

Effects of Gender and Proficiency on Written Corrective Feedback

Chongwon Park

English Language and Literatures Pukyong, National University at Busan, South Korea.

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to explore how gender and language proficiency plays a role as a mediating variable in accelerating the effect of Written Corrective Feedback (WCF). In the second language, the concept of accuracy was extended from linguistic to organization and content, and these three domains became the primary investigation of this study. In addition, opinion paragraph, which received little attention from previous WCF studies, will also be addressed in this study as the main consideration of this study. The study involved 226 university students and analyzed 1,130 samples of composition. The results of this study show that gender and language proficiency do not affect each other in determining the impact of WCF. Moreover, gender differences do not have a unique effect on the outcome of the WCF. However, the different language proficiency levels of learners selected in this study showed a distinct advantage for beginner and intermediate level students. On the other hand, it was reported that there was no difference between pre-test and post-test across students with advanced language proficiency. However, rather than reaching a hasty conclusion, this study suggests that researchers accept the incomparable characteristics of research on WCF and undertake advanced research that can enable comparisons between WCF studies. This study seeks to explore what items should be prioritized and what educational implications can be given to teachers at classes who need to teach learners at different levels, given the time constraints of writing classes.

Keywords: comprehensive feedback, dynamic written corrective feedback, level, gender

INTRODUCTION

Researchers in a second language or foreign language have become interested in systematically investigating a second language learner's error, known as Error Analysis, over the past 20 years, in their attempt to overcome the limitations of the second language analysis in that they cannot predict in advance the type of error that learners produce. However, from the perspective of the interpretation and processing of learners' errors, second language acquisitionists and writing experts have maintained different stance. One kind of error analysis, WCF, refers to a teacher making an assessment of a learner's composition with criteria for assessment in grammar, content, and organization, in which way there are three ways to simply draw a line about an error, present a target language with lines, or provide meta-lingual knowledge. Drawing lines alone is called indirect written corrective feedback, and providing feedback information along with the lines which is called direct written corrective feedback.

For a second language learner, writing is the act of acquiring one specific language item within a given time and is also a proof of learning that can be demonstrated by writing a new article in succession. In this regard, improving students' linguistic accuracy in writing has become a major concern. However, writing experts have focused more on the applicability of error analysis (EA) to the writing guidance field by expanding the scope of error analysis from linguistic items to content and organization. Composition experts set comprehensive and overall improvement as a major area of concern, as well as correction of grammar areas related to students' writing.

Despite the two distinct differences in perspectives, such as those of second language researchers and writing experts, both theorists and experts in second language writing have a common assumption that WCF will help improve grammatical accuracy or learners' overall writing skills. Moreover, Ferris stresses that both these positions provide a full picture of how a second language or foreign language is learned or acquired in a texted manner of communication, so they should be viewed as complementary rather than exclusive.

No one would agree with the conclusion that any specific guidance or training in explaining the WCF's learning outcomes and success or failure could have an exclusive effect on the outcome. This is because language learning or acquisition is a very complex social phenomenon, and countless variables can interact with each other. Therefore, in order to fully understand the process and consequences of language acquisition in writing, it will be important to consider that WCF may be influenced in some way by mediating variables and that relationships between variables need to be investigated.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine how the two mediating variables, gender and proficiency of L2 learners, interact with the WCF.

By conducting the studies described above, the researcher expected to extend the knowledge that on how gender and language proficiency affect the WCF and act as intervening variables and ultimately lead to the success or failure of the WCF.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The question of how different WCF methods affect students' writing has always been at the center of controversy in the field of English as a second language (ESL) or foreign language (EFL). According to Vaezi and others, there are six different methods of written corrective feedback such as explicit correction, clarification requests, meta-linguistic information, elicitation, repetition, and recast. These different types of written corrective feedback are integrated directly and indirectly, depending on the size of the directivity, in the delivery of feedback in a particular study. Theoretical arguments supporting direct or indirect written corrective feedback methods have often been considered learners' writing proficiency as one of intervening variables with the effect of written corrective feedback. Identifying whether students with different levels of language proficiency are equally receptive to the different ways of WCF, especially writing teachers who intend to accelerate students' development of writing skills by enhancing their language awareness.

