

WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN EFL WRITING: GENDER-BASED PREFERENCES AND PERCEPTIONS OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Shoresh Jelal Hussein¹ *, Idrees Ali Hasan²

¹Dept. of English Language, College of Humanities, University of Zakho, Kurdistan Region – Iraq.(shoreshhussen24@ugmail.com)

²Ararat Technical Institute, Kurdistan Region, Duhok, Iraq.(idrees.ali@dpu.edu.krd)

Received: 08/ 2025 / Accepted: 08/ 2025 / Published: 6/ 2026 <https://doi.org/10.26436/hjuoz.2026.14.2.1708>

ABSTRACT:

Despite the extensive research on Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) among EFL students, limited attention has been given to how gender may shape learners' perceptions and preferences regarding feedback in academic writing within the Kurdish context. The present study investigates the gender-based beliefs and preferences of Kurdish EFL university students toward WCF in academic writing. This study aims to fill this gap by examining how male and female students perceive various WCF approaches and how these perceptions influence their paragraph writing development. A quantitative approach was adapted for the study, which involved 60 second-year students from the English Department at the University of Zakho, College of Humanities, during the academic year 2024–2025. A 14-item Likert-scale questionnaire was used, and the data were analyzed using the Statistical Package of Social Science (SPSS) version 25, applying descriptive statistics, independent samples t-tests, and Cronbach's Alpha to analyze the reliability of the questionnaire items. Findings indicated that both male and female students viewed WCF as helpful to enrich their motivation, awareness of error, and writing skills. However, statistical gender effects emerged in emotional responses and feedback preferences. Despite these affective and strategic differences, no systematic gender differences were observed in attitudes toward the overall utility of WCF. These findings suggest the advantages of a gender-sensitive feedback pedagogy that acknowledges students' affective and strategic natures to ensure more effective and comprehensive EFL writing instruction.

KEYWORD: Written Corrective Feedback, Feedback Preference, Perception, Gender Differences, EFL.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND:

Teaching English writing to students who are learning English as a second language (ESL) or English as a foreign language (EFL) has experienced considerable modifications over the past few decades. In spite of changes in methodology and curriculum, there is one component that has remained fundamental to writing training throughout the years: feedback from an instructor (Alisoy, 2024). According to Ferris and Hedgcock (2005), many teachers of writing devote more time and effort to delivering feedback than they do to any other instructional duty. This highlights the perceived significance of feedback in determining the results for students. Writing is essential but challenging. It is not just about putting words on paper; there are many aspects to consider, like spelling, sentence structure, and word choice (Harmer, 2004). Despite these challenges, writing remains a key way for people to communicate, express themselves, and succeed academically (Graham, 2006). Doing well in writing also helps with learning other subjects and kills. Because

writing can be so complex, students especially need real support to improve their skills when learning a foreign language. That is where EFL teachers play an important role, by giving clear and helpful feedback. Research shows that writing-focused feedback, like WCF, helps students not only fix small mistakes but also improve the overall structure of their writing (Chandler, 2003; Jahin, 2012; Kamimura, 2006).

Since students' preferences for feedback may influence how effective it is (Schulz, 1996), identifying these preferences is necessary. Some contexts remain under-researched regarding learners' and teachers' feedback preferences, and gender differences in this area are rarely studied. This research tries to investigate learners' and teachers' preferences regarding WCF types. In another study conducted by Aboubakr (2016) who thinks that concentrating on learners' preferences towards written feedback (WF) can foster their writing. That is to say, exploring what learners prefer can raise teachers' awareness of their learning styles. It is crucial to examine how learners wish to be corrected. Teachers of English also have preferences to correct learners' writing; some of

* Corresponding Author.

This is an open access under a CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>)

them want to correct all errors, while others leave the errors uncorrected (Noora, 2008).

Several studies have investigated students' preferences for different types of error correction; however, the findings remain inconclusive. In a study by Chen and Nassaji (2018), it is stated that students, in general, are in favor of feedback that locates and clarifies the description of the error and provides the correct form of the error. Furthermore, it can be believed that learners' preferences for specific kinds of feedback impact the utilization in acquiring another language. For example, some students may pay more attention to the effects of the corrections provided (Schulz, 1996) if they prefer specific types of feedback and find them useful. From this perspective, understanding students' preferences is crucial for developing writing skills. Referring to a study conducted by Riazi and Riasati (2007), teachers need to recognize that learners have various choices for the type of feedback they prefer when correcting their errors. Regarding students' preferences to six kinds of feedback (implicit, explicit, selective, comprehensive, form, and content), Aridah. et al. (2017) argued that learners prefer to receive more feedback on grammar rather than on other topics. Results from a study by Ferris and Roberts (2001) propose that all students prefer having their errors corrected indirectly using codes. Additionally, Chen et al. (2016) carried out a study to test learners' preferences towards written error correction; however, the findings showed learners like to get feedback on content.

Despite the lack of evidence on the role of gender 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 (Francis et 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 females rate themselves as more successful writers than 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 regarding their writing potential, and it directly influences their motivation and engagement in the writing process (Hawthorne, 2008). Although many studies address learners' general views on WCF, very few have explicitly examined how male and female students may differ in their attitudes or expectations. This gap is particularly evident in Middle Eastern and especially Kurdish EFL contexts, where cultural and educational dynamics may further influence feedback reception. This study aims to address this gap by studying how Kurdish EFL university students view and prefer WCF, considering their gender, to help create better and more effective feedback methods in teaching academic writing.

1.2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM:

WCF, despite being common as a component of second language writing pedagogy instruction, is effective only as a function of how students perceive and use it. Writing pedagogy in undergraduate studies in most EFL contexts, like the Kurdistan Region of Iraq, mostly concentrates on the evaluation of end products without much attention to

the learning function of feedback. Despite growing interest in WCF, there remains limited empirical knowledge about how Kurdish EFL undergraduate learners perceive, prefer, and evaluate written comments on their academic writing. In particular, there is a notable lack of research exploring whether female and male students differ in their preferences and reactions to such feedback. Without this knowledge, practices in giving feedback may not satisfy the needs of students, limit participation, and make teaching less effective. This study seeks to bridge this gap by examining Kurdish EFL undergraduate students' attitudes and preferences concerning WCF with a specific focus on gender-based differences in an effort to implement more responsive and effective feedback procedures in the teaching of academic writing.

1.3. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY:

The contribution of this study lies in the fact that it focuses on the attitudes and experiences of Kurdish EFL undergraduate students with WCF in the KRI. Investigating students' attitudes and the problems they face, such as uncertain feedback, affective responses, and limited revision opportunities, highlights the need for feedback behavior to adapt to learners' needs and support successful writing improvement. In EFL contexts like KRI, feedback does not only serve as error correction, but also as a pivotal factor in building students' motivation and autonomy. Of particular significance is the study's gender-sensitive approach, which helps uncover whether male and female students respond differently to the same types of feedback. Recognizing such distinctions is vital in developing effective, inclusive feedback practices. This research contributes to the growing second language writing literature by providing empirical data that enriches knowledge about how feedback functions in complex cultural and educational environments. In addition, the findings can guide teachers and curriculum planners in designing more culturally responsive and gender-aware feedback mechanisms. These designs can enhance student engagement, writing abilities, and achievement in university-level EFL courses.

