

Gender and Learners' Beliefs in Corrective Feedback in Learning Chinese as a Foreign Language: A Network Questionnaire Survey Report

Liqin Wu¹

¹ Anhui University of Finance and Economics, Bengbu, Anhui, China

Correspondence: Liqin Wu, a professor of English in Languages and Media, AUFU. Her fields of interest include SLA, applied linguistics, psycholinguistics, etc. 962 Caoshan Road, Bengbu, Anhui, China. 233030. E-mail: lilywulq@126.com

Received: November 3, 2020; Accepted: November 13, 2020; Published: November 14, 2020

This research is financially supported by The Key Anhui Humanities and Social Sciences Planned Project Fund (AHKZZ2018D16); and by The Key Scientific Research Fund in Anhui University of Finance and Economics (AUFU) (ACKY1805ZDA).

Abstract

This network questionnaire survey aims to confirm whether gender differences exist in learners' beliefs in corrective feedback (CF) in learning Chinese as a foreign language (LCFL). Ninety-seven (53 male and 44 female) university learners of Chinese from 33 countries participated in the survey. The statistical results indicated that there were little significant differences in male and female learners' beliefs in CF in LCFL except in two psychological effects in which male learners seemed more emotional or grateful to teachers' correction; that culture did not influence male and female learners' beliefs in CF; that *self-correction* and *teachers' correction* are more welcomed than *peers'*; that *immediate correction* in specific contexts was preferred; that teachers were supposed to *tell the learners where the mistake was before correcting it*; that it was not confirmed whether *direct* or *indirect correction* was better; that learners' preference of frequency of CF was between *sometimes* or *often*; and that *negative* effects of CF were not found. These findings may contribute to the Chinese teachers' understanding of learners as individuals and to correction methods teachers adopt while confronting learners' errors in teaching Chinese as a foreign language (TCFL) classes.

Keywords: gender, beliefs, CF, LCFL, network questionnaire survey

1. Introduction

The difference between male and female is something that everybody knows and nobody knows (Money, 1987, 13). A long history of research has shown that females are superior on many measures of memory, verbal tasks without considering the types of memory, like episodic memory, and the quality of the speech (Halpern, 2012, 115-123). Numerous indicators of gender differences in second language acquisition (SLA) or foreign language learning (FLL) have been presented by scholars and researchers (Aliakbari & Tazik, 2011; Ehrlich, 1997; Kobayashi, 2002; Tercanlioglu, 2004; Zoghi et al., 2013). And the relationship between learners' beliefs and the preference of CF has been studied (Ding & Zhao, 2019; Zu & Ma, 2015). Results display that teachers may not be aware of the students preferred CF types in written errors (Alshahrani & Storch, 2013). The preference of CF type is closely related to anxiety. For example, *recast* and *metalinguistic* feedback types were better rated by the students who reported higher levels of anxiety in oral communication classes (Martin & Valdivia, 2017).

However, research on gender and learners' beliefs in CF in LCFL is rarely reported. Do gender differences exist in learners' beliefs in CF in LCFL? This is a crucial issue in LCFL or TCFL that the author tries to explore to contribute to LCFL or to SLA.

2. Literature Review

Previous studies in gender and learners' beliefs in CF in SLA or FLL comprise two essential issues. One is about gender in SLA; the other concerns the relationship between the choice of CF types and learners' beliefs.

2.1 Gender in SLA

Gender's role in SLA or FLL has been a controversial issue for researchers, educators, and scholars for over half a century. Earlier research in gender differences in SLA or FLL can be divided into two main streams: One features performance-related differences, learning strategy differences and language learning as being a particularly female activity; The other manifests more social constructionist views of language and gender (Feery, 2008). Gender differences are studied from the perspectives of sociolinguistics, ethnology, pedagogy, linguistics, psycholinguistics, and cognitive linguistics, etc.

Much evidence seems to have shown that females tend to have better verbal abilities than males, males are better than girls in mathematics. Bećirović's (2017) findings indicate that female students are more successful at learning English as a foreign language than male students at each group/grade level. But females' advantage in verbal abilities is likely to be small and depends on the type of verbal ability that is measured (Halpern, 2012, 119). And their language proficiency is a genetically-influenced ability interacting with environmental factors such as motivation, orientation, education, and learner strategies that still mediate between endowment and acquiring language proficiency at an adult stage (van der Slik et al., 2015).