Bitchner and others report that direct written corrective feedback shows positive results when the advanced level of writers were divided into four groups: (1) written meta-linguistic input, (2) indirect focused circle drawing, (3) written and oral meta-linguistic input, and (4) control group. While the results of Bitchener et al.'s study report that all three methods show better results in immediate post-testing compared to those of control group, two groups of direct feedback group reported better results in delayed post-testing 10 weeks later than the indirect feedback group.

However, Sauro examined the effects of metalinguistic feedback on the intermediate and advanced learners of Swedish learners when they were exposed to text-chat reformulation using newspaper. Although meta-linguistic group slightly show better results than control group from the immediate posttest, there was no difference between direct or indirect mode of feedback.

On the other hand, studies of intermediate or low-level learners report positive results. For example, Bitchener et al. investigated the effect of four different modes of written corrective feedback on intermediate level of learners, that is, (1) direct focused feedback, providing metalinguistic knowledge on written and spoken mode of communication, (2) the direct focus correction, the input of metalinguistic information in written language, (3) the direct-centered feedback, and (4) the control group. Their study reports that all three focus WCF groups outperformed the control group in an immediate post-test, and those of three delayed posttest over a 10-month period showed better results than a control group.

In the study of Young-hee Sheen et al., intermediate level learners were also examined by dividing them into four groups: (1) direct focus correction, (2) non-focus correction, (3) execution of composition, and (4) a control group to investigate the effects of different corrective feedback methods. Studies have shown that groups (1) through (3) both performed better in immediate and delayed post-test than in control, with groups (1) performing greater than in group (2).

Although the aforementioned studies are robust in terms of methodology and comparable among studies, the studies cited above focus significantly on a single language item or a small number of language items. Such a focus on only specific grammar items can be said to be problematic because students consciously monitor the use of that particular grammar item when they take a post-test.

Other studies that raise the question that language proficiency may serve as a parameter in the WCF, unlike those based on the aforementioned pre-test, delayed post-test design, and so on, suggest conflicting research results. For example, Ferris et. al report that beginning level students with a second language have improved their writing with the teacher's feedback. Without a teacher's feedback, students can hardly recognize their writing errors. As a result, students are frustrated. Ferris et al argue that through indirect feedback, learners are engaged in guided learning, which allows them to think about their errors, focus on the form of errors, and consequently maintain long-term memory.

However, in observations by other age groups whose age is 12 to 13, Icy Lee reports that most of the students in the study wanted teachers to correct their writing, but not everyone wanted written corrective feedback, and that students with less proficiency in writing did not value error correction methods as much as they would rate them, and sometimes they did not recognize the importance.

Haft, who provided a computer-aided computer-assisted WCF (Computer-assisted WCF) tool in guiding German to a foreign language, also conducted a study on the two types of corrections that were given to the development of the writing skills of beginning level students: meta-linguistic explanations and meta-linguistic clues. The results showed that in beginner-level learners there was no difference in self-correcting rates for self-specific feedback types and generic feedback types.

Over the course of the three semesters, however, learners have significantly increased their error-correction rates in response to explicit written corrective feedback (meta-linguistic explanation). On the other hand, the degree of learners' understanding of non-explicit (meta-linguistic cues) WCF has not changed significantly over time. These results indicate that explicit WCF benefits as students progressively become more familiar with metalinguistic terminology or computer-aided language learning programs (CALL programs).