1.4. RATIONALE FOR THE CONDUCTION OF THE STUDY:

The rationale for this research comes from the growing realization of how crucial the role of WCF is in enabling the attainment of academic writing among EFL students (Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Ferris, 2010). Although numerous studies have examined WCF's impact, most of them focused on English-speaking contexts (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Bitchener & Knoch, 2008), and little research has been conducted on students in underrepresented regions such as the KRI. Kurdish EFL university students have particular linguistic and educational contexts that can modify their perception and reaction to WCF. Furthermore, gender may play an important role in shaping these perceptions, as male and female students may have different expectations, comfort levels, and learning strategies in response to feedback. Because feedback becomes most effective if it meets students' expectations and learning styles (Lee, 2008), knowing their attitudes toward WCF is important. These have immediate influences on learners' responses to

feedback and the improvement of their writing based on feedback (Klimova, 2013). The aim of this study is to investigate Kurdish EFL learners' gender-based perceptions and preferences toward WCF in academic writing. Through the bridging of this gap, the study is able to inform teachers to adopt more helpful and learner-centered feedback methods, leading to improved writing outcomes and academic performance in such classrooms.

1.5. AIMS OF THE STUDY:

The present study aims to:

1. examine Kurdish EFL students' perceptions and preferences concerning different types and approaches of WCF in enhancing their academic writing skills.
2. investigate males' and females' attitudes toward the usefulness and impact of WCF on their motivation and writing development.
3. determine whether there are significant differences in genders' perceptions and preferences regarding specific features of WCF, including direct corrections, coding symbols, and error prioritization.

1.6. RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. What are the perceptions of EFL students regarding the implementation of WCF in academic writing?
2. What are the differences between male and female EFL students in their perceptions of WCF?
3. How do male and female EFL students differ in their preferences for various types of WCF strategies?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

There is widespread agreement that feedback is an essential instructional technique in second language writing. In accordance with Hyland and Hyland (2006), it facilitates student learning by directing review, encouraging reflection, and advancing academic development. According to Klimova (2013), writing is a multifaceted and productive skill influenced by various cognitive and emotional factors. Among these, students' preferences and beliefs regarding feedback significantly impact how they interpret and utilize corrective input. Learners' perspectives on what constitutes effective feedback and their expectations about how their writing should be revised can directly influence the development of their writing abilities (Greenberg, 1988).

Nevertheless, not all feedback is equally useful. In product-oriented classrooms where only the final draft is evaluated, feedback is often reduced to a summative function, used to justify grades. Connors and Lunsford (1993) and Straub (1996) criticized this type of feedback, which tends to be overly prescriptive, impersonal, and of limited instructional value. Knoblauch and Brannon (1981) similarly argued that such feedback offers little to foster student learning. (Hedgcock, 2005) noted that vague or overly directive comments often fail to promote students' independent revision. Truscott (1996 and 2007) took an even more critical view, suggesting that grammar

correction is not only ineffective but potentially harmful to writing fluency and should be eliminated.

Writing clearly and effectively remains a significant challenge for both native and non-native speakers of English language. As Hyland (2003) asserts, strong writing ability arises from well-planned and context-sensitive instruction. In recent years, second language writing instruction has gained increased attention due to two main factors: the recognition of writing as a critical skill for success in the digital age, and evolving insights into written texts and writing processes that have encouraged pedagogical innovation. Dincer and Seker (2014) investigated students' perceptions of teacher feedback in a Turkish university's L2 writing program. Their study revealed a considerable mismatch between the comprehensive and detailed feedback students desired and the narrower feedback provided by teachers, which focused mainly on grammar and content. Nonetheless, students still valued the feedback, particularly in grammar and vocabulary.

Several studies explored learners' and teachers' preferences toward different types of feedback. Radecki and Swales (1988) concluded that learners expected written feedback on all their errors. Similarly, Leki (1991) reported that students preferred teachers to correct all their mistakes. The survey by Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1994) revealed that learners appreciated teacher comments and corrections, especially when they were direct and clear. Schulz (1996) further demonstrated that learners strongly favored direct, explicit correction over other feedback types. Diab (2005), in a study of 156 EFL university students, found that learners preferred when teachers crossed out errors and provided the correct form, describing this as "the best teacher feedback technique". Across these studies, a common finding was that learners consistently preferred comprehensive correction rather than selective feedback.

Complementing these earlier findings, Wu (2020) reported that university learners of Chinese as a foreign language preferred teacher and self-correction over peer correction, favored immediate correction in specific contexts, and expressed no significant negative effects of Corrective Feedback (CF), which has been widely studied for its impact on error correction. While overall gender-based differences in CF beliefs were minimal, male learners were found to be more emotionally responsive or appreciative of teacher correction. These results reinforce the idea that learners' preferences are shaped not only by instructional context but also by individual emotional and cognitive orientations.

Regarding the long-term importance of WCF, several researchers have emphasized that corrective feedback can lead L2 learners to produce more accurate texts than those who do not receive such input (Wang, 2017). Sustained improvement in accuracy over time has been associated with gains in overall language proficiency among ESL/EFL students. In particular, explicit error correction has been found to help adult learners avoid fossilization in their interlanguage development (Ellis, & Suzuki, 2014; Kang & Han, 2015; Polio, 2012; Shintani). These findings suggest that consistent exposure to WCF enables learners to better understand the reasons behind their errors and to

take corrective action, fostering metalinguistic awareness and deeper language acquisition.

2.1 DEFINITIONS OF WCF:

In EFL instruction, WCF refers to the process where teachers provide comments, corrections, and suggestions on students' written work to improve their language accuracy and writing quality. Bitchener and Storch (2016, p.5) define WCF as "the provision of feedback to learners on their written output to help them notice and correct their errors." Hyland and Hyland (2006, p. 84) explain that WCF helps students bridge the gap between their current and desired performance levels.

In their study, Bitchener and Knoch (2008) describe WCF as a tool for students to master targeted linguistic forms. Truscott (1996) defines corrective feedback as the correction of grammatical errors intended to improve writing accuracy. Collectively, these definitions position WCF as a strategic and purposeful mechanism that helps learners identify, understand, and correct errors for long-term writing development.

Feedback, especially written feedback, is a central pedagogical task in the language classroom. Coffin et al. (2003) state that providing feedback is a "central pedagogic practice." However, excessive correction can be counterproductive, particularly for beginners (Chaudron, 1988). Feedback serves teachers by guiding improvements in instruction and supports learners by encouraging self-reflection and facilitating progress. As Selinker (1969) notes, errors themselves are valuable for language researchers as indicators of learning stages.

2.2 TYPES OF WCF:

Various strategies of WCF exist, each differing in the degree of explicitness and the type of guidance provided to students. The following sub-sections shed more light on the main types of WCF commonly implemented in language instruction. Ferris (2011) defines direct corrective feedback (DCF) as occurring "when an instructor provides the correct linguistic form for students (word, morpheme, phrase, rewritten sentence, deleted word[s] or morpheme[s])" (p. 31). In contrast, indirect corrective feedback (ICF), such as underlining or coding, "occurs when the teacher indicates that an error has been made but leaves it to the student writer to solve the problem and correct the error" (Ferris, 2011). This distinction has important implications for learner autonomy, revision strategies, and engagement with feedback.