Hyde et al. (2008) research in several states in the United States indicates that there was virtually no difference in the average math scores for girls and boys from Grades 2 through 11. But, as the authors noted, the items in the tests required lower level thinking rather than higher level thinking. Besides, races play a dominant role in the significance of sex differences in mathematics at advanced level. For White students, predominance of boys to girls among the highest scorers was obvious, but it was vague for Asian/ Pacific Islander students (Halpern, 2012, 146).

Karlak & Medve's (2016) research reveals that female learners were significantly more motivated than males in certain motivational dimensions, but *male learners of English* achieved statistically significantly higher results than female peers in standardized evaluation. However, in *German* no statistically significant gender differences were found, irrespective of the measure of communicative competence.

Besides, males and females are proven to be different in *cognitive styles* or *psychological* differentiation (Witkin et al., 1962; Kao et al., 2017). Evidence suggests that girls were better at recognizing faces than boys (Rehman & Herlitz, 2006; Sasson et al, 2010). Regarding the interaction of age with gender, females consistently outperformed males in the reported strategy use, in all grade levels and categories except for the social (Platsidou & Sipitanou, 2015). Females were found to be more motivated than male language learners, and have more positive attitudes toward speakers of the target language (Gardner and Lambert, 1972; Muchnick and Wolfe, 1982). On the other hand, in the research on the gender differences in affective variable in FLL, females showed higher anxiety than males though they earned higher scores on exams (Bell & McCallum, 2012). But it was also reported that boys, but not girls, used negative attributes for self-description (Martínez-Marín, 2019). Kriegbaum et al's (2018) study found no significant moderator effects for gender. Males and females exhibited different advantages and disadvantages in learning online within the personal learning environment (Wu & Cheng, 2019).

2.2 CF and Language Learner Beliefs in SLA or FLL

CF refers to "any indication to the learners that their use of language is incorrect, including various responses that learners receive" (Lightbown and Spada, 1999, 171-172). In a narrow sense, CF was usually categorized into six types (Lyster & Ranta, 1997), including *explicit correction*, *recasts*, *clarification requests*, *metalinguistic feedback*, *elicitation*, and *repetition*. But in a broad sense, it takes two forms: *explicit* and *implicit* or *direct* and *indirect* (Ellis et al., 2009; Karim & Nassaji, 2020; Kim et al., 2020; Lyster et al., 2013).

Language learner beliefs in SLA or FLL were initially proposed and then were theoretically put forward by Horwitz (1985; 1988) for the well-known Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory (BALLI). The current research on language learner beliefs in SLA or FLL often revolves around the following eight questions based on the early five ones (Ellis, 2009; Hendrickson, 1978; Zhu & Wang, 2019): 1. Is it necessary for the teacher to correct learners' errors? 2. What errors should be corrected? Errors in spelling or grammar or pronunciation or reading aloud or structure, or any other errors? 3. Who is to correct the error? It is the teacher or the student himself or herself or the peers who should correct the errors? 4. When to correct? Should errors be corrected immediately or afterwards? 5. How to correct? Should errors be corrected explicitly or implicitly (or directly or indirectly)? Or by using any or some of the six types mentioned above? 6. Which type of CF is the most effective? 7. How often is to correct? Always or often or sometimes or seldom correct? 8. What effects of CF produces on learners? Positive or negative effects?

So far, the research on the gender and learners' beliefs in CF, especially in CF in LCFL is rarely reported. Therefore, it is of vital importance to conduct this research to fill the gap in this aspect.

This article is to compare male and female learners' beliefs in CF in LCFL with the aim to determine whether gender influences learners' beliefs in CF in LCFL to eliminate gender-based stereotypes in language learning. Moreover, it tries to uncover what male and female learners perceive about CF in LCFL and how they expect the teacher to correct their errors. It is hoped that the results of this study have some potential implications for teachers to improve teaching pedagogy in TCFL and considering learners as individuals instead of simply different gender groups.