However, Haft argues that he found no notable advantage in any type of corrective feedback. Thus, Ferris' findings that simply indicating the location of errors is enough for intermediate English learners to achieve a successful corrective feedback could also be applied to beginning level students who begin to learn a foreign language. Kepner examined the writing accuracy of two groups of intermediate-level Spanish learners. The experimental group receives direct corrective feedback, and the control group received content based instruction. The results of the study indicate that there is no significant difference between two groups of learners in terms of writing accuracy. On the other hand, Haft emphasized that from some of the essays where error categories were divided, direct feedback led more successful results. In searching for the mediating role of proficiency for the intermediate level learners,

Larande also compared the method of direct and indirect written corrective feedback, and for direct feedback group, the instructor wrote all the contents of the student's composition to correct it, and for corrective feedback groups, only the error correction symbol was used to indicate the error.

The results of the above study point out that in most non-verbal error categories, the indirect feedback group was better at writing than the direct written corrective feedback group. Semke compared the effects of four different teaching methods: (1) writing comments and questions rather than correcting errors; (2) providing presentation and correction forms for all errors; (3) combining positive comments and corrections; and (4) pointing out errors using symbols. Studies show that all four groups have improved the accuracy of their writing over the course of one semester, but there is no marked difference between the two methods, either direct or indirect written corrective feedback. In conclusion, while Larande argued for a greater effect in the explicit corrective feedback approach, the results of Semke's study showed that there was no difference between explicit and non-explicit corrective feedback. However, both studies cannot compare to each other on the grounds that there are no comparison group that have received no feedback at all. Therefore, it is unclear whether the treatment of the group of experiments conducted by researchers in each study is due to group difference or different parameters' involvement. The bottom line is that even the results of these studies did not provide a definitive and conclusive outcome of the effects of the WCF.

Brutton also warned that a written corrective study focusing on a particular area of grammar could be a study of fitting too well into a structured framework, such as a writing grammar exercise, rather than a real writing task. Van Boonigen and others went further and argued that: The WCF strongly argued that the methods of research should be similar to those used in real writing tasks, not just one use of grammatical features, considering that the purpose of teachers who correct students' writing tasks is to improve overall accuracy. Therefore, it is more urgent than anything else to expand the concept of accuracy, from language elements to all other English composition considerations, such as the system and content of writing.

The impact of the WCF could have on improving or degenerating students' writing ability is still difficult to determine. Among some of the papers mentioned on this issue, Ramazan and Harun investigated on gender differences in the use of past tense.

The results of the study show that female students make fewer errors in second language writing compared to male students. Therefore, it would be possible to say that women are better than men as language learners. However, it is necessary to be careful in interpreting the findings, considering that there has been no effort or processing to substantiate differences among the subjects in the study.

Ghani also studied 56 subjects' hedging devices and concluded that women were very knowledgeable about their language ability. If male and female learners show these unusual features in language learning, it could be a self-evident

fact that these characteristics affect the processing and results of the WCF. Moreover, in addition to the issue of gender impact, a more in-depth study is clearly required when it comes to the question of how gender and language proficiency interact with writing orthodontics. Moreover, in addition to the discussion of gender, further in-depth research looking at the interaction between gender and proficiency calls for scrutiny. Also, previous studies focusing on narrative style of writings have not fully investigated on the role of genre as a mediating variable in deciding success or failure of WCF.

Specifically, persuasion or thinking about other people's thoughts requires highly cognitive ability, especially those who write in a second language will have limited communication skills between cultures and also show deficit in their linguistic, rhetorical and strategic abilities.

While the previous studies mentioned so far has provided some insight into the relationship between sex, language proficiency, and WCF, it is imperative to expand the scope of accuracy from grammar, organization, and content in opinion writing.

Research questions derived from the previous studies are as follows:

- (1) Does the WCF show significant differences in overall quality of the composition by level (advanced, middle, and beginner)?
- (2) Does the WCF show significant differences between genders in terms of overall quality of composition?
- (3) Does the WCF have important interactions between language proficiency and gender in terms of overall quality of composition?