2.2.1. DIRECT CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK:

Direct corrective feedback involves the instructor explicitly providing the learner with the correct form of an error (Ellis, 2008). This may include crossing out unnecessary words or morphemes, inserting missing elements, or writing the correct form directly above or near the mistake. The primary goal is to clearly present the accurate language form, helping learners to recognize and internalize proper usage. This feedback can be delivered both orally and in written form, where the teacher either verbally corrects errors or marks them in the student's written work. By offering explicit correction, direct feedback reduces ambiguity, making it easier for learners

to understand their mistakes and how to fix them. According to Ellis (2009), direct feedback provides explicit information and useful guidance especially for learners unable to self-correct. Ferris and Roberts (2001) suggest this method for low proficiency learners who may lack the knowledge to self-correct. However, Ellis (2009) warns that direct feedback may contribute less to long-term learning as it requires minimal learner engagement. Despite this, Sheen (2007) found direct feedback effective in the acquisition of certain language features, such as articles.

2.2.2. METALINGUISTIC FEEDBACK:

Metalinguistic feedback provides learners with comments, hints, or codes related to the nature of their errors without directly supplying the correct form (Ellis, 2009). Commonly, teachers use error codes placed above mistakes or underline/circle errors to prompt students to identify and correct them independently. This feedback encourages cognitive engagement by guiding learners to reflect on language rules and error types. Error codes typically label errors such as grammar, vocabulary, or spelling, helping learners categorize their mistakes and develop self-correction skills. Metalinguistic explanations may also involve brief grammatical clarifications related to the error, though this is less frequently used due to time constraints.

2.2.3. INDIRECT CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK:

Indirect corrective feedback signals the presence of errors without providing explicit corrections. It includes indicating where errors occur or simply alerting learners that an error exists without specifying its location. According to Lalande (1982), indirect feedback promotes problem-solving and guided learning, encouraging learners to reflect on and correct their errors. This approach is preferred over direct feedback by some scholars (Ferris & Roberts, 2001) because it fosters long-term acquisition through active learner involvement. Techniques include highlighting errors, underlining, or using symbols and arrows near mistakes without giving the correct form. However, learners with lower proficiency may struggle to self-correct when only indirect feedback is provided (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005). Jusoh et al. (2016) highlight that indirect feedback supports more proficient learners by developing self-monitoring and editing skills critical for writing improvement. Table 1 shows the Typology of WCF (Adapted from Ellis, 2009, p. 98).

Table (1): Typology of WCF (Ellis, 2009, p. 98)

Types of CF	Description	Strategy for Error Correction
Direct CF	The teacher provides the student with the correct form.	Explicitly corrects errors by giving the correct form.
Indirect CF	The teacher indicates an error has occurred but does not	a. Indicating + locating the error: Underlining or using cursors to show omissions in the student's text.

	provide the correction.	b. Indication only: Marking the margin to show an error exists in a line of text.
Metalinguistic CF	The teacher provides comments or explanations related to the errors.	a. Use of error code: Writing symbols or codes in the margin (e.g., 'T' for tense errors). b. Brief grammatical explanation: Providing explanations for specific errors.

These techniques of WCF address learner errors, as noted by Ellis (2009). Direct WCF is when the teacher provides the correct form expressly, either in the text or margin. Indirect WCF requires learners to self-correct because the teacher only marks the existence and location of the error by underlining or without giving the correction. Metalinguistic WCF gives learners coded or abbreviated grammatical information, very often in the form of symbols, that identify the error type rather than the correct form. These categories vary in explicitness and cognitive engagement, with each having distinct benefits for language development according to learners' level and pedagogical goals.

2.3. DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ERRORS AND MISTAKES:

Though often used interchangeably, “errors” and “mistakes” have distinct meanings in second language acquisition (Ellis, 1997). Corder (1983) defines mistakes as unsystematic performance errors, caused by fatigue, stress, or distraction, where the learner actually knows the correct form. In contrast, errors are systematic deviations that reveal gaps in the learner’s current interlanguage or knowledge of rules which Corder (1983) refers to as “transitional competence.”

Errors that reoccur indicate a need for learning or instruction, while mistakes are accidental slips. Corder (1983) emphasizes that errors are more valuable pedagogically, as they give insight into learners' developmental stages and what needs to be taught. However, distinguishing the two requires careful observation over time, and as this is difficult in most classroom settings, this study will use the term “error” broadly to cover all forms of deviation from target-like performance.

2.4. PREVIOUS STUDIES:

Recent studies have investigated how and what error types should be selected for correction (Abedi & Latifi, 2010; Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener et al., 2005; Chandler, 2003; Eslami, 2014; Hosseiny, 2014; Jamalinesari et al. 2015; Shintani, Ellis & Suzuki, 2014). Much of this research has focused on the distinction between direct and indirect WCF.

Various studies have explored the impact of different types of WCF, including error identification, direct and indirect

correction, metalinguistic comments, and content-based suggestions (Ashwell, 2000; Bitchener & Knoch, 2008; Chandler, 2003; Clark & Ouellette, 2008; Ellis et al., 2008). Bitchener and Knoch (2008) conducted a large-scale study to investigate the extent to which different types of WCF influence the grammatical accuracy of EFL students' writing. Their research involved 144 international and migrant students in New Zealand and focused on the use of two functional aspects of the English article system: the referential indefinite article [a] and the referential definite article [the]. The study found out that students who received WCF particularly those who were provided with direct correction combined with written and oral metalinguistic explanation significantly outperformed those who received no feedback. Furthermore, the gains in accuracy were sustained over a seven-week period. While all feedback types were more effective than no feedback, there was no statistically significant difference among the three WCF treatment groups. Additionally, the study reported no difference between migrant and international learners in how they responded to WCF. These findings highlight the effectiveness of targeted, explicit feedback in improving specific areas of second-language writing accuracy.

While there is general agreement that WCF benefits writing instruction, scholars disagree on which type is most effective. Some argue that metalinguistic feedback enhances grammatical accuracy (Bitchener, 2008; Sheen, 2007), while others, such as (Truscott, 1996), contend that grammar correction has no lasting effect on writing development. Additionally, studies emphasize the importance of learners noticing their errors (Schmidt, 1990) and actively engaging with feedback (Long, 1985). At the same time, excessive correction, especially during early stages of learning, can reduce motivation (Chaudron, 1988; Fanselow, 1977), and some evidence suggests that learners who receive no correction may perform better in certain contexts (Semke, 1984).

3. METHODOLOGY

This section provides the methodological framework utilized in the present study, providing the research design, participants, and data collection instruments which are used for the purpose of the study.

3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN:

The current study utilized a descriptive survey design to investigate students' perceptions and preferences towards the WCF in the connect of EFL at university level. According to Cohen et al (2018), descriptive approach is effective in researching aspects in social and humanities sciences. This is because it is used to study aspects related to beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions (Sekaran & Bougie, 2020).

3.2 PARTICIPANTS:

This study involved 60 second-year Kurdish EFL undergraduate students from the English Language Department at the University of Zakho. The sample comprised 36 females and 24 males, all enrolled in the morning study program. A purposive sampling method was employed to select participants relevant to the research on WCF. This ensures that the selected students

had appropriate academic exposure to provide valid and meaningful data (Cohen et al., 2018).