3. Research Questions and Hypotheses

This article explores the relation between gender and learners' beliefs in CF in LCFL. The questions the author raises are:

1. Do male and female learners perceive CF differently in Chinese classes?
2. Do male and female learners anticipate different types of CF from their Chinese teachers?
3. Do cultural factors influence male and female learners' beliefs in CF in LCFL since they are from 33 different cultural backgrounds?

To answer the above questions, we pose the following hypotheses:

H₁: Male and female learners have similar perception of CF in LCFL.

H₂: Male and female learners have similar beliefs in CF in LCFL.

H₃: Culture influences male and female learners' beliefs in CF in LCFL.

4. Methodology

In this network questionnaire survey, the quantitative research was applied to discern whether gaps exist between male and female learners, hoping to find some constructive clues for LCFL or TCFL. A 5-point Likert scale was mainly used to measure students' beliefs in CF in LCFL.

4.1 Participants

Ninety-seven international students, including 53 males, 44 females, participated in this on-line survey. The participants had studied Chinese for 5 months to 5 years, a great majority of them were studying in different universities in Anhui Province in China. They were from 33 countries in Asia, Africa, Europe, island country of Southwest Pacific Ocean and South America.

4.2 Instrument

The network questionnaire survey on learners' beliefs in CF in LCFL is made up of three sections with 56 items in total. Section 1 was about demographic data, items 1-4 in this section were: *gender*, *nationality*, *time of Chinese study*, and *the university where the participant was learning Chinese*. Section 2 was composed of 47 items about learners' *perception of committing verbal errors in Chinese classes*, and eight issues in CF: *whether*, *what*, *who*, *when*, *how*, *how often*, *which* and *what effects* (including students' psychological effects CF produced in Chinese classes). The 5-point Likert scale used in items 5-47 was: *1=strongly disagree*; *2=disagree*; *3=not sure*; *4=agree*; *5=strongly agree*; but the scale in items 48-51 was: *1=never*; *2=seldom*; *3=sometimes*; *4=often*; *5=always* since it was about the survey of the frequency of CF. After finishing reading each of the 47 items, participants were required to choose one choice from the 5-point Likert scale.

To know more about *how* and *when to correct* in oral and written classes, Section 3 was designed, which included 5 questions. Different from those above, the choices in the section were more detailed and concrete. Choices in items 52-55 were: *1=immediately correct*; *2=correct after I finish speaking*; *3=correct me personally after class*; *4=correct together with other peer' errors*; *5=not correct*. The choices for item 56 were: *1=correct together with peers' errors*; *2=The teacher underlines the wrong places, then the students correct them by themselves*; *3=give the correct forms directly*; *4=correct face to face*; *5=The teacher provides the related network link addresses, and then the students search for the relevant information themselves*; *6=not to correct*; *7=other methods*.

To guarantee the quality of the questionnaire survey, the items of the same category were maximally separated; affirmative and negative items were alternated; and the same issue was asked occasionally twice in different ways to avoid the participants' inertial selection.

Wenjuanxing (<https://www.wjx.cn/>), an online questionnaire survey platform in China was used in distributing, collecting and analyzing the questionnaire survey. The statistical technique employed for comparison

and analysis in this platform was a paid on-line SPSS software through using *one-way anova*. It was used to calculate the mean of the male and the female learners' choices, and finally test if the observed data supported the hypotheses.

Gender was considered as the single *independent variable*, and all the other 52 items in Sections 2 and 3 as *dependent variables*.

5. Data Collection and Analysis

Learners were invited to complete the survey at *we-chat* without time limitation. After their submission, the data were automatically collected and calculated at *wen juan xing*. By using one-way anova, the results of learners' beliefs in CF in LCFL were obtained.