METHOD

Subjects

In order to answer the three research questions of the study, 226 students who took beginning level English writing courses for six years (2004, 2007, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012) were the primary investigation. Most students are English majors, and most of the classes observed in this study have been designated by the department as compulsory subjects for students in the second year of the English department who want to take beginning level English composition courses taught by Korean professors. Participants in the study included 166 female students and 60 male students from first to fourth graders. The subjects took the pretest, test 1, and post-test and submitted three writing assignments. A total of 1,130 samples of composition were collected and analyzed for the purpose of this study. The average error rate of 226 subjects was 0.085 in the pre-test, indicating that the subjects made about 9 errors out of 100 words. All the students were taught through the same textbook and one professor.

Procedures and instrument

At the beginning of the semester, in the pretest, students were asked to write whether they preferred city life or rural life. The test was conducted in a computer lab, and the students were given 30 minutes to complete their tasks. In the pre-test, the high frequency errors of 226 students were identified first, and the teacher researchers classified them according to three areas of composition components, including Dulay and Smazler, and the English Testing Services' writing assessment guidelines. Each error produced by the students was underlined, and a direct written corrective feedback method was used. Based on the integrated assessment guidelines, the researcher identified student errors, and by measuring students' errors per 100 words, accuracy score was converted from the raw score. In this study, accuracy refers to organization and content as well as grammar.

The same researcher randomly selected 30 of the individual pre-test texts one month after the initial pre-test for the reliability of the score of the writing test. The correlation (PPMC) of the Pearson calculation (PPMC) for the 10 sets of writing score was 0.93.

The main textbook used in the writing class was changed according to academic years, which was *Basic Writing* written by Reid (2004) and *Great Paragraphs* by Folse et al. (2012). *Basic Writing* targeted for false beginners or students who were less proficient in writing, and *Great Paragraphs* were adopted to guide intermediate level students. *Basic Writing* is attempted to provide writing in various genres through supporting materials by teachers/researchers, but it particularly focused on language and descriptive styles of writing. In contrast, *Great Paragraphs* deals with five different genres of writing: Definition, process analysis, descriptive, opinion, and narrative.

All of the subjects in this study took three writing tests after they were introduced to the main elements of paragraph. Due to the nature of the test involving time limits rather than pressure, students were expected to need more time to revise and reconsider their writing. When students submitted their assignments via e-mail, the researchers collected the writing and entered them into NVivo 9 program. NVivo 9 is a program recognized as the best tool to structure non-unified and irregular data, such as learner errors. The original text submitted by students was coded according to the sequence of errors using the criteria suggested from the previous studies, such as Dulay, Smazler, and the English Testing Service's writing evaluation guidelines, and each individual's error frequency was calculated automatically through NVivo 9.

In the pre-test analysis, students made 21 errors including linguistic (agreement, sentence types, article, verb, adjective, preposition, word order, comparison, demonstrative, verbals, and adverbs), organization (title, paragraph indentation, balance, style, and contrast), and content (consistency, conjunction, meaning, word choice, and usage). The typical errors that the participants of this study produced is in the appendix section of this study. These local learners-generated errors were the focus of teaching throughout the semester, and students took four quizzes in relation to these error items.

At the end of the semester, students were asked to answer questions in essay form about whether they liked to keep pets at home or not. The topics of writing tests were randomly chosen from the TOEFL essay questions provided by English Testing Service's (ETS) official web site (<http://www.ets.org>).

The study focused on persuasion because it not only helped complement linguistic, rhetorical and strategic deficits as learners of English as a foreign language, but also on preparing students for the persuasion typically required when writing oral expressions and documents in English at their future workplaces.