3.3 QUESTIONNAIRE AND DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES:

The instrument employed in this study is a five-point Likert scale (strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree) utilized to investigate Kurdish EFL participants' perceptions and preferences toward WCF in academic writing (Joshi et al., 2015). According to Sauro and Lewis (2016) Likert-scale questionnaire is the best tool to use for collecting data. 14 items were specifically designed and some of them were adapted and modified from (Ferris, 1995), (Hyland & Hyland, 2006), Amrhein and Nassaji (2010) to explore students' emotional responses, beliefs about the usefulness of correction, and preferences for feedback strategies. To ensure clarity and validity, the questionnaire was reviewed by a panel of eight applied linguistics experts for face and content validity. Revisions were made based on their suggestions to improve relevance and accuracy. The finalized questionnaire was administered via Google Form then the link for the survey was shared with the participants of the study. Data collection took place during week 9 of the spring semester. The gender-balanced sample enabled the examination of both general perceptions and gender-based differences in attitudes toward WCF. The responses of the participants in the study were analyzed using descriptive statistics and independent samples t-tests to identify whether statistically significant differences existed between male and female participants.

3.4 DATA ANALYSIS:

The data gathered for this research study were input and analyzed using SPSS version 25. The primary objective of this research was to assess participants' replies to the survey items through the examination of descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics were utilized to ascertain the mean value and standard deviation for each survey item, offering an overview of central tendencies and the degree of response variability. Subsequently, inferential analysis was performed utilizing a one-sample t-test. This test was employed to determine if the observed mean values of the survey items significantly deviated from the hypothesized value. The t-test and associated p-values were calculated to evaluate statistical significance. A criterion of $p < 0.05$ was employed to ascertain statistical differences.

3.4. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS:

The participants were informed about the objectives of the study and reassured that their participation was entirely voluntary, in line with ethical standards for educational research (Mertens, 2019 as cited in Murad and Malo,2025). They were also informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any point without any consequences. Strict confidentiality was upheld by securely storing the data, with access limited to the research team to prevent any unauthorized use (Babbie, 2021). To protect privacy, personal identifiers were removed so that responses could not be traced back to individual participants. The research complied with institutional ethical guidelines to ensure the protection and rights of all participants throughout the study.

4. RESULTS

This section reports and presents reliability result of the items utilized in the survey of the study, results on students' perceptions, attitudes, and WCF preferences to further improve their academic writing capacity. The data of the study were collected using a structured questionnaire of 14 Likert-scale questions.

To measure the reliability analysis of the items, Cronbach's alpha is used for this study in which the perfect value of 1.0 denotes perfect internal consistency, meaning that every item accurately measures the same construct. Table 2 below shows the reliability check.

Table (2) Reliability check Using (Cronbach's alpha)

Case Processing Summary			
		N	%
Cases	Valid	60	100.0
	Excluded ^a	0	.0
	Total	60	100.0
a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.			

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.901	14

The purpose of the Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.901 for this study is to reveal the internal consistency and reliability of the 14 Likert-scale items, indicating whether they are strongly correlated and measure the same underlying construct about students' perceptions of WCF. As a result, as revealed in Table 2 above, an alpha value of 0.901 shows that all the items used in the survey are highly consistent and well-correlated.

The findings are presented as percentage distributions, descriptive statistics that includes (means and standard deviations), and t-test findings to determine the statistical significance of the responses. The findings are then interpreted thematically to respond to students' perceptions, likes, and judgments regarding the effectiveness of the feedback. Table 3 shows the effectiveness of the students' feedback.

Table (3): The Effectiveness of the Students' feedback

N o.	Item	Gender	Mean	SD
1	Constructive feedback on my writing makes me feel proud.	F	4.3	0.7
		M	1	4
			4.0	0.7
			8	8
2	Written feedback on my writing makes me feel satisfied.	F	3.9	0.8
		M	4	5
			3.7	1.0
			9	0

3	Written feedback on my writing is helpful and provides clear guidance on how to expand my writing.	F M	4.2 5 4.1 7	0.7 7 0.7 9
4	Written feedback on my writing can sometimes be frustrating and unhelpful.	F M	2.5 4 3.3 2	1.1 6 1.2 1
5	Written feedback should focus only on errors that impede meaning.	F M	2.3 5 3.8 4	1.1 0 1.0 5
6	Providing the correct forms of errors encourages me.	F M	4.1 6 3.9 9	0.8 4 0.9 2
7	Knowing the correct forms helps me reflect on my errors.	F M	4.2 8 4.1 7	0.7 9 0.8 1
8	I prefer written feedback that includes scoring codes for errors, such as "gr", "sp".	F M	3.9 2 3.6 3	0.8 9 1.0 2
9	Using scoring codes helps me understand my mistakes better.	F M	4.1 4 4.0 0	0.8 2 0.8 4
10	I find underlining or circling errors without explanation more helpful than corrections.	F M	2.7 8 3.8 2	1.4 1 1.1 8
11	Identifying errors without correction helps me analyze my mistakes critically.	F M	4.0 6 4.0 0	0.8 9 0.8 5
12	Correcting all errors helps me become more aware of my writing.	F M	4.2 5 4.1 7	0.7 7 0.8 1
13	Receiving corrections on all errors increases my knowledge.	F M	4.2 8 4.1 7	0.7 7 0.8 1
14	I find correcting all errors beneficial for my learning.	F M	4.2 5 4.1 3	0.7 7 0.8 1

The percentage distribution of Kurdish EFL students' responses in Table 3 revealed several noteworthy trends. Overall, students expressed predominantly positive attitudes toward WCF. For example, 86.1% of female and 79.1% of male students strongly agree that receiving constructive feedback on their writing makes them feel proud, with mean scores of 4.31 and 4.08 for females and

males, respectively. Likewise, in item 3, almost all students agree that written feedback provides clear guidance on how to improve their writing, with mean scores close to 4.25 for females and 4.17 for males. Items 7, 12, 13, and 14 related to understanding the correct forms to reflect on errors and the benefits of correcting all errors show very similar mean scores and low standard deviations, indicating that the majority of participants show strong agreement and consistency.

However, some items reveal notable differences between male and female students. For instance, in item 4, males find written feedback more frustrating and unhelpful than females do, with mean scores of 3.32 for males and 2.54 for females. Additionally, item 5 shows that males strongly agree that feedback should focus only on errors that impede meaning, with a mean score of 3.84, while females largely disagree, scoring a mean of 2.35. This proposes that female students may prefer more comprehensive feedback, whereas male students may favor more targeted correction. This aligns with Zhang's (2017) argument that individual learner differences and feedback literacy play a role in shaping how feedback is received. When asked whether feedback should only target errors that impede meaning, responses were nearly evenly split.

Regarding feedback formats as in item 10, males show a stronger preference for underlining or circling errors without explanation than females, as indicated by mean scores of 3.82 for males and 2.78 for females. The higher standard deviation among females here points to more varied opinions. Moreover, females prefer written feedback that includes scoring codes for errors such as "gr" for grammar or "sp" for spelling as it is clear in item 8, with a mean of 3.92 compared to 3.63 for males, suggesting females find this type of feedback clearer and more helpful.

4.1 EMOTIONAL RESPONSES TOWARD WCF AMONG MALE AND FEMALE EFL STUDENTS:

In this study's subsection, it will present the results of male and female EFL students' emotional responses toward WCF, reflecting their perceptions of WCF implementation.