The following is about the results of one-way anova about male and female learners' beliefs in CF in LCFL in Section 2 (see Tables 1)

Table 1. One-Way ANOVA: Male and Female Learners' Beliefs in CF in LCFL (Section 2)

Item	Gender (M±SD)		F	p
	Male (n=53)	Female (n=44)		
Perception of language errors				
9. It is normal for me to commit errors in the process of Chinese learning.	4.21±0.77	4.27±0.76	0.175	0.677
Whether to Correct				
5. It is very necessary for teachers to correct students' language errors.	4.11±0.70	4.32±0.67	2.139	0.147
28. Teachers should correct students' language errors in class.	4.04±0.71	4.11±0.75	0.261	0.610
31. I don't like teachers to correct my errors in class.	1.94±1.08	2.07±1.02	0.337	0.563
What to Correct				
6. Errors in oral Chinese practice class should be corrected.	4.11±0.91	4.18±0.69	0.168	0.683
11. I hope the teacher will correct every mistake I make.	3.72±1.01	4.07±0.93	3.146	0.079
35. I would like my teachers to correct my oral errors.	4.15±0.60	4.14±0.80	0.011	0.918
36. I would like my teacher to correct my written errors.	4.26±0.59	4.34±0.75	0.319	0.574
40. Teachers should try to correct all the students' language errors.	3.92±0.90	3.77±1.01	0.616	0.434
41. Teachers should correct the common or habitual errors, not all of them.	3.36±0.92	3.39±0.99	0.020	0.886
42. Teachers should focus on correcting grammatical errors.	3.36±0.94	3.41±1.00	0.066	0.798
32. Teachers should not correct students' pronunciation errors in class unless they interfere with comprehensibility.	2.19±1.08	2.25±1.16	0.073	0.788
33. Teachers should not correct students' grammatical errors in class unless they interfere with comprehensibility.	2.26±1.09	2.27±1.11	0.001	0.970
Who is to correct				
29. Students' language errors should be corrected by teachers because they are specialists.	3.89±1.01	4.16±0.71	2.252	0.137
14. When I commit language errors in class, I hope the teacher will guide me to find the correct form myself.	4.09±0.74	4.27±0.62	1.606	0.208
30. It is better for teachers to guide students to correct their errors by themselves than to say the correct forms directly.	3.74±1.06	3.75±0.84	0.005	0.943
37. I prefer to be corrected by my peers in a small group work rather than by my teachers in front of the entire class.	2.87±1.02	2.73±1.02	0.457	0.501
When to Correct				
10. In my view, the teacher should correct my errors immediately in class.	3.94±0.72	3.93±0.79	0.006	0.94
7. I hope the teacher can correct my errors immediately when I commit errors in answering questions.	4.06±0.84	3.89±1.02	0.815	0.369