Major research instruments

Given the nature of the data to be analyzed in this study, the use of two different data analysis tools was inevitable. Naturally occurring and accumulated learner errors were collected and analyzed using NVivo 9. NVivo 9 is the best tool for organizing unstructured data and establishing the frequency and model of data. Although this study involved a highly precise coding scheme established in previous WCF related literature, there is room for NVivo 9 to discover a unique or new type of error found in this field of study. However, all learner errors identified in this study were classified into categories of existing studies and no new or unique errors were found or added. Once the frequency and model were detected in learner errors, and the structured qualitative data in NVivo 9 were incorporated into quantitative data using SPSS 17 program to find answers to the research questions and further perform statistical analysis.

RESULTS

To test the effect of WCF on gender and proficiency, the difference between pretest and posttest results was calculated. Table 1 shows the difference in scores between the pre- and post-test in terms of gender.

According to Table 1, male students showed an average error rate of 3.5 percent, while female students showed a 2.79 percent decrease. Table 2 shows the difference between pre- and post-test performance depending on language proficiency levels.

Table 1. A Descriptive Statistics on Gender

Gender	Variable	Total	Mean	Standard Deviation
Male	Difference	60	3.50	10.75
Female	Difference	165	2.79	8.54

The average value is indicated as an error item.

Table 2. A Descriptive Statistics on Proficiency

Group	Variable	Total	Mean	Standard Deviation
Advanced	Difference	81	1.00	3.41
Intermediate	Difference	55	1.29	2.92
Beginner	Difference	90	7.64	12.63

The average value is indicated as an error item.

According to Table 2, beginner-level students showed the largest decrease in the average error rate (N=90, M=7.64). Intermediate level learners showed a decline in the average error rate of 1.29, but advanced level students showed signs of retreat by showing an increase in errors on average by one point at the end of the semester.

Analysis using the independent sample t-test was conducted to verify the effects of the WCF, regardless of the differences between groups of gender and level. Table 3 is the result of a T-test analysis.

Table 3. Effect of Participants on the Written Corrective Feedback

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Degree of Freedom	T-value	P value
226	2.98	9.16	224	4.88	.0001

The average value is indicated as an error item.

p<.01: statistically significant

Table 3 shows that subjects have improved their writing skills over a long period of time as they have been exposed to WCF to this study. Two-way ANOVAs were conducted to answer the research questions raised earlier. As a result, there was no interaction effect between gender and language proficiency levels (F=0.52, p=0.59, ns.).

Table 4 shows analysis results that focus on the main effects of each of the two parameters, except for the effects of the interaction between level and gender. The results of the two-way ANOVAs show that there is no major impact on the gender portion (F=0.23, p=0.63, n.s.). However, the level of language proficiency had a significant effect because the F value was 7.17, and the p value was 0.000, less than 0.01. To determine the degree of influence on the level of student language proficiency on WCF, Least Squares Means was used for differences in performance between pretest and posttest. Table 5 shows the result.

In this study, the minimum square mean (LSMEAN) was applied in consideration of the fact that the figures of gender and language proficiency levels were not balanced, which was calculated on the basis of a minimum square assessment.

As shown in Table 3, there is a difference between the beginner and advanced groups, and the p value of 0.0001 (p < 1.01), showing statistically significant results. An important difference was also found among beginner and intermediate level students with a p value of 0.0001.

Table 4. The Results of ANOVA by Proficiency and Gender

Source	DF	Sum of squares	Mean Square	F-value	P-value
Model	3	309.05	103.02	4.78	0.003
Gender	1	4.96	4.97	0.23	0.63
Proficiency	2	308.85	154.43	7.17	0.00
Gender*Proficiency	2	8.00	4.00	0.52	0.59

Error	221	4760.95	21.54
Adjusted Total	224	5070.00	

p<.01: statistically significant

The square mean means the minimum square mean.

Table 5. Differences in the Minimum Square Average of Pretest and Posttest

Group	Sum of Difference Squares	Standard Error
Advanced	1.0420	0.9983
Intermediate	1.2580	1.1627
Beginner	7.6136	0.9162

Based on the results of the above analysis, one can conclude that the WCF method used in this study was effective for beginner and advanced-level students who participated in the study. However, despite the same WCF over a long period of time, it has not changed the overall quality of writing for advanced-level learners.