Table (4) Gender Comparison of Emotional Response to WCF

No.	Items	Female Mean	Male Mean	t-test	p-value
1	Constructive feedback on my writing makes me feel proud.	4.25	3.79	2.68	0.01
2	Written feedback on my writing makes me feel satisfied.	3.26	3.06	0.68	0.50
4	Written feedback on my writing can sometimes be frustrating and unhelpful.	2.61	3.32	2.23	0.03

The analysis of emotional response to WCF items in Table 4 reveals nuanced gender differences. Female participants reported significantly greater positive effect associated with receiving constructive feedback, as evidenced by a higher mean score on Item 1 (Constructive feedback on my writing makes me feel proud) compared to males 4.25 vs. 3.79, $p = 0.01$. This suggests that female students derive more intrinsic motivation and pride from constructive feedback relative to their male counterparts. Conversely, Item 2 (Written feedback on my writing makes me feel satisfied) showed no statistically significant difference $p = 0.50$, indicating comparable levels of overall satisfaction with feedback across genders. Notably, male students scored significantly higher on Item 4 (Written feedback can sometimes be frustrating and unhelpful) than females 3.32 vs. 2.61, $p = 0.03$, highlighting a greater tendency among males to perceive feedback as occasionally demotivating or inadequate. Collectively, these findings suggest that female students generally respond with more positive emotional engagement to WCF, whereas male students are more prone to experiencing frustration.

4.2 GENDER PREFERENCES FOR TYPES OF WCF STRATEGIES:

The differences between male and female students in their preferences for various types of WCF strategies is shown in the below subsection.

Table (5) Gender Comparison of Feedback Type Preference in WCF

N o.	Item	Femal e Mean	Mal e Mean	t- test	p- value
5	Written feedback should focus only on errors that impede meaning.	2.40	3.33	4.85	<0.001
8	I prefer written feedback that includes scoring codes for errors, such as "gr" for grammar, or "sp" for spelling.	3.03	2.82	0.65	0.52
10	I find underlining or circling errors without an explanation more helpful than direct corrections.	2.78	4.09	4.59	<0.001

Table 5 shows the significant gender disparities were also observed in preferences regarding the nature and style of

WCF. Male participants demonstrated a pronounced preference for feedback that prioritizes correction of meaning-impeding errors exclusively (Item 5; male mean = 3.33 vs. female mean = 2.40; $p < 0.001$). This preference indicates a tendency among males to favor selective and focused feedback that minimizes cognitive load. Similarly, Item 10 (I find underlining or circling errors without explanation more helpful than direct corrections) elicited significantly higher agreement from males 4.09 than females 2.78 with $p < 0.001$, reflecting a greater acceptance of indirect error identification approaches among male students. However, no significant gender difference emerged for preferences concerning scoring codes for errors Item 8 with $p = 0.52$, suggesting equivalent attitudes toward symbolic or coded feedback. These results collectively imply that male students prefer more implicit and targeted feedback strategies, whereas female students appear to favor more explicit and comprehensive correction methods.

4.3 GENDER BELIEFS ABOUT THE BENEFITS OF WCF:

This subsection surveys male and female students' beliefs concerning the benefits they received from WCF.

Table (6) Gender Beliefs in Correction Benefits from WCF

N o.	Item	Femal e Mean	Mal e Mean	t- test	p- valu e
6	Providing the correct forms of errors encourages me.	3.93	3.64	1.13	0.27
7	Knowing the correct forms helps me reflect on my errors.	4.05	3.88	0.66	0.51
12	Correcting all errors helps me become more aware of my writing.	4.00	3.90	0.36	0.72
13	Receiving corrections on all errors increases my knowledge.	4.13	3.85	1.01	0.32
14	I find correcting all errors beneficial for my learning.	3.94	3.76	0.60	0.55

The results in Table 6 reveals the investigation of gender differences in students' beliefs about the benefits of WCF revealed a consistent pattern of convergence across all related items. For Item 6, (Providing the correct forms of errors encourages me) female students reported a slightly higher mean score 3.93 than males 3.64, though this difference was not statistically significant $p = 0.27$. This suggests that both genders perceive correction as a

motivational factor, with females showing only a marginally stronger endorsement. Similarly, Item 7, which probes whether “Knowing the correct forms helps me reflect on my errors,” indicated equivalent positive perceptions among females 4.05 and males 3.88 with no significant gender effect $p = 0.51$. The remaining items 12, 13, and 14 explored beliefs that corrective feedback heightens awareness of writing accuracy, expands knowledge, and benefits learning overall. Scores remained consistently high across both groups, with no significant differences detected all $p > 0.3$, reflecting a shared acknowledgment of WCF’s pedagogical utility. This consistency underscores that irrespective of gender, students recognize corrective feedback as an integral component of their language acquisition process and writing skill enhancement. The absence of gender disparity in these domains implies that beliefs about the value of correction transcend gender-based preferences, potentially reflecting widespread educational norms and the effectiveness of WCF practices in diverse learner populations.

4.4 CLARITY AND REFLECTIVE ENGAGEMENT WITH WCF:

The investigation of gender differences in participants’ perceptions of clarity in WCF and their reflective engagement with the feedback is presented in this subsection.

Table (7) Gender Comparison of Clarity and Reflection in WCF

N o.	Item	Female Mean	Male Mean	t-test	p-value
3	Written feedback on my writing is helpful and provides clear guidance on how to expand my writing.	4.00	3.95	0.23	0.82
9	Using scoring codes, such as "gr" for grammar or "sp" for spelling, helps me understand my mistakes better.	3.85	3.67	0.73	0.47
11	Identifying errors without correction helps me analyze my mistakes critically.	3.84	3.67	0.79	0.43

As it is indicated in Table 7, the clarity of WCF and its capacity to foster reflective learning also demonstrated no statistically significant gender differences, indicating a parallel appreciation for these aspects among female and male students. For Item 3, “Written feedback provides

clear guidance on how to expand my writing,” both groups reported nearly identical agreement levels females: 4.00; males: 3.95; $p = 0.82$, signifying that clarity in feedback is universally valued and experienced similarly. Regarding Item 9, which assessed the effectiveness of scoring codes in facilitating error comprehension, females 3.85 and males 3.67 again showed comparable responses with no significant difference $p = 0.47$. This parity suggests that symbolic feedback mechanisms are equally accessible and beneficial across genders. Finally, Item 11, (Identifying errors without correction helps me analyze my mistakes critically.) also yielded non-significant gender differences $p = 0.43$, indicating that students of both genders equally endorse the role of autonomous error analysis in developing metacognitive skills. Taken together, these results highlight a shared cognitive engagement with WCF, where both female and male learners perceive feedback clarity and opportunities for self-reflection as critical components of effective language learning. The convergence in these perceptions suggests that instructional strategies aimed at enhancing feedback clarity and promoting reflective practice are likely to be universally effective regardless of gender.

5. DISCUSSION

The present study findings infer that Kurdish EFL university students generally observe WCF as an effective element of teaching writing instruction in academic settings. Male and female participants approved the significance of WCF in identifying the errors, increasing writing accuracy, and raising sensitivity to language use. This complete fulfilment was stated in consistently high mean scores on items related to total correction and perceived utility of feedback. For instance, they were in clear consensus that feedback on every error develops their knowledge and that correction of their mistakes is beneficial to learning, observing a shared sense of pedagogical value in WCF. This is in line with research by Bitchener and Knoch (2008), who highlighted the role of comprehensive feedback toward promoting metalinguistic development and accuracy in second-language writing. Also, the findings support the perception that WCF is not only beneficial in promoting writing fluency and precision but also crucial in promoting EFL learners' reflective and self-regulated mode of academic writing.