8. I hope the teacher can correct my errors immediately when I commit errors in reading the text aloud.	4.04±0.92	3.91±0.77	0.543	0.463
16. I hope the teacher will correct my errors immediately when I make errors in pronunciations.	4.15±0.69	4.30±0.59	1.194	0.277
17. I hope the teacher will correct my errors immediately when I make errors in vocabulary.	4.04±0.78	4.11±0.62	0.272	0.603
18. I hope the teacher will correct my errors immediately when I make errors in grammar.	4.13±0.79	4.14±0.73	0.001	0.978
19. I hope the teacher will correct my errors immediately when I make errors in language use.	4.06±0.74	4.18±0.58	0.826	0.366
43. When a student makes an error, the teacher had better correct it immediately.	3.77±0.85	3.77±0.89	0.000	0.996
How to Correct				
12. When I commit language errors in class, I hope the teacher will tell me directly the correct form.	3.91±0.81	4.11±0.69	1.797	0.183
13. When I commit language errors in class, I hope the teacher will tell me what is wrong before telling me the correct form.	4.15±0.69	4.25±0.75	0.457	0.501
44. When a student makes a mistake, the best strategy is to say clearly, "No, you should not say in this way, you should say...".	3.51±1.05	3.50±1.17	0.002	0.967
45. When students make errors, the best strategy is to explain the relevant grammar rules.	3.96±0.78	4.05±0.68	0.305	0.582
How often to correct				
48. Teachers should () correct pronunciation errors.	3.91±0.95	4.05±0.78	0.616	0.434
49. Teachers should () correct lexical errors.	3.83±0.96	3.91±0.86	0.180	0.673
50. Teachers should () correct grammar errors.	3.98±0.97	4.20±0.77	1.538	0.218
51. Teachers should () correct language use errors.	3.92±1.00	4.11±0.84	0.994	0.321
Which is effective				
46. Indirect error correction is better than direct one because it does not hurt students' self-esteem.	3.49±1.05	3.36±1.16	0.319	0.574
47. Direct error correction is often more effective than indirect one because it saves students' time to find out the correct one.	3.47±0.85	3.77±0.96	2.690	0.104
What Effects of CF				
15. It helps me a lot when the teacher corrects my language errors in class.	4.34±0.71	4.25±0.53	0.481	0.490
38. I learn a lot when my teacher corrects the errors made by my peers in class.	3.96±0.88	3.89±0.89	0.177	0.675
39. I learn a lot when my teacher corrects the errors I make in class.	4.15±0.74	4.14±0.77	0.009	0.925
20. If the teacher keeps correcting me, I will be unwilling to speak.	2.38±1.18	2.23±1.22	0.378	0.540
21. If the teacher keeps correcting me, I will be afraid to speak.	1.89±0.95	2.11±1.17	1.111	0.294
22. Teachers' correction makes me feel humiliated.	1.96±1.14	1.80±0.98	0.583	0.447
23. Teachers' correction in class makes me nervous and anxious.	1.83±1.01	2.02±1.07	0.826	0.366
24. Teachers' correction in class makes me shy.	1.89±1.01	2.14±1.15	1.287	0.259
25. Teachers' correction in class makes me reluctant to answer the questions for a period.	2.02±1.15	1.95±0.99	0.085	0.771
26. I feel lucky when my teacher corrects my errors in class.	3.87±1.16	3.27±1.39	5.295	0.024*
27. I feel grateful to my teacher for correcting my errors.	4.17±0.94	3.52±1.41	7.331	0.008**
34. I feel cheated if a teacher does not correct the written work I hand in.	3.30±0.99	3.59±1.02	1.991	0.161

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01

Results indicate that statistically significant differences were not found between *gender* and *perception of committing verbal errors in Chinese classes* and *eight issues* ($p>0.05$) except in items 26 and 27(* $p<0.05$; ** $p<0.01$).

The mean in each item in Tables 1 demonstrates that male and female learners showed little difference in *perception of committing language errors*. Concisely, both male and female learners agreed or quite agreed to the *normality to commit errors* in the process of Chinese learning and *necessity to correct errors (whether to correct)*. They showed little difference in *what to correct*, too. Specifically, they agreed to or strongly agreed to *error correction in oral Chinese practice class*. As to whether *every mistake* or *common/habitual* or *grammar mistakes* should be corrected, their choices were between *not sure* and *agree*. However, they agreed or strongly agreed to *oral* and *written* correction. Regarding the items whether *pronunciation* or *grammatical errors* in class should not be corrected if they do not interfere with comprehensibility, their choices were close to *disagree*. Concerning *who is to correct*, their choices were also similar to each other. If we arrange them from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*, they are *self-correction under guidance* (but learners hesitated when teachers' correction and self-correction were mixed), *teachers' correction*, and *peers' correction*. Likewise, they were consistent with each other in *when to correct*. Specifically, both male and female learners agreed or strongly agreed to *immediate correction* of errors in *pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar and language use*. As to immediate correction of errors in *answering questions, reading the text aloud*, males (4.06; 4.04) showed a little bit stronger desire than females (3.89; 3.91). But for the general statement of *immediate correction of errors*(items 10 and 13), the means were lower than those for the concrete ones(items 7, 8, 16, 17, 18 and 19). Equally, they displayed little discrepancy in *how to correct*. They agreed or strongly agreed to the statement of *telling students what is wrong before telling them the correct form*. The means of the females in *telling directly the correct form* (4.11) and *explaining the relevant grammar rules* (4.05) were a bit higher than those of the males (3.91; 3.96). They showed no certainty in direct correction "No, you should not say in this way, you should say...". Male and female learners didn't show any significant differences in *how often to correct*, either. Their means were approximately between *sometimes* and *often* whether it was in *pronunciation, lexical, grammar or language use errors*, with female learners' means (4.05; 3.91; 4.20; 4.11) respectively a bit higher than male learners'(3.91; 3.83; 3.98; 3.92). Moreover, they demonstrated little differentia in *which type of CF is most effective*. Detailly, it was not obvious as whether *direct* or *indirect correction* is better, for all their means were below 4. They also showed little difference in the *effects of CF* except in except in items 26 and 27. Specifically, significant gender difference existed in "I feel lucky when my teachers correct my errors in class" for its *p* was less than 0.05($F=5.295$, $p=0.024$). The mean of the male in this item was 3.87, obviously higher than that of the female (3.27). Great significant gender difference also appeared in "I feel grateful to my teacher for correcting my errors" for its *p* was less than 0.01($F=7.331$, $p=0.008$). And the mean of the male in this item was 4.17, obviously higher than that of the female (3.52). Overall, they agreed to or strongly agreed to the positive effect of CF provided by teachers. But the effect of peers' correction was not as apparent as that of teachers'. The positive psychological effects were also revealed from the means. Teachers' CF did not make learners *unwilling to speak, afraid to speak, feel humiliated, nervous and anxious, or reluctant to answer the questions for a period*. But it was not certain whether *learners would feel cheated without teachers' CF*.

