



ISSN: 0976-3031

Available Online at <http://www.recentscientific.com>

CODEN: IJRSFP (USA)

International Journal of Recent Scientific Research
Vol. 10, Issue, 03(C), pp. 31303-31306, March, 2019

**International Journal of
Recent Scientific
Research**

DOI: 10.24327/IJRSR

Research Article

GENDER PERCEPTION TOWARDS THE EFFECTIVE FEEDBACK PRACTICES

Rini Susanti

Director of International Relation Office (IRO) & Language Institute
Universitas Muhammadiyah Palembang

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijrsr.2019.1003.3233>

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 06th December, 2018

Received in revised form 14th

January, 2019

Accepted 23rd February, 2019

Published online 28th March, 2019

Key Words:

Feedback, large class, writing, gender

ABSTRACT

The combination of teacher and peer's feedback are needed by the students in learning writing, especially in a large class which is in line with Khalid's study (2011). While, the new finding is that the students want a feedback from their teacher because they want to have a good grade. This study aims to delineate how the male and female students' perception towards the effective feedback practices. The methodological rationale and procedures of quantitative research approach as the research design. The data were obtained through the closed-ended questionnaire with 150 participants, their opinions about the feedback on writing in large class. In term of findings, there are three kinds of perceptions about the effective feedback practices based on gender such as oral and written feedback, direct and indirect feedback, feedback on the first and final draft as well. The result showed that male and female students chose feedback from their lecturers more than from their peer. In addition, the gender (both male and female) did not influence their rating to the different kinds of feedback.

Copyright © Rini Susanti, 2019, this is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

Back when teaching. The feedback can be positive and negative. To this, feedback is defined as the teachers' reaction to students' learning attitude and performance. It can be given as positive feedback when the students do good job, or it can be given as negative feedback when the students do something wrong (Waring & Wong, 2009). These kinds of feedback are used by most of teachers in Indonesia starting from early school stages to higher education.

Khalid (2011) used feedback as one of the teaching writing techniques in Indonesia. In his research, he reported that the combination of teacher and peer feedback in teaching writing resulted in better writing. As the matter of fact, teacher feedback is mostly used for the elementary and junior high schools while peer feedback is started to be applied as a primary feedback in the senior high schools and higher education levels. The reason is because in those levels, the students' knowledge about writing components has been established.

Study on Feedback

As English learners who use English as a Foreign Language (EFL), writing means communicating with the readers by making the communication understandable in both ways. Since every language has its own style in writing, the input from the

readers is very helpful as a way of communicating the ideas and writing components. Teachers can use feedback as a way of communicating the strength and the weaknesses of their students (Mcgrath, Taylor, & Phycyl, 2011).

According to Alexander et al (1991), "feedback is information with which a learner can confirm, add to, overwrite, tune, or restructure information in memory, whether that information is domain knowledge, meta-cognitive knowledge, beliefs about self and task, or cognitive, tactics and strategies" (as cited in Winne & Butler, 1995, p. 275). Although feedback will not result in the students' writing perfection (Bitchener, 2008), feedback is able to raise the students' awareness of making mistakes when writing (Barnawi, 2010).

Who should give feedback to the students' writing is a crucial question often asked both by the students and teachers. It is true that this question seems easy to be answered. In practical thinking, both students and teachers are going to say that feedback given by the teacher will be the best in improving students' writing quality (Tsui & Ng, 2000). However, it is not true at all, because students also preferred to get feedback from their peer rather than their teacher (Rollinson, 2005; Hu, 2005). In addition, a study from Saito and Fujita (2004) about feedback provided to the EFL students in a Japanese university showed that students rated peer and teacher feedback in the same way. The truth that what the students are concerned the

*Corresponding author: **Rini Susanti**

Universitas Muhammadiyah Palembang Jl. Jend A Yani 13 Ulu Palembang

most about their writing and the feedback they got from their teacher is grade/score. They need their teachers' feedback in order to get a good grade, not to improve their writing quality. This situation makes them correct their mistakes based on the feedback given by the teacher because they are only expecting a good writing to get a good grade. Teacher feedback is found only for a short term benefit not for long term benefit because the students are not involved in the thinking and learning process (Muncie, 2000).

Some research found the disadvantages of peer feedback. Firstly, it is not an easy task for the students to understand about what is going on in their friends' writing. Some students will easily understand what the teacher expected during the peer feedback process, but some others will feel blank or even not know what to do (De Guerreru & Villamil, 1994).

Some universities, especially public universities, will limit the number of students in one class between 20 to 30 students. However, some others have the minimum number of 50 students and maximum 100 students which is categorized as a large class. According to Kumar (1992), "A large class is generally perceived as one which has anything between 35 to a 100 students, and on account of its size is said to pose insurmountable problems for the teacher" (p. 30).

No exact definition about small and large class has been used worldwide because of the different perception about number of students in a class. A large number of students based on one country's standard can be the smaller number in another country. As Shamim et al. (2007) note, "a large class in a western context might be considered small for both teachers and learners in most teaching-learning contexts in Africa" (p. 12) or even super small in the Ivory Coast (Bamba, 2012).

How many students there are in one class is not the only parameter in defining large class. The other thing is the teachers' judgment about the class size (Coleman, 1989c). When a teacher who used to teach a class with 30 students is asked to teach a class with 40 students, he or she will assume that his or her class now is a large class. Otherwise, a teacher who handles 40 students for the first time thinks that it is a small class since he or she used to handle 60 students (Todd, 2006).

This chapter outlines the methodological rationale and procedures of quantitative research approach as the research design. I explored, through the questionnaire with 150 participants, their opinions about the feedback on writing in large class. The questionnaire consisted of 26 closed-ended questions. The participants expressed their opinion by rating the feedback with the Likert scale (Not Helpful at All 1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 6 – 7 Very Helpful).

Data collection procedures started with the letter of approval from the university where I took the data and recruited participants. Then, right after I got my IRB approved, the questionnaires were distributed to the 150 participants. In analyzing the data, SPSS was used. In order to clearly address the research questions, two-way and three-way ANOVA were interpreted by using descriptive and inferential statistics data. In chapter four, I describe the results of the study.

Findings

Perceptions about the effective feedback practices based on gender. Based on the gender (Table 10), although the difference mean scores between lecturers and peers is only 0.22, the higher mean from lecturers (M=5.97) shows that male students preferred to get feedback from their lecturers. It also occurs in the mean scores from feedback sources which were chosen by female students. They chose feedback from their lecturers (M=6.25, SD=1.26) more than from their peer (M=5.86, SD=1.48).

Feedback Sources based on Gender

No	Feedback Sources	Male		Female	
		M	SD	M	SD
1	Lecturers	5.97	1.50	6.25	1.26
2	Peers	5.75	1.35	5.86	1.48

Oral and written feedback. Based on their gender, as can be seen in Table 11, both male and female students agreed that written feedback from their lecturers was more effective than oral feedback. They expected their lecturers to write the corrections and comments about the mistakes in their writing.

Table 1 Written and Oral Feedback from Lecturers based on Gender

No	Feedback Type	Feedback from Lecturers			
		Male		Female	
		M	SD	M	SD
1	Written	6.41	1.37	6.57	1.08
2	Oral	6.04	1.48	6.14	1.39

Different from the feedback which was given by their lecturers, both male and female students chose oral feedback from their peers (Table 12). Female students thought that feedback from their peers was effective in oral (M=5.88, SD=1.46) not in written form (M=5.75, SD=1.50). Male students also agreed that their peers had to speak to them when correcting their writing (M=6.30, SD=0.87).

Table 2 Written and Oral Feedback from Peers based on Gender

No	Feedback Type	Feedback from Peers			
		Male		Female	
		M	SD	M	SD
1	Oral	6.30	0.87	5.88	1.46
2	Written	5.59	1.28	5.75	1.50

Direct and indirect feedback. In Table 13 and 14, most of the 27 males and 122 females perceived that it was more effective when their lecturers gave the feedback by showing them where the mistakes were and writing the correct words or structures (Direct feedback). Female students not only perceived direct feedback as the effective feedback from their lecturers (M=6.48, SD=1.31), but also from their peers (M=6.06, SD=1.47). However, male students perceived them differently. Although the different mean scores among indirect feedback 2 and direct feedback was only 0.04 (Table 12b), male students perceived indirect feedback (M=6.00, SD= 0.92) as more effective from their peers while direct feedback from their lecturers.

Table 3 Direct and Indirect Feedback from Lecturers based on Gender

Feedback from Lecturers							
No	Feedback Type	Male		No	Feedback Type	Female	
		M	SD			M	SD
1	Direct	6.30	0.99	1	Direct	6.48	1.31
2	Indirect 2	6.26	0.94	2	Indirect 2	6.26	1.33
3	Indirect 1	5.48	1.78	3	Indirect 1	5.69	1.55

Table 4 Direct and Indirect Feedback from Peers based on Gender

Feedback from Peers							
No	Feedback Type	Male		No	Feedback Type	Female	
		M	SD			M	SD
1	Indirect 2	6.00	0.92	1	Direct	6.06	1.47
2	Direct	5.96	1.22	2	Indirect 2	5.80	1.60
3	Indirect 1	5.56	1.65	3	Indirect 1	5.76	1.55

Feedback on the first and final draft: As can be seen in Table 15, male and female students decided that feedback on the final draft was the effective feedback practice for their writing which was done in a large EFL writing class. Whether from their lecturers or from their peers, they all chose feedback on the final draft as more effective than feedback on the first draft.

Table 5 Feedback on the First and Final Draft based on Gender

No	Feedback on	Feedback from Lecturers				Feedback from Peer			
		Male		Female		Male		Female	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
1	the Final Draft	5.67	1.73	5.89	1.41	5.67	1.47	5.52	1.67
2	the 1 st Draft	5.41	1.74	5.75	1.46	5.30	1.75	5.38	1.53

It can be concluded that both male and female students perceived written feedback as the effective feedback practice if it was given by their lecturers. They also both agreed that from their peers, oral feedback was the effective feedback practice in a large EFL writing class. They all agreed that feedback on the final draft would be helpful for their writing whether it was given by lecturers or peers. The different perception towards the effective feedback practice occurred in their choice of direct and indirect feedback.

When the feedback was given by their lecturers, both male and female students agreed that direct feedback was effective. However, their perceptions were different on feedback from peers. Male students believed when their peers showed them where the mistakes were and gave the clues on how to correct them (Indirect feedback 2) as more effective than directly writing the correct words or structures (Direct feedback). On the other hand, female students thought that feedback from their peers would be good when they directly wrote the correct words or structures upon the mistakes (Direct feedback).

The significant result of three way ANOVA of gender (male/female)-Participants (lecturers/peers)-Question (types of feedback) (Table 15) shows that there is no significant interaction among the rating of question number, participants, and gender ($p=1.000$, $p \text{ value} > .05$), although there is a significantly different rating between gender ($p \text{ value} = .000$, $p < .05$).

Table 6 Three Way ANOVA Gender-Participants-QuestionSource	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Corrected Model	550.138a	77	7.145	3.886	.000
Intercept	8577.546	1	8577.546	4665.720	.000
Question_Number	15.555	12	1.296	.705	.748
Participants	.925	1	.925	.503	.478
Gender	31.026	2	15.513	8.438	.000
Question_Number*Participants	4.190	12	.349	.190	.999
Question_Number*Gender	30.722	24	1.280	.696	.860
Participants*Gender	6.528	2	3.264	1.775	.170
Question_Number*Participants*Gender	13.640	24	.568	.309	1.000
Error	7020.920	3819	1.838		
Total	148909	3897			
Corrected Total	7571.058	3896			

CONCLUSION

The inferential statistic data shows that there is no significant effect of question number (types of feedback) and rating for male and female students. This result means that the gender (whether it is male or female) did not influence their rating to the different kinds of feedback. This finding is not in line with the finding of Alhaisony's (2004) study who found that gender has a strong effect on the findings (cited in Grami, 2004, p. 54). It is worth noting that there is an imbalance in gender distribution in the current study. There were only 27 male and 122 female students in this study which means that when comparing the data from male and female, the results cannot be generalized. On the other hand, the discussion about female students in this current study is more trusted since there were 122 male students participated in this study.

Since I only found one study about feedback with only male participants, so this part of the finding discussion will discuss the finding about the students' perception towards the effective feedback practice based on male and female students' perceptions separately. The study from Grami (2004), who conducted the study for MA thesis, found that male students valued feedback from their teacher (Miao, Badger, & Zhen, 2006; Cresswell, 2000; Tsui & Ng, 2000) because they thought that there were many benefits they got from their teacher's correction. This study was conducted in an Arab country with the 36 male university-level students who were asked to respond to the questionnaire. Besides this, this study from Grami (2004) also found that the students perceived that direct feedback which was given by their teacher could help them know their mistakes or errors in their writing. The students believed that direct feedback benefited them more than indirect feedback although the interview with two ESL teachers in the same university showed that the teachers promoted indirect feedback more than direct feedback because it involved their students' learning process in correcting their writing.