Table 6 shows the results of calculating the minimum square mean for the effect group.

Table 6. Least Squares Mean on the Effect Group

	Advanced	Intermediate	Beginner
Advanced		0.1171	0.0001
Intermediate	0.1171		0.0001
Beginner	0.0001	0.0001	

p<.01: statistically significant

While the previous studies focused solely on the limited number of components of the target language in the student's composition, this study attempted to better understand students' writing development by extending the scope of measurement from grammar to organizational and content areas of the student writings. In addition, compared to the narrative task that was most notable in the previous study, this study selected opinion task to determine whether the results were the same or different. Moreover, the main concern of this study is to shed light on the role of gender and learner language proficiency in relation to the WCF, ultimately investigating how these two intervening variables lead to learner success or failure in acquiring written communication competency.

The results of this study show that gender and language proficiency do not interact with each other when it comes to WCF. There is not even a significant impact from gender, meaning that gender differences do not affect the WCF alone. However, there was a distinctly significant difference in the language proficiency of learners: in the opinion paragraph, where the quality of overall writing is the primary concern, the impact of the WCF is largely dependent on the language proficiency of learners.

Given that it is the pre-requisite of writing teachers to make a difference in students' writing skills in a given teaching and learning time, this study seeks to highlight an important role of learner proficiency in determining the success of the WCF.

Based on the results of this study, one can confirm that both direct written corrective feedback and overall assessment of writing can yield a positive result for the beginning level of writers' writing development. However, the same method of WCF may not be an ideal teaching strategy for advanced learners.

It is generally recognized that female learners are better candidates for language learning compared to male counterparts. However, the results of this study refute our common sense by pointing out that gender differences do not play a key role in determining the impact of the WCF. An alternative explanation for this result is that gender's role in the WCF may depend on task effects.

Lazarus (1966) investigated noticing of a gap as static phenomenon in relation to WCF. However, their studies show that this phenomenon is a dynamic characteristic and is not only influenced by intrinsic factors such as learner's age, but also by external aspects such as task effects.

On the same lines as Rezai and other's claims, Bermudz looked at essays written by Spanish women and reported that compared to essays written by Spanish men, female students' essays are attempting to express a more sophisticated and clear writer's point of view, regardless of their level of learner proficiency. Based on these results, the foregoing studies suggested that teachers should incorporate writing beyond the grammar guidance level of text in their classes to include the discourse skills that students have.

Although this study addresses the overall quality of writing, including the discourse competency, it refutes claims such as Bermudz et al., which emphasizes the role of gender in the WCF. Thus, the gender impact on the WCF is extremely small, given that the focus of WCF is comprehensive in opinion paragraphs. Care is required to make hasty conclusions about the different effects of learners' language proficiency on WCF.

The findings of the WCF are difficult to compare because different researchers measure and interpret different criteria for accuracy. For example, Kepner reported an average of four errors out of 200 words, while Ferris and others reported an average of 30 to 40 errors out of 350 words. Furthermore, in a report submitted by students, Icy Lee counted an average of an error appeared for every seven words as an error measurement. The accuracy rate or standard for learners' errors must be clearly reported in order to give readers to check the possibility of transferring a result of a study to one's teaching context.

Another factor that makes direct comparisons among WCF studies impossible is that researchers have different interpretations of accuracy. For example, in Ellis's study, experimental group achieved accuracy only in the second post-test, but in Bitchener et al., all post-test accuracy is shown. In addition, some researchers assessed the development of students' accuracy on the basis of an analysis of the revision submitted immediately after the draft, while others observed improvements in the writing from new pieces of writing.

Despite the inherent limitations of the WCF study in terms of incomparability of the results of the study, the results suggest that there is a learner variability even within the same group of learners. On the other hand, most existing studies report the positive effects of WCF across learners at intermediate and advanced levels.