Then, the form of the questionnaire was transformed into 5 questions to know more about *how* and *when to correct* in oral and written classes. Here are the results of one-way anova about male and female learners' beliefs in CF in LCFL in Section 3 (see Tables 2).

Table 2. One-Way ANOVA: Male and Female Learners Beliefs in CF in LCFL (Section 3)

Item	Gender (M±SD)		F	p
	Male (n=53)	Female (n=44)		
Answer the following questions.				
<i>When and how to correct</i>				
52. When do you expect the teacher to correct your pronunciation errors in oral practice class?	2.09±1.13	2.05±0.94	0.052	0.820
53. When do you expect the teacher to correct your lexical errors in oral practice class?	2.04±1.04	1.98±0.82	0.098	0.755
54. When do you expect the teacher to correct your grammar errors in oral practice class?	2.21±1.12	2.20±1.02	0.000	0.989
55. When do you expect the teacher to correct your language use errors in oral practice class?	2.04±1.04	2.05±0.91	0.001	0.969
56. In what way do you like your teacher to correct your written mistakes?	2.68±1.65	2.11±1.35	3.321	0.072

* $p<0.05$, ** $p<0.01$

As the table reveals that male and female learners did not display any significant differences in *when* and *how to correct* in oral and written courses, either ($p>0.05$). Their choices in items 52-55 mainly focused on *correction after finishing speaking* in oral practice class. As to the written errors, their choices were between *underlining the wrong places for students to correct them by themselves* and *teacher's giving the correct forms directly*.

6. Discussion

Both male and female learners demonstrated little significant differences in *perception of committing verbal errors in Chinese classes*, and in *whether, what, who, when, how, how often, which* and *what effects* in CF in LCFL. These results accept H_1 and H_2 except in items 26 and 27. Male learners showed more gratefulness and sensitivity to teachers' CF than female ones, which is quite beyond the traditional images of males who are masculine and insensitive to emotions. A further research has found that "The human male is, on most measures, more vulnerable than the female. Part of the explanation is the biological fragility of the male fetus, which is little understood and not widely known." (Kraemer, 2000) It is the biological factor that partially accounts for the emotional gap between male and female learners. Therefore, masculine stereotype on males is harmful to learners and teachers. This finding enables the author to stand firm on the belief that males, like females, are individuals with similarities and differences.

However, the results do not accept H_3 , i.e. culture did not categorize these international learners into male or female group with different beliefs in CF in LCFL although they were from 33 cultural backgrounds with diverse educational customs. In other word, male and female learners' beliefs are not influenced by their cultures.

7. Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

This paper compared male and female learners' beliefs in CF in LCFL by means of one-way anova. The results found in the research may be conducive to LCFL or TCFL. Yet, limitations in the research constrained the researcher from going into the deeper side of the topic.

Firstly, all the results in this survey were based on a network questionnaire survey without other any parameters like interviews, learners' achievements, etc. Next, the 5-point Likert scale remained unaltered without flexible options that learners may choose from. Finally, the reasons for the choices were not supplied in the questionnaire survey. As a result, it is hard for the author to analyze the reasons when differences emerge.

Multiple research methods might be adopted for future research in the similar topics, case studies, ethnographic studies, narrative inquiry, etc. They may involve more detailed designs in each specific category to explore gender and learners' beliefs in CF in LCFL.

8. Conclusion

Results in one-way anova reveal that broadly there were little significant differences between male and female learners in CF in LCFL. These results echo the findings in Halpern (2012). The author compared male and female beliefs in CF in LCFL, she did not mean to distinguish males from females in learning. But rather she treated them equally or as a single group with different emotions and motivations in LCFL.

For a long time there has been existing a serious and common misunderstanding about sex differences: women are like this, men are like that, then treat each sex differently according to these differences. As a result, many similarities between males and females are obscured, and people as individuals are neglected (Halpern, 2012, 151). However, in modern scientific research every learner is an individual with individualized character, verbal ability, aptitude.

Acknowledgements

The author is very grateful to all the participants and teachers who have contributed a lot to the data collection.

References

- Aliakbari, M., & Tazik, K. (2011). On the relationship between gender and perceptual language learning styles: the case of Iranian academic EFL learners. *Educational Psychology: An International Journal of Experimental Educational Psychology*, 31(6), 654-674, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2011.592275>
- Alshahrani, A., & Storch, N. (2013). Investigating teachers' written corrective feedback practices in a Saudi EFL context: How do they align with their Beliefs, institutional guidelines, and students' preferences? *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 37(2), 101-122. <http://doi.org/10.1075/ARAL.37.2.02ALS>
- Bećirović, S. (2017). The Relationship between gender, motivation and achievement in learning English as a foreign language. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, 6(2), 210-220. <https://doi.org/10.13187/ejced.2017.2.210>

- Bell, S., & McCallum, R. (2012). Do foreign language learning, cognitive, and affective variables differ as a function of exceptionality status and gender? *International Education*, 42(1), 86-106. Retrieved from <http://trace.tennessee.edu/internationaleducation/vol42/iss1/6>
- Ding, Y., & Zhao, T. (2019). Chinese university EFL teachers' and students' beliefs about EFL writing: differences, influences, and pedagogical implications. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 42(2), 163-181. <http://doi.org/10.1515/CJAL-2019-0010>
- Ehrlich, S. (1997). Gender as Social Practice: Implications for Second Language Acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(4), 421-446. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197004014>
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development, *L2 Journal*, 1, 3-18. <http://doi.org/10.5070/12.v1i1.9054>
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2009). *Implicit and explicit knowledge in second language learning, testing and teaching*. Clevedon, North Somerset: United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.
- Feery, K. (2008). Current perspectives on the role of gender in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) Research. *ITB Journal*, 9(1), 32-51. <https://doi.org/10.21427/D7DB3H>
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Halpern, D. F. (2012). *Sex Differences in Cognitive Abilities*. New York, NY: Psychology Press; Hove, East Sussex: Psychology Press.
- Hendrickson, J. M. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice. *Modern Language Journal*, 62(8), 387-398. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1978.tb02409.x>
- Horwitz, E. K. (1985). Using student beliefs about language learning and teaching in the foreign language methods course. *Foreign Language Annals*, 18, 333-340. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1985.tb01811.x>
- Horwitz, E. K. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *Modern Language Journal*, 72(3), 283-294. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1988.tb04190.x>
- Hyde, J. S., Lindberg, S. M., Linn, M. C., Ellis, A., & Williams, C. (2008). Gender similarities characterize math performance. *Science*, 321, 494-495. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1160364>
- Kao, P. C., Chen, K. T. C., & Craigie, P. (2017). Gender differences in strategies for coping with foreign language learning anxiety. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 45(2), 205-210. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.5771>
- Karim, K., & Nassaji, H. (2020). The revision and transfer effects of direct and indirect comprehensive corrective feedback on ESL students' writing. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(4), 519-539. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818802469>
- Karлак, M., & Medve, V. B. (2016). Gender differences in the use of learning strategies, motivation and communicative competence in German and English as foreign languages. *STRANI JEZICI*, 45, 163-183. Retrieved from: <https://hrcak.srce.hr/193101>
- Kim, Y. J., Choi, B., Kang, S., Kim, B., & Yun, H. (2020). Comparing the effects of direct and indirect synchronous written corrective feedback: Learning outcomes and students' perceptions. *Foreign Language Annals*, 53(1), 176-199. <http://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12443>
- Kobayashi, Y. (2002). The role of gender in foreign language learning attitudes: Japanese female students' attitudes towards English learning. *Gender and Education*, 14(2), 181-197. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09540250220133021>
- Kraemer, S. (2000). The fragile male. *BMJ*, 321(7276): 1609-1612. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.321.7276.1609>
- Kriegbaum, K., Becker, B., & Spinath, B. (2018). The relative importance of intelligence and motivation as predictors of school achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 25, 120-148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2018.10.001>
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37-66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 1-40. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000365>