Regardless of this overall optimistic viewpoint, the difference between genders appeared in how WCF was recognized and enjoyed. Supportive feedback led to stronger positive emotional responses from female students. For example, their pride, satisfaction, and motivation levels were noticeably higher, as shown by ratings that reflected their emotional impact. The data suggests that female students are more open to correction and see feedback as encouragement rather than criticism. In contrast, male students felt more frustrated with WCF when it was unclear, off-topic, or overly critical. This difference was especially clear in their responses to the emotional burden of feedback. Ferris (2011) and Zhang (2017) found that students’ understanding of feedback, emotional involvement, and expectations played a key role in how they receive, process, and use feedback, and these findings are consistent with the current results. Since students' confidence in the quality of their writing

influences their motivation to write (Pajares & Valiante, 2006), the observed differences between gender difference suggest variations in writing self-efficacy. Female students tend to respond more emotionally to WCF, while male students are more likely to feel dissatisfaction or fear when the feedback is unclear or delivered negatively.

In terms of preferences for feedback techniques, the findings indicated that male and female students differ quite significantly. Male students overwhelmingly favored indirect feedback techniques, such as circling or underlining errors but not giving direct correction, and favored feedback to correct only meaning-blocking issues. These results suggest a desire for greater autonomy, self-monitoring, and thinking in revision. They might consider less intrusive feedback as a chance to correct themselves and think critically, which is in line with learner-centered instructional theories. On the other hand, female students preferred clearer and more detailed feedback and perhaps an even stronger need for structure, guidance, and reassurance in correcting their writing mistakes. This concurs with Bitchener and Ferris (2012), who assert that the effectiveness of feedback is partly a function of its consistency with learners' expectations, personal preferences, and cognitive styles. While males may thrive when being challenged to engage in self-regulated learning with minimal support, females may be best served by accurate corrections, detailed explanations, and authoritative teacher assistance.

Statistically significant gender differences were found on four of the fourteen items relevant to the WCF, which accounted for approximately 29% of the total. These differences were related to emotional responses, frustration with comments, and the indirect correction of meaning blocking errors. The fact that such differences occurred supports the significance of gender in both the cognitive and affective processing of feedback. These results confirm that WCF is not a one-shot instructional strategy. Therefore, adjusting feedback according to gender-based interests and affective needs may enhance students' motivation, engagement, and ultimately writing outputs. Teachers must utilize a balanced and adaptive strategy for WCF and offer direct and indirect methods along with varying their feedback style based on learners' profiles and situational needs.

This study also addresses a particular need gap in previous literature. While many studies have explored participants' attitudes toward WCF (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Ferris, 2006; Hyland & Hyland, 2006), fewer have examined gender differences, especially among Kurdish EFL students at state universities. By comparing the gender-oriented data and rendering emotional and strategic choice, this study presents a more informed insight into the reception of WCF in a specific sociocultural context. Further, the study contributes to the expanding literature advocating differentiated, learner-centered feedback strategies customized to take care of unique needs. Additionally, it offers pedagogical suggestions for EFL teachers that it suggests the need to balance types of different correction approaches and consider learners' affective responses to correction. Given the reality of the learning culture in Kurdish public universities as being more exam-centered and instructor-dominated, the

findings support the need for a shift towards more participatory, responsive, and interactive feedback practices.

Overall, the study's findings validate prevailing theories about the benefits of WCF in academic writing, as documented by researchers such as Bitchener (2008), Chandler (2003), and Ferris (2011). These scholars have highlighted the effectiveness of different WCF types, especially direct and metalinguistic feedback, in improving writing accuracy and learner engagement. Building on this foundation, the current study advances the field by revealing noteworthy gender-based differences in students' reactions and preferences toward WCF. These results underscore the need for more dynamic and varied feedback strategies that address both the affective and pedagogical needs of diverse learners. By adopting gender-sensitive feedback approaches, teachers can foster more supportive learning environments, encourage greater student engagement with writing, and promote improved writing competence among EFL learners. Researchers in their future studies can develop these results to state how gender feedback practices have longitudinal effects or whether WCF preferences differ across various proficiency contexts.

6. CONCLUSION

In light of the findings and discussion discussed above, the present study concludes with the following key points:

1. Both male and female Kurdish EFL students at the University of Zakho expressed overall positive attitudes toward WCF. However, their preferences and perceptions varied notably across emotional responses and feedback types, underscoring the complexity of learners' engagement with feedback.
2. Female students tended to view WCF as constructive and emotionally supportive. They responded more positively to feedback that was detailed, clear, and affirming, particularly when it contributed to their motivation and confidence in academic writing. This reflects a preference for feedback that reinforces self-efficacy and encourages continued effort.
3. In contrast, male students were more likely to find feedback frustrating or unhelpful, especially when it lacked clarity, was overly detailed, or focused on less significant errors. They showed a stronger preference for indirect feedback strategies that promote reflection, self-correction, and learner autonomy, highlighting a desire for control over their learning process.
4. The results revealed that a one-size fits all approach to WCF may not meet the diverse emotional and cognitive needs of all learners. Gender-related differences suggest the importance of differentiated feedback practices that consider learner variability and individual preferences to optimize the impact of feedback.
5. While students generally acknowledged the benefits of receiving corrections, not all feedback practices were equally effective for all students. Some feedback methods, such as underlining or coding, were found helpful by some learners but confusing or discouraging for others, indicating a need for clearer explanation and feedback literacy.

6. The study emphasizes the need for WCF strategies that balance clarity, motivation, and learner independence. Teachers should adopt flexible, student-centered approaches that consider students' gender-based