Given the fact that the subjects in this study demonstrate learner variability even within the same group, there is serious doubt about the results of previous WCF studies that have provided extensive generalizations of effective WCF methods for both intermediate and advanced learners. Therefore, more in-depth scrutiny is required in identifying, verifying, and clearly describing learner language proficiency in the WCF study involving the role of language proficiency.

Although the results of this study support the researchers' arguments at this point, it is not easy to reach a solid conclusion by stating that learners' language proficiency plays a key role in the impact of the WCF. It is more urgent than anything else to carry out a replicating study of the results of this study based on a comparison of the same conditions. The self-defined notion of learners' language proficiency prescribed here in the context of the local area in which the researchers belong to for the purpose of conducting the study remains a limitation of the study. However, this limitation also helped the researcher have an opportunity of critically reviewing WCF previous studies and calling for further elaborated future research on WCF.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was supported by a Research Grant of Pukyong National University(2021).

REFERENCES

1. Bermudez, A. B. & Prater, D. L. (1994). Examining the effects of gender and second language proficiency on Hispanic writers' persuasive discourse. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 18(3&4), 47-62.
2. Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(2), 102-118. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2007.11.004
3. Bitchener, J. & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
4. Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(3), 409-431. doi: 10.1177/1362168808089924
5. Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010a). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(4), 207-217. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2010.10.002
6. Bitchener, J. & Knoch, U. (2010b). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten month investigation. *Applied Linguistics*, 31, 193-214.
7. Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14(3), 191-205. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2005.08.001
8. Bruton, A. (2009). Improving accuracy is not the only reason for writing, and even if it were *System*, 37(4), 600-613.
9. Bruton, A. (2010). Another reply to Truscott on error correction: Improved situated designs over statistics. *System*, 38(3), 491~498. doi: DOI: 10.1016/j.system.2010.07.001
10. Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(3), 267-296. doi: 10.1016/s1060-3743(03)00038-9
11. Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language two*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
12. Ellis, R. & Barkhuizen, G. (2009). *Analysing learner language*. New York: Oxford University Press.

13. Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System*, 36(3), 353-371.
14. Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing implications for second language students*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
15. 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.
16. Ferris, D. R. (2010). Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 181~201.
17. 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, 161~184.
18. Folse, K.S., Muchmore-Vokoun, A. & Solomon, E. (2004). *Great Paragraphs*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
19. Ghani, M., Naz, B. & Akram, R. (2007). Feminism, language choice and discourse practice: A Pakistani perspective. *Journal of research (Faculty of Language and Islamic Studies)* 11, 9~18.
20. Guénette, D. (2007). Is feedback pedagogically correct?: Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(1), 40-53. doi: DOI: 10.1016/j.jslw.2007.01.001
21. Haroon, H. A. & Sani, A. M. (2009). Children's achievement in two second languages: The roles of gender, language use domain and beliefs. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*(3), 234-266.
22. Heift, T. P. (2010). CALL: A longitudinal study of learner uptake. *Modern Language Journal*, 94, 198-216.
23. Kepner, C. G. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of second-language writing skills. *Modern Language Journal*, 75, 305-313.
24. Kim, J. (1997). A balanced approach to second language writing: Focus on product and process variables. *English Teaching*, 52(4), 51-90.
25. Lalande, F. II. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *Modern Language Journal*, 66, 140~149.
26. Lazarus, R. S. (1966). *Psychological stress and the coping process*. McGraw-Hill.
27. Lee, I. (2007). Student reactions to teacher feedback in two Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(3), 144-164. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2007.12.001
28. Lee, I., Ten mismatches between teachers' beliefs and written feedback practice. *ELT Journal*, 63(1), 13-22. doi: 10.1093/elt/ccn010
29. Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A Meta-Analysis. *Language Learning*, 60(2), 309~365.
30. Mehnert, U. (1998). The effects of different lengths of time for planning on second language performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20(1), 83-108.
31. Ramazan, A. S., Guijar, A. A. & Iqbal, J. (2011). Gender differences and L2 writing. *Language in India* 11(7), 1-10.
32. Reid, J. M. (1996). *Basic writing*. NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
33. Rezaei, S., Mozaffari, F., & Hatef, A. (2011). Corrective feedback in SLA: Classroom practice and future directions. *International Journal of English Linguistics* 1, 21-29.
34. Richard, L.(2010). New features of NVivo 9. Retrived from QSR international <http://www.qsrinternational.com>
35. Robb, T., Ross, S. & Shortreed, I. (1986). Salience of feedback on error and its effect on EFL writing quality. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(1), 83-95.
36. Sauro, S. (2009). Computer-mediated corrective feedback and the development of L2 grammar. *Language Learning & Technology* 13(1), 96-122.

37. Semke, H. (1984). The effects of the red pen. *Foreign Language Annals*, 17, 195-202.
38. Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41, 255-283.
39. Sheen, Y. (2011). *Corrective feedback, individual differences and second language learning* (1st ed.). New York: Springer.
40. Sheen, Y. & Ellis, R., Corrective feedback in language teaching. In Eli Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning Volume II* (pp. 593~610). New York: Routledge.
41. Sheen, Y., Wright, D., & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. *System*, 37(4), 556~569. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2009.09.002
42. Smazler, W. R. (1996). *Write to be read*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
43. Vaezi, S., Zand-Vakili, E. & Kashani, A. Fard. (2011). Patterns of corrective feedback in relation to error types in Iranian adult EFL learners' classes. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 66(4), 517~531.
44. Van Beuningen, C. G., De Jong, N. H. & Kuiken, F. (2011). Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in second language writing.
45. Vyatkina, N. (2010). The effectiveness of written corrective feedback in teaching beginning German. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43(4), 671-689. doi: 10.1111/j.1944-9720.2010.01108.x
46. Xu, C. (2009). Overgeneralization from a narrow focus: A response to Ellis et al. (2008) and Bitchener (2008). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(4), 270-275. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2009.05.005

APPENDIX

Examples of Student Produced Errors

I. Linguistic

- 1) Agreement: However, so many merits which has mentioned above can cover the uncomfortable relationship between them.
- 2) Sentence types: Animals turn their back to their owners for their prays. Because animal shave different thinks with humans (delete period and small letter with b).
- 3) Articles: ...because I had pet when I was young (*a* is needed).
- 4) Verbs: The silver stream where we can jump into (no main verb).
- 5) Adjectives: I think it is the most easy way for kids.
- 6) Prepositions: You tend to buy expensive clothes to your child.
- 7) Word order: So, I decided to hard study.
- 8) Comparison: And, actually they like more mother than me.
- 9) Demonstrative: But I can't buy all that musics and save that CDs.
- 10) Verbal: I must to do it.
- 11) Adverb: I believe that it is so much important factor.

II. Organization

- 1) Title for a paragraph
- 2) Indentation in the beginning of a paragraph
- 3) Clear demonstration of introduction, body, and conclusion

- 4) Parallelism: Living in a city, I can dance in a club, I can go to the beauty room, I can do many things (A conjunction is needed between the word room and I).
- 5) Mechanics: I was quite selfish before I have a pet named looloo.

III. Content

- 1) Overall level of coherence in a writing sample
- 2) Connectives: The last, a few people attend university to increase knowledge.
- 3) Meaning: Pets wear clothes and shoes as well as dying.
- 4) Word choice: So, I think that puppy really can be my good young brother, they often can cure my mother's lonely motion.
- 5) Usage: Most of puppies can become our brother (*the* is needed).

Citation: Chongwon Park. *Effects of Gender and Proficiency on Written Corrective Feedback*. *Int J Innov Stud Sociol Humanities*. 2021; 6(2): 32-42. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.20431/2456-4931.0602004>.

Copyright: © 2021 The Author(s). This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license.