- Martínez-Marín, M.D., & Martínez, C. (2019). Negative and positive attributes of gender stereotypes and gender self-attributions: A Study with Spanish adolescents. *Child Indicators Research*, 12, 1043-1063. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-018-9569-9>
- Martin, S., & Valdivia, I. M. A. (2017). Students' feedback beliefs and anxiety in online foreign language oral tasks. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 14(1), 1-15. <http://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-017-0056-z>
- Money, J. (1987). Propaedeutics of ducious G-I/R: Theoretical foundations for understanding dimorphic gender-identity/role. In J. M. Reinisch, L. A. Rosenblum, & S. A. Sanders (Eds.), *Masculinity/femininity: Basic perspectives*. New York: Oxford, 13.
- Muchnick, A. G., & Wolfe, D. E. (1982). Attitudes and motivations of American students of Spanish. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 38(2), 262-281. Retrieved from: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ259797>
- Platsidou, M., & Sipitanou, A. A. (2015). Exploring relationships with grade level, gender and language proficiency in the foreign language learning strategy use of children and early adolescents. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 4(1), 83-96. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsl.2014.778>
- Rehman, J. , & Herlitz, A. (2006). Women remember more faces than men do. *Acta Psychologica*, 124, 344-355. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2006.04.004>
- Sasson, N. J., Pinkham, A. E., Richard, J., Hughett, P., Gur, R. E., & Gur, R. C. (2010). Controlling for response biases clarifies sex and age differences in facial affect recognition. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 34, 207-221. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10919-0100092-z/>
- Tercanlioglu, L. (2004). Exploring gender effect on adult foreign language learning strategies. *Issues in Educational Research*, 14, 1-11. Retrieved from <http://www.iier.org.au/iier14/tercanlioglu.html>
- van der Slik, F. W. P., van Hout, R. W. N. M., & Schepens, J. J. (2015). The gender gap in second language acquisition: Gender differences in the acquisition of Dutch among immigrants from 88 countries with 49 mother tongues. *PLOS ONE*, 10(11), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0142056>
- Witkin, H. A., Dyk, R. B., Faterson, H. F., Goodenough, D. R., & Karp, S. A. (1962). *Psychological Differentiation*. New York: Wiley and Sons.
- Wu, J. Y., & Cheng, T. Y. (2019). Who is better adapted in learning online within the personal learning environment? Relating gender differences in cognitive attention networks to digital distraction. *Computers & Education*, 128, 312-329. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.08.016>
- Zhu, Y., & Wang, B. L. (2019). Investigating English language learners' beliefs about oral corrective feedback at Chinese Universities: A large-scale survey, *Language Awareness*, 28(2), 139-161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2019.1620755>
- Zoghi, M., Kazemi, S. A., & Kalani, A. (2013). The effect of gender on language learning. *Journal of Novel Applied Sciences*, 2(S4), 1124-1128. Retrieved from: <http://jnasci.org/special-4/>
- Zu, X. M., & Ma, Jiali (2015). Chinese teachers and students beliefs and attitudes regarding corrective feedback. *Chinese Language Learning*, 4, 66-75. Retrieved from http://en.cnki.com.cn/Article_en/CJFDTOTAL-HYXX201504008.htm

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).