affect their writing motivation (Pajares & Valiante, 2006), the female students who had a negative correlation between their self-assessment and academic writing performance needed to be encouraged to construct a positive attitude over their writing capabilities.

Finally, the participants in this study also exhibited different preferences and reactions to the WCF methods with respect to gender. In terms of the preferred feedback method, the finding that the female students asked for more implicit feedback in the form of coded feedback was also reported in the literature (Ferdouse, 2012; Lee, 2005; Oladejo, 1993). In this sense, the instructor could aid the students to become aware of the errors that could be self-corrected.

Conclusion

The aim of this study was to shed light on the role of differences in gender in shaping student expectations of WCF to multiple draft essays. The writing instructors have to pay close attention to the dynamics in their writing classrooms and shape their WCF practices accordingly. Providing the females with coded feedback in preliminary drafts and feeding them with explicit feedback in the subsequent drafts may contribute to their learning process. Policy makers and curriculum developers have to take gender differences in academic settings into account and make sure that both genders are provided with the equal learning environments and resources (Bijami et al., 2013). The findings of this study pose implications for further comprehensive research where the role of gender can be investigated with a larger sample of different age groups studying at both public and private institutions.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Boğaziçi University School of Foreign Languages students who volunteered to take part in the study and the instructors and the administration for their kind help in data collection.

References

- Agbayahoun, J. P. (2016). Teacher written feedback on student writing: Teachers' and learners' perspectives. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6 (19), 1895–1904.
- Alavi, S. M., & Kaivanpanah, S. (2007). Feedback expectancy and EFL learners' achievement in English. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 3 (2), 181–196.
- Al-Shammari, S. R. (2011). *The attitude of male and female teachers and students towards teachers' feedback on the writings of secondary school students in Rafha City, Saudi Arabia*. MA Thesis King Saud University, Saudi Arabia.
- Bijami, M., Kashef, S.H., & Khaksari, M. (2013). Gender differences and writing performance: A brief review. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 1 (2), 8–11.
- Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 102–118.
- Black, D. A., & Nanni, A. (2016). Written corrective feedback: Preferences and justifications of teachers and students on a Thai context. *Journal of Language Studies*, 16 (3), 99–114.
- Brown, D. (2012). The written corrective feedback debate: The next steps for classroom teachers and practitioners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46 (4), 861–867.
- Chiang, K. (2004). An Investigation into students' preferences for and responses to teacher feedback and its implications for writing teachers. *Hong Kong Teachers' Centre Journal*, 3, 98–115.
- Ferdouse, F. (2012). Learning from mistakes: Using correction code to improve student's writing skill in English composition class. *Stamford Journal of English*, 7, 62–86.
- Ferris, D. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 33–53.
- Ferris, D. (1999). The case of grammar correction in L2 writing classes: a response to Truscott. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8 (1), 1–11.
- Ferris, D. R. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 81–104). Cambridge, UK. Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, D. R. (2011). *Treatment of error in second language student writing* (2nd edition). Ann Arbor. The University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2013). *Teaching L2 composition: Purpose, process, and practice* (3rd edition). New York. Routledge.
- Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10 (3), 161–184.
- Francis, B., Robson, J., & Read, B. (2001). An analysis of undergraduate writing styles in the context of gender and achievement. *Studies in Higher Education*, 26 (3), 313–326.
- Hamouda, A. (2011). A study of students and teacher's preference and attitudes towards correction of classroom written errors in Saudi EFL context. *English Language Teaching*, 4 (3), 128–141.
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Hartshorn, J., & Evans, N. (2012). The Differential Effects of Comprehensive Corrective Feedback on L2 Writing Accuracy. *Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 3 (2), 217–248.
- Hartshorn, K. J., Evans, N. W., Merrill, P. F., Sudweeks, R. R., Strong-Krause, D., & Anderson, N.J. (2010). Effects of dynamic corrective feedback on ESL writing accuracy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 44, 84–109.
- Hawthorne, S. (2008). Students' beliefs and barriers to engagement with writing in secondary school English: A focus group study. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 31 (1), 30–42.

- Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2006). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*. Cambridge, UK. Cambridge University Press.
- IBM Corp. Released 2017. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 25.0.
- Jacobs, G. M., Curtis, A., Braine, G., & Huang, S-Y. (1998). Feedback on student writing: Taking the middle path. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7, 307–317.
- Kahraman, A. (2013). Affective and cognitive effects of coded teacher feedback on writing students. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi [Hacettepe University Journal of Education]*, 28 (1), 189–201.
- Kahraman, A., & Yalvaç, F. (2015). EFL Turkish university students' preferences about teacher feedback and its importance. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199, 73–80.
- Kamari, E., Gorjian, B., & Pazhakh, A. (2012). Examining the effects of gender on second language writing proficiency of Iranian EFL students: Descriptive vs opinion one-paragraph essay. *Advances in Asian Social Science*, 3 (4), 759–763.
- Kubota, R. (2003). New approaches to gender, class, and race in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12 (1), 31–47.
- Lee, I. (2005). Error correction in the L2 writing classroom: What do students think? *TESL Canada Journal/Revue TESL Du Canada*, 22 (2), 1–16.
- Lee, I. (2008). Student reactions to teacher feedback in two Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 144–164.
- Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24 (3), 203–218.
- Liu, J., & Hansen, J. (2002). *Peer Response in Second Language Writing Classrooms*. Ann Arbor. The University of Michigan Press.
- Motlagh, L. N. (2015). Who do learners prefer to be corrected by? Teachers or classmates? *Procedia–Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199, 381–386.
- Oladejo, J. A. (1993). Error correction in ESL: Learners' preferences. *TESL Canada Journal/Revue TESL Du Canada*, 10 (2), 71–89.
- Oscarson, A. D. (2009). *Self-assessment of writing in learning English as a foreign language*. Göteborg Studies in Educational Sciences (277).
- Pajares, F., & Valiante, G. (2006). Self-Efficacy Beliefs and Motivation in Writing Development. In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 158–170). The Guilford Press.
- Peterson, S. (2006). Influence of Gender on Writing Development. In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 311–323). The Guilford Press.
- Radecki, P. M., & Swales, J. M. (1988). ESL student reaction to written comments on their written work. *System*, 16 (3), 355–365.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46 (2), 327–369.
- Truscott, J., & Hsu, A. (2008). Error Correction, Revision, and Learning. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 292–305.