7. REFERENCES

- Abedi, R., & Latifi, M. (2010). The effect of error correction vs. error detection on Iranian pre-intermediate EFL learners' writing achievement. *English Language Teaching*, 3(4), 168.
- Aboubakr, M. (2016). *Teachers' and students' preferences for error correction in EFL writing* (Unpublished master's thesis). Nile Valley, Sudan.
- Alisoy, H. (2024). The role of teacher feedback in enhancing ESL learners' writing proficiency. *Global Spectrum of Research and Humanities*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.69760/1rmdzx45>
- Amrhein, H. R., & Nassaji, H. (2010). Written corrective feedback: What do students and teachers think is right and why? *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(2), 95–127.
- Aridah, I., Weda, S., & Arifin, M. B. U. (2017). Students' preferences toward written corrective feedback in EFL writing. *International Journal of Language Education*, 1(2), 68–76.
- Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(3), 227–257.
- Babbie, E. R. (2021). *The basics of social research* (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(2), 102–118.
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. Routledge.
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(3), 409–431.
- Bitchener, J., & Storch, N. (2016). *Written corrective feedback for L2 development*. Multilingual Matters.
- 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.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chen, Q., & Nassaji, H. (2018). EFL learners' perceptions of written corrective feedback: Effects of learner-related factors. *System*, 74, 116–127.
- Chen, S., Nassaji, H., & Liu, Q. (2016). EFL learners' perceptions and preferences of written corrective feedback: A case study of university students from Mainland China. *Asian Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 1(5), 1–17.
- Clark, I., & Ouellette, M. (2008). *The handbook of writing assessment*. Routledge.
- Coffin, C., Curry, M. J., Goodman, S., Hewings, A., Lillis, T. M., & Swann, J. (2003). *Teaching academic writing: A toolkit for higher education*. Routledge.
- Connors, R. J., & Lunsford, A. A. (1993). Teachers' rhetorical comments on student papers. *College Composition and Communication*, 44(2), 200–223.
- Corder, S. P. (1983). *Error analysis and interlanguage*. Oxford University Press.
- Diab, R. L. (2005). Teachers' and students' beliefs about responding to ESL writing: A case study. *TESL Canada Journal*, 23(1), 28–43.
- Dincer, A., & Seker, M. (2014). An insight to students' perceptions on teacher feedback in second language writing classes. *English Language Teaching*, 7(2), 73–83.
- Ellis, R. (2008). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63(2), 97–107.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 3–18.
- 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.
- Eslami, E. (2014). The effects of direct and indirect corrective feedback techniques on EFL students' writing. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 445–452.
- Fanselow, J. F. (1977). The treatment of error in oral work. *Foreign Language Annals*, 10(5), 583–593.
- Ferris, D. R. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 33–53.
- Ferris, D. R. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on 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 University Press.
- Ferris, D. R. (2010). Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA: Intersections and practical applications. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 181–201.
- Ferris, D. R. (2011). *Treatment of error in second language student writing* (2nd ed.). University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2005). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 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 by gender. *Oxford Review of Education*, 27(2), 293–305.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.29000/rumelide.816988>
- Graham, S. (2006). Writing. In P. Alexander & P. Winne (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 457–478). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Greenberg, K. L. (1988). Error analysis and grading student papers. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 7(1), 65–77.
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. Pearson Longman.
- Hawthorne, S. (2008). Gender, writing, and identity: Examining student perspectives. *Journal of Academic Writing*, 8(1), 45–59.
- Hedgcock, J. (2005). Taking stock of research and pedagogy in L2 writing. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 597–614). Routledge.
- Hedgcock, J. S., & Lefkowitz, N. (1994). Feedback on feedback: Assessing learner receptivity to teacher response in L2 composing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3(2), 141–163.
- Hosseiny, M. (2014). The role of direct and indirect written corrective feedback in improving Iranian EFL students' writing skill. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 668–674.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39(2), 83–101.
- Jahin, J. H. (2012). The effect of peer reviewing on writing apprehension and essay writing ability of prospective EFL teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(11), 60–84.
- Jamalinesari, A., Rahimi, F., Gowhary, H., & Azizifar, A. (2015). The effects of teacher-written direct vs. indirect feedback on students' writing. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 192, 116–123.
- Joshi, A., Kale, S., Chandel, S., & Pal, D. K. (2015). Likert scale: Explored and explained. *British Journal of Applied Science & Technology*, 7(4), 396–403.
- Jusoh, J. S. B., Mohd Ali, N. Z. B., & Mohd Daud, R. B. (2016). Corrective feedback improves students' writing skill in ESL: A quasi-experimental study. ResearchGate.https://www.researchgate.net/publication/302023584_Corrective_Feedback_Improve_Students%27_Writing_Skill_in_ESL_A_Quasi-Experimental_to_Language_Pedagogy
- Kamari, Z., Samad, A., & Baki, R. (2012). Gender differences in language learning among Iranian EFL learners. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 66, 1962–1971.
- Kamimura, T. (2006). Effects of peer feedback on EFL student writers at different proficiency levels. *TESL-EJ*, 10(2), 1–14.
- Kang, E. Y., & Han, Z. (2015). The efficacy of written corrective feedback in improving L2 written accuracy: A meta-analysis. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12189>
- Klimova, B. F. (2013). Motivation for learning English at a university level. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 3459–3463.
- Knoblauch, C. H., & Brannon, L. (1981). Teacher commentary on student writing: The state of the art. *Freshman English News*, 10(2), 1–4.
- Kubota, R. (2003). Critical teaching of Japanese culture. *Japanese Language and Literature*, 37(1), 67–87.
- Lalande, J. F. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *The Modern Language Journal*, 66(2), 140–149.
- Lee, I. (2008). Student reactions to teacher feedback in two Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(3), 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.
- Long, M. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 377–393). Newbury House.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research Methods in Education* (8th ed.). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315456539>
- Murad, I. H., & Malo, S. S. (2025). Exploring Kurdish EFL students' views on the assessment process at university level. *Humanities Journal of University of Zakho*, 13(1), Article 1538. <https://doi.org/10.26436/hjuoz.2025.13.1.1538>
- Noora, A. (2008). Iranian students' perceptions of language learning and teaching in Iran. *The International Journal of Language Society and Culture*, 24, 30–36.
- 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). Guilford Press.
- Polio, C. (2012). The relevance of second language acquisition theory to the written error correction debate. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(4), 375–389. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.004>
- Peterson, S. (2006). Influence of gender on writing performance. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 29(2), 507–530.
- Radecki, P. M., & Swales, J. M. (1988). ESL student reaction to written comments on their written work. *System*, 16(3), 355–365.

- Riazi, A., & Riasati, M. J. (2007). Language learning style preferences: A study of Iranian EFL students. *Asian EFL Journal*, 9(1), 97–125.
- Sauro, J., & Lewis, J. R. (2016). *Quantifying the user experience: Practical statistics for user research* (2nd ed.). Morgan Kaufmann.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129–158.
- Schulz, R. A. (1996). Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: Students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar. *The Modern Language Journal*, 80(2), 149–168.
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2020). *Research methods for business: A skill-building approach* (8th ed.). Wiley.
- Selinker, L. (1969). Language transfer. *General Linguistics*, 9, 67–92.
- Semke, H. D. (1984). Effects of the red pen. *Foreign Language Annals*, 17(3), 195–202.
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(2), 255–283.
- Shintani, N., Ellis, R., & Suzuki, W. (2014). Effects of written feedback and revision on learners' accuracy in using two English grammatical structures. *Language Learning*, 64(1), 103–131.
- Straub, R. (1996). The concept of control in teacher response: Defining the varieties of 'directive' and 'facilitative' commentary. *College Composition and Communication*, 47(2), 223–251.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46(2), 327–369.
- Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(4), 255–272.
- Wang, X. (2017). The effects of corrective feedback on Chinese learners' writing accuracy: A quantitative analysis in an EFL context. *World Journal of Education*, 7(2), 74–88. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v7n2p74>
- Wu, L. (2020). Gender and learners' beliefs in corrective feedback in learning Chinese as a foreign language: A network questionnaire survey report. *International Educational Research*, 3(4), 1. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30560/ier.v3n4p1>
- Zhang, Z. (2017). Exploring the impact of feedback literacy on students' engagement with feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42(6), 8.

فیدبکی راگه‌هاندنی نووسراو ل نووسینی زمانی نینگلیزی وهک زمانیکی دووم: هه‌لیژاردن و بوچوونی خویندکاری زانکو به په‌یوه‌ندی به جیندهر

پوخته:

ئهم توژیینه‌یه بوچوو و هه‌لیژاردنه جیندهری خویندکاری کوردی زانکو زاخ که زمانی نینگلیزی وهک زمانیکی بیانی (EFL) فیردین، ل سباعت به Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) ل نووسینی نه‌کادیمه‌دهکات. ئهم توژیینه‌یه ل کولنجی زانستی مرقابه‌ی زانکو زاخ ل سالی خویندنی (2024-2025) به‌یوه چوو و 60 خویندکار و خویندکاری سالی دووم ل بهشی زمانی نینگلیزی به‌شداربوون که پرسنامه‌یهکی راهنراوی 14 بندی مقیاس لیکرت پرکردن. نامانجی توژیینه‌یه که هه‌سنگاندنی رووبیری نیر و هاوره‌گهز بو جوره جوری رینگلانی WCF و تیگه‌بشتنه‌کانیان ل سهر کاریگه‌یهی ئهم رینگلانه ل دروستکردنی پاراگرافه نووسراو مکان بوو. شیوازی توژیینه‌یهی ژمیریاری به‌کار هاتوو و داتاگان به به‌نامه‌ی SPSS گوه‌ه‌تویا 25 هاتیه به‌کار هینان راپورت کراون به شیوه‌ی ناماره و مسقیه‌مکان و تاقیکردنه‌یهی t بو نموونه‌یهکی سهر به‌خو بو دیاریکردنی جیوازی جیندهری. بو شروقه‌مکرنا پشتراستی مادده‌کانی پرسنامه‌که، کرؤنباک ئه‌لفا (Alpha Cronbach) به‌کار هاتوو.