This study from Grami (2004) is in line with the findings of the current research study in which male students perceived that getting the written feedback from their lecturers would help them improve their writing skills (Mahfoodh& Pandian, 2011). The male students in the current study also preferred their lecturers to write their corrections or comments into their papers by showing where the mistakes are and writing the correct words or structures next to them (direct feedback). Moreover, male students preferred their lecturers to write the comments or corrections in the final draft not in the first draft.

Regarding female students in this study, they perceived similarly that the feedback would be effective if both their lecturers and peers could show them where the mistakes or errors were and write the correct words or structures next to mistakes or errors (direct feedback) in their final draft. The only difference is that they perceived differently about from whom oral and written feedback should be provided. They believed that their lecturers should write the corrections or comments into their paper while they wanted their peers to speak to them about the mistakes or errors in their writing. A study from Tamada (as cited in Schwarte & Meier, 1998) highlighted that female students' learning characteristics is to write as many notes as possible and make summary of what they have learned. This study is in line with the finding of the current study in which female students preferred to get direct feedback because as found in Tamada's study (as cited in Schwarte & Meier, 1998) that female students are not good in discussing, that is why they preferred to choose direct feedback in which the answers were there without asking or discussing with peers or lecturers.

References

- Bamba, M. (2012). *Seeking effective approaches to teaching large classes in the Ivory Coast*. (Master's Thesis). Available from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses databases. (UMI No. 1508500)
- Barnawi, O. Z. (2010). Promoting noticing through collaborative feedback tasks in EFL college writing classrooms. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 22(2), 209-217.
- Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(2), 102-118.
- Coleman, H. (1989c). *How Large are Large Classes?* (Research Report No. 4) Lancaster-Leeds Language Learning in Large Classes Research Project.
- Cresswell, A. (2000). Self-monitoring in student writing: Developing learner responsibility. *English Language Teachers Journal*, 54(3), 235-244.
- De Guerrero, M. C., & Villamil, O. S. (1994). Social-cognitive dimensions of interaction in L2 peer interaction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(4), 484-496.
- Grami, G. M. A. (2004). The effect of written feedback on ESL students' perceptions: A study in a Saudi University-Level context. Retrieved from http://research.ncl.ac.uk/ARECLS/vol2_documents/Grami/grami.htm
- Hu, G. (2005). Using peer review with Chinese ESL student writers. *Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 17(1), 321-342.
- Khalid, M. (2011). Teknik pembelajaran writing dalam bahasa inggris. [English writing learning technic]. *Majalah Ilmiah Ukhuwah*, 6(3), 1-8.
- Kumar. K. (1992). Does class size really make a difference? – Exploring classroom interaction in large and small classes. *RELC Journal*, 23(1), 29-47.
- Mahfoodh, O, H, A., & Pandian, A. (2011). *A qualitative case study of EFL students' affective reactions to and perceptions of their teachers' written feedback*. English Language Teaching. Universiti Sains Malaysia.
- McGrath, A.L., Taylor, A., & Phycyl, A. (2011). Writing helpful feedback: The influence of feedback types on students' perceptions and writing performance. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 2(2), 1-14.
- Miao, Y., & Badger, R., & Zhen, Y. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15(3), 179-200.
- Muncie, J. (2000). Using written teacher feedback in EFL composition classes. *English Language Teachers Journal*, 54(1), 47.
- Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 23–30.
- Saito, H., & Fujita, T. (2004). Characteristics and user acceptance of peer rating in EFL writing classrooms. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(1), 31–54.
- Schwarte, B & Meier, A. (1998, March). *The role of gender in language learning and teaching*. Paper presented at the TESOL 1998 Annual Conference, Seattle, WA.
- Shamim, F., Negash, N., Chuku, C., & Demewoz, N. (2007). *Maximizing learning in large classes: Issues and options*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: British Council.
- Todd, R. W. (2006). Why investigate large classes? [Special issue] *KMUTT Journal of Language Education*, 9, 1-12.
- Tsui, A. B. M., & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(2), 147–170.
- Winne, P. H., & Butler, D. L. (1995). Feedback and self-regulated learning: A theoretical synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 63(3), 245-281.
- Waring, H., & Wong, J. (2009). “Very good” as a teacher response. *English Language Teaching*, 63(3), 195-203.

How to cite this article:

Rini Susanti., 2019, Gender Perception Towards the Effective Feedback Practices. *Int J Recent Sci Res*. 10(03), pp. 31303-31306. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijrsr.2019.1003.3233>
