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INTRODUCTION
Revision provided the opportunity to define arguments and find interconnections between pieces of information (Fitzgerald, 1987). The process of re-writing was described as both mental and actual (Fitzgerald, 1987), or at the surface/format or meaning/content level (Bailey & Vardi, 2009).

PURPOSE
The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of revision opportunities on gender.

METHODS
The population consisted of university students (N=22). Participants were selected randomly from a class in Kinesiology. Subjects were divided into a group of males (G1, n=11) and a group of females (G2, n=11). Trained undergraduate Teacher Assistants (TA) scored papers (Donlan, 1980). TA’s attended selected seminars in which scoring was explained, specific to the format, graphic, and content. Subjects were not informed about the study to prevent the Hawthorne effect (Mayo, 1933). The assignment was explained by the instructor and again in small TA groups of 4-6 students. Students were asked to write an abstract which outlined a TA approved peer refereed journal article. After scoring, previous drafts were stapled in sequence to the newest revision. This provided augmented feedback on two levels. The first level was knowledge of results and the second level was knowledge of performance. Group means were calculated for number of revisions. A graphic display (see Figure 1) and a two tailed t-test were used to observe differences between males and females in number of attempts at revision. An alpha level of 0.05 was used as the decision.

RESULTS
The null hypothesis stated no difference in number of revisions undertaken between male and female students. Females produced one more revision than did males during the same time span. Females recorded a higher number of revisions. No statistical differences were found (see Table 1; p=.08). The hypothesis was accepted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Number of Revisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Revisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. No significant difference occurred between number of revisions for males and females.

DISCUSSION
The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of revision opportunities between genders. Students were provided the opportunity to revise a written assignment as frequently as time would allow. Many university students in Kinesiology chose to revise written work an average 5-6 times. The writing revision study in Kinesiology simultaneously involved 74 students. Twenty two (N=22) students were selected randomly to participate in the revision tracking system. The stagger system was considered appropriate because students were faced with too much feedback to absorb and incorporate. Over-all, females demonstrated a slight advantage in number of revisions. Explanation for this slight variation was related to long held expected gender bias. “...[Males] remain[ed] unmotivated and demonstrate[d] a particular resistance to revisiting and revising... written work” (Jones & Myhill, 2007, p. 458).
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