ئهنجامه‌کان و هشان ددهن که هه‌روو گروپ، نیر و هاوره‌گهز، WCF له چاوه‌روانیهکی چاکدا دهمین بو به‌سزکردنه‌یهی هیز، ناگاداری ل هه‌لمکان و په‌پیدانی توانا نووسینی. به‌لام جیوازی به‌کانی جیندهری ل هه‌ستی هه‌ستیار و هه‌لیژاردنی جوری فیدبک دهر خستن. بو نموونه، جیوازی به‌تایه‌بیه‌مکان دیار بوون ل مادده‌کان وهک هه‌ستی خویندکاران به فه‌خرو سهرکه‌وتن ل وهرگرتنی فیدبکی دروست، هه‌ستی ناخوشی ل راگه‌هاندنی نووسراو، و په‌سندکردنی هه‌لیژاردنه‌کان به‌ی روونکردنه‌یهی. خویندکاری هاوره‌گهز هه‌ستی هه‌ستیار زیاتر و فه‌خز و ره‌زایه‌تی به‌سزتر ل وهرگرتنی فیدبکی دروست پینشان داوون، و رینگلانی روون و گه‌نتی ل راگه‌هاندنه‌یهی په‌سند ده‌مکان که دهره‌نگه‌په‌یستی به روونی و رینمایه‌یهکی زور ل فیرکاری ده‌یبت. به شیوه‌یهکی جیوازی، خویندکاری نیر فیدبک هه‌ست به سهرنهرکیشی و ناخوشی ده‌مکان و هه‌لیژاردنه‌کانیان له جوره هه‌لیژاردنه‌کانی دیاریکراو یان ناراسته‌خو وهک نیشاندان به‌ی ره‌خنه‌یان سهرنج ددهن ئه‌لها بو هه‌لمکانی که مانای خویندن ده‌سپینی ده‌مکان.

له‌گه‌ل ئهم جیوازی هه‌ستیار و ستراتیجیه‌یه‌کانه‌یه، هه‌چ جیوازی سیستهمی جیندهری نه‌خو زرایه‌یه ل لایه‌ی رووشنه‌کان بو گه‌نتی به‌کار هینانی WCF، یان ل سهر روونکردنه‌یهی و هاورکاری ل دامه‌زاردنی عاده‌مکانی تیگه‌بشتن ل نووسین. ئهم دوزینه‌یه‌یه‌یه پینشانی به ریکه‌سستی راهنراوی راگه‌هاندن به‌هاوپیهمانی جیندهر ده‌مکان که هه‌ستی هه‌ستیار و ستراتیجی خویندکاران بو دابین ده‌کات بو که سانه‌یه‌یهکی باشتر و نه‌واوتر ل فیرکاری نووسینی زمانی نینگلیزی وهک زمانیکی دووم.

په‌یفتن سهره‌کی: فه‌رجیری نووسراو راستکردنه‌یه، هه‌لیژاردنی جوری فیدبک، تیگه‌بشتن، جیوازی به‌کانی جیندهر، زمانی نینگلیزی وهک زمانیکی بیانی.

التصحیح الكتابی الراجعی فی الكتابة باللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية: تفضیلات الطلبة الجامعیین وإدراكاتهم وفقاً لجنسهم

المخلص :

تتناول هذه الدراسة المعتقدات والتفضیلات المتعلقة بالجنس لدى طلبة جامعة زاخو من الأكراد الذين يدرسون اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية (EFL) تجاه التصحيح الكتابی الراجعی Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) في الكتابة الأكاديمية. أجريت الدراسة في كلية العلوم الإنسانية بجامعة زاخو خلال العام الدراسي (2024-2025)، وشارك فيها 60 طالباً وطالبة من السنة الثانية في قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، حيث أكملوا استبياناً موجهاً مكوناً من 14 بنداً على مقياس ليكرت. هدفت الدراسة إلى استكشاف كيفية نظر الطلاب والطالبات إلى مختلف أساليب التصحيح الكتابی، ومدى إدراكهم لتأثير هذه التصحيحات في بناء الفقرات الكتابية. وقد استخدم منهج كمي، وتم تحليل البيانات باستخدام برنامج SPSS الإصدار 25، حيث تم تطبيق الإحصاءات الوصفية واختبارات (t) العينات المستقلة لفحص الفروقات المستندة إلى الجنس. كما تم استخدام معامل كرونباخ ألفا (Cronbach Alpha) لتحليل موثوقية عناصر الاستبيان. أظهرت النتائج أن كلا من الذكور والإناث رأوا في التصحيح الكتابی أداة مفيدة لتعزيز دافعتهم ووعيهم بالأخطاء وتطوير مهاراتهم الكتابية. ومع ذلك، برزت تأثيرات إحصائية مرتبطة بالجنس فيما يتعلق بالاستجابات النفسية وتفضیلات نوع التصحيح. فعلى سبيل المثال، ظهرت فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية في بنود تتعلق بشعور الطلبة بالفخر عند تلقي تغذية راجعة بناءة، وفضلان الأساليب الواضحة والشاملة في التصحيح، مما يشير إلى حاجتهم إلى التوجيه والوضوح في التدريس. في المقابل، مال الذكور إلى شعور أعلى بالفخر والرضا عند تلقي التغذية الراجعة البناءة، وفضلوا الأنواع الانتقائية أو غير المباشرة مثل وضع علامات دون تعليق أو التركيز فقط على الأخطاء التي تعيق الفهم. وعلى الرغم من هذه الفروقات النفسية رؤية التغذية الراجعة كمصدر للإحباط، وفضلوا الأنواع الانتقائية أو غير المباشرة مثل وضع علامات دون تعليق أو التركيز فقط على الأخطاء التي تعيق الفهم. وعلى الرغم من هذه الفروقات النفسية والاستراتيجية، لم تُلاحظ فروق منهجية بين الجنسين في مواقفهم تجاه الفائدة العامة للتصحيح الكتابی، أو في دوره في تحسين الشفافية أو في تعزيز عادات التأمل الذاتي من خلال الكتابة. وتشير هذه النتائج إلى أهمية اعتماد أسلوب تغذية راجعة يراعي الفروق الجندرية، ويأخذ في الاعتبار الجوانب النفسية والاستراتيجية لدى الطلبة، من أجل تحقيق تعليم أكثر فاعلية وشمولية في مجال الكتابة باللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية.

الكلمات المفتاح: التصحيح الكتابی الراجعی، تفضیل نوع التغذية الراجعة، الإدراك، الفروقات الجندرية، اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية .