

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES**

**A Study on Gender Differences in Teacher-Student
Interaction in EFL Classrooms: with Special
Reference to Four Private High Schools
in Addis Ababa**

**By
Danayt Belay**

June, 2006

DANAYT
BELAY

**A Study on Gender Differences in Teacher-Student
Interaction in EFL Classrooms: with Special
Reference to Four Private High Schools
in Addis Ababa**

**A Thesis Submitted to the
Department of Foreign Languages
and Literature**

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English
as a Foreign Language (TEFL)**

**By
Danayt Belay**

June 2006

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES**

**A Study on Gender Differences in Teacher Student
Interaction in EFL Classrooms: with Special
Reference to Four Private High Schools
in Addis Ababa**

**BY
Danayt Belay**

Approved by Board of Examiners

Elizabeth Ayalew
Advisor

[Signature]
Signature

Dr. Halom Bantlayoge
Examiner

[Signature]
Signature

AYE REGASSA (Ph.D.)
Examiner

[Signature]
Signature



Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor W/ro Elizabeth Ayalew for her helpful and constructive comments through out the work of this thesis, with out which it would have not been in its present form.

I am also very much indebted to those who helped me in various ways during the entire period of my study.

Directors, unit leaders and teachers of the selected high schools are also acknowledged for their cooperation during the data collection.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....	i
List of Tables.....	iv
List of Appendices.....	v
Abstract.....	vi
Chapter One: Introduction	
1.1 Background of the Study.....	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	3
1.3 Objective of the Study.....	4
1.4 Significance of the Study.....	4
1.5 Scope of the Study.....	5
1.6 Limitation of the Study.....	6
1.7 Definition of Terms.....	6
Chapter Two: Review of Related Literature	
Part I	
2.1. Teacher Student Interaction	8
2.1.1 Teachers Talk in Language Classrooms.....	9
2.1.2 Teachers Language Use.....	11
2.1.3 Pupils Talk in Language Classrooms.....	12
2.1.4 Questioning Behavior.....	13
2.1.5 Wait Time.....	15
2.1.6 Error Treatment.....	16
2.2. The Importance of Teacher Student Interaction.....	17
2.3. Verbal Teaching Behavior.....	19
2.3.1 Direct Teaching Behavior.....	19
2.3.2. Indirect Teaching Behavior.....	19
2.4. Non Verbal Teaching Behavior.....	19
Part II	
2.5. Gender Bias in Schools.....	20
2.6 Gender Difference in Teacher Student Interaction.....	22
2.6.1 The Distribution of Interaction.....	23

2.6.2 Teachers' Feedback and Attribution.....	27
Chapter Three: Methodology	
3.1 Subjects.....	33
3.2 Instruments and Procedures of Data Collection	34
3.2.1 Theoretical framework for data Collection from Observation.....	34
3.2.1.1 Observation	37
3.2.2 Questionnaire.....	39
3.2.3 Procedure	40
Chapter Four: Data Analysis and Interpretations	
4.1 Analysis and Interpretations of the Classroom observation.....	41
4.1.1 Analysis of Teaching Behavior of Teachers Based on Individual Data...42	
4.1.2 Analysis of Gender Differentiated teaching behavior of English Teachers.....	47
4.1.2.1 Evaluative type of Interaction.....	47
4.1.2.2 Evaluative Content of Interaction.....	50
4.1.2.3 Students as Initiators of Interaction.....	51
4.1.2.4 Comparison of Teachers and Students Talk Initiation.....	53
4.1.2.5 Overall Interaction.....	54
4.2 Analysis and Interpretations of Students' Questionnaire.....	57
Chapter Five: Summary of the Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations of the Study	
5.1 Summary of the Findings.....	65
5.2 Conclusions.....	66
5.3 Recommendations.....	67
Bibliography	68
Appendix A.....	75
Appendix B.....	76
Appendix C.....	79
Appendix D.....	81
Appendix E.....	85
Appendix F.....	94

List of Tables

Table	page
1. Frequencies and percentage of each category to individual teachers.....	43
2. Total evaluative type frequencies forwarded towards male and female students.....	47
3. Proportion of evaluative type interaction directed towards male and female students.....	48
4. Total evaluative content frequencies forwarded towards male and female students.....	50
5. Proportion of evaluative content forwarded towards male and female students.....	50
6. Total private and public student initiations by male and female students....	51
7. Proportion of private and public talk initiations by male and female students.....	52
8. Proportion of teachers and students talk initiation.....	53
9. Gender of student and the 11 types evaluative interactions received.....	55
10. Classroom Participation.....	57
11. Teachers' feedback.....	59
12. Questioning.....	61
13. Teachers' discriminatory behavior.....	62
14. Wait time.....	63

List of Appendices

Appendix A-Observational instrument

Appendix B- Students' questionnaire (Amharic)

Appendix C- Students' questionnaire (English)

Appendix D- Calculation of the Chi-square (X^2) statistics for the data in Table
3-8

Appendix E- Lesson Transcriptions

Appendix F- Inter Observer Agreement

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to analyze gender differences in teacher student interaction. To this end, a descriptive method was employed in the study. Seven English teachers and 48 students were taken as sample of the study from four private high schools in Addis Ababa. A modified observational instrument (INTERSECT) and questionnaire were employed in the data collection process. The data obtained using classroom observation and questionnaire were analyzed by using percentage and a statistical method chi square.

Results of the data analysis indicated that significant differences were evidenced between teachers' use of evaluative interaction type, and evaluative interaction content towards male and female students. The general levels of teacher student interactions, the extent of reprimands, and the involvement of students in interaction with the teachers all show domination by males. Female students' participation in asking and answering questions is very limited. Teachers also give more chances to male students in classroom interaction. Although no significant difference was observed between male and female students' talk initiation, teachers' talk initiation showed significant difference in relation to students' talk initiation.

Finally, based on the major findings it was recommended that teachers need to be educated about gender equitable teaching during workshop or seminars, administrators could also incorporate observations of gender equity into their regular classroom observations and it would be beneficial to provide teachers with current articles regarding gender equity as they are published.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

Different scholars have defined and interpreted the terms 'sex' and 'gender' in different ways. For example, Sanders et al (1997) have explained that, sex is the physical and physiological difference between males and females. However, according to Lee (1997), gender difference is based on socio-cultural grounds and may differ from place to place. Similarly, Maggie (1989) in Sunderland (1994:1) defines gender as "a culturally shaped group of attributes and behaviors given to the female or to the male." She further affirmed that a society's or group's culture shapes, or 'genders', the people within it according to their biological sex, what men and women, boys and girls do occupationally and socially. To the extent that this social construction of gender continues to 'masculine' biological males and 'feminine' biological females.

Gender in terms of roles and relations is not static. It can be reformulated as a society desires or intends it to be. One generation could assign roles to males and females differently from another generation. However, certain societies may maintain certain roles and relations (Sunderland, 1994). In addition, Jones and his colleagues (2000) noted that because cultures are not homogeneous with in any culture and even subcultures, there will be many 'masculinities' and many 'femininities' in the underlying belief of societies and in the minds of individuals.

This difference in gender has been a means of discriminating members of a society. Females particularly are victims of this discrimination in that their participation in activities of the society is mostly limited to reproductive work. Because most societies around the world seldom or never expect women's participation in education, they have denied women the right of going to school.

And the very few who have been to school were not encouraged to study further and play significant roles in all walks of life.

According to Gollnick and Chinn (1998), female's unequal access to education, may result from the expectations of the society towards both sexes. Many societies do not expect both sexes to perform and achieve equally. Thus, one sex is expected to perform and achieve better than the other. In most cases, it is the male who is provided with better opportunity.

As part of the society, Heinonen (1996) in Weldekidan (1998) puts forward the claim that the school is an environment where conscious socialization is taking place. It plays a crucial role in maintaining those duties and responsibilities assigned to male and female genders by the society. The curricula as well as teachers prepare boys and girls to play roles and follow careers that are socially expected of them, that is, they inculcate the importance of the sense of competitiveness and participation in education for boys and its absence for girls. Furthermore, recent studies have shown that in the teaching learning process teachers might show behaviors that favor one sex over the other. According to Good, Sikes and Brophy (1973), these discriminatory behaviors might occur in classrooms through the interaction of the teacher and his/her students (as individual or as a group of students).

For some time now, multidisciplinary interest in gender issues has been on the rise internationally. A significant part of this interest has been in the area of gender and education. Most research efforts in this area have focused on explaining the patterns of gender inequality and causes of gender gaps in education. In the case of Ethiopia, for example, enrollment and participation in education is characterized by sexual disparities. The number of female students in elementary, secondary, and tertiary education is lower than the number of boys (Genet, 1991). Factors contributing to this include high direct and opportunity costs of sending girls to school and cultural and social barriers to their inclusion in education. In addition, the school environment itself is often

found to be intimidating for girls. Furthermore, dropping out through early marriage, pregnancy, sexual harassment can also constrain girls' continued participation and enrollment in schools (Genet, 1991; Seyoum, 1991).

In addition, the curriculum, the learning environment and teachers' interaction with their students are also found to influence females' access and participation within schools, and their ability to learn in a secure environment. And since females are part of the society and should contribute to the country's socio-economic well being, and since teachers' interactions with female and male students in the classroom can play a crucial role in providing females with the confidence to achieve their full potential at school. The researcher believes that it is now time the problem should be taken into account for females to benefit from fair treatment from their teachers.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Education is a right to any member of the society regardless of age, sex, and race. According to the 1994 UN declaration (MOE report: 1998), both sexes have equal right to access to education at all levels. O'Gara and Kendall (1996:10) state: "Most people think that education enhances the quality of people's lives." Insofar this is true; girls have equal right with boys to a better quality of life. This means, according to the authors, what is thought to be important to males, in this case education, is also important to females.

In the Ethiopian context, most classes in government schools have an average of seventy students. Such number of students may put a lot of demand on the teacher to pay attention to individual students according to their needs. This is to say, every student, as an individual needs a different kind of treatment and amount of attention from her or his teacher. For instance, shy students may need much encouragement to involve actively in the learning process. This implies that teachers have to give different treatment for such type of students. On this point, Sunderland (1994) notes that since 'students are individuals' they need different treatment for different reasons, including pedagogical

reasons. She also reveals that differential teachers' treatment might also occur because of 'social characteristics of gender' not only because of 'students' individual characteristics'.

O'Gara and Kendall (1996) agree that in classroom interaction, the two sexes receive different treatment from their teachers. These scholars and Sunderland (1994) affirmed that in classroom interaction males get more teacher attention than females do. And this gender biased teacher-student interaction greatly affects students' participation and achievement in education Sunderland (1994). To see whether there is the same practice in Ethiopia. Hence, the study was concerned with investigating the nature of teacher student interaction in four private high schools in Addis Ababa. The following are the specific research questions:

- How do EFL teachers interact with male students?
- How do EFL teachers interact with female students?
- Do EFL teachers' interactions vary by the students' gender?
- If yes, what differences are observed?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The study aims to find out the effect of students gender on teacher student interaction in EFL classrooms. It will, therefore, attempt to:

- To Address the issue of gender in teacher-student interaction in EFL classrooms.
- To identify components of teachers' behavior in classroom interaction that influence gender differentiated instruction.

1.4 Significance of the Study

International research (Howe, 1997) suggests that boys typically have a disproportionate share of contributions in classroom interaction partly due to their being selected by the teacher more frequently than girls, and also due to their ability to create conditions (positive and negative) which attract teachers'

attention and facilitate their participation and dominant position in classroom interaction. This 'conversationally focal' position of boys provides them with an important learning experience, i.e. the confidence of being listened to and responded to within the public domain, thus stimulating them to participate more. This means that girls may be unintentionally or intentionally pushed out of the centre of the action, learning to expect a lower participation level than boys. The present study, therefore, can be considered as significant in that it provides some useful information for teachers to develop positive expectation towards their students and encourage them to work hard despite differences in gender. As Coffey and Delamont (2000) stated, teachers tend to be concerned with equal opportunities, a gender-free or gender-aware curriculum and non-sexist practice, rather than promoting anti-sexist practice in the classroom. The findings of this research might help teachers to develop critical self-awareness of their classroom practice, with particular reference to the quantity and quality of their interactions with female and male students in the classrooms.

The study could also show the sources of gender related problems and this might help students as well as teachers to improve their teacher student interaction.

In addition to these, the study might be helpful as a reference or as a secondary source of information for further studies on related issues.✓

1.5 Scope of the Study

Gender differentiation in schools might occur in different ways. However, the study focuses on teacher-student interaction because the researcher believes this is probably the most influential factor related to students' motivation and achievements. The study, however, did not avail whether the gender of the teacher has an impact on teacher student interaction or not. It only tries to give insight into the variation that may be observed in classroom interaction by the

The study was restricted to assessing the teacher student interaction in grades, nine and eleven in four private high schools, which have seven English language teachers. The researcher has chosen grade nine and eleven as grade ten and twelve students leave school earlier after taking their model exam in order to prepare for school leaving examinations and may not be available to serve as subjects of the study for this particular investigation.

1.6 Limitations of the Study

There were several limitations involved in this study that must be acknowledged. Firstly, classroom processes are extremely complex. It would be simplistic to think that an observer can fully understand what is going on in the classroom by observing and analyzing a number of lessons. Therefore, the researcher believes that the categories for analyzing teacher student interaction (see Appendix A) in light of gender are not elements of an exhaustive list.

Secondly, the limited number of teachers, only seven, jeopardizes generalizing the findings of this study to other situations.

Thirdly, other variables difficult to control like background experience, personal characteristics, and non verbal teaching behavior of the subjects, which inescapably influence the findings were difficult to control.

Lastly, since being observed or examined could be an anxiety provoking situation, the presence of the observer could cause a certain amount of limitation to the study despite what the researcher has done to minimize this problem.

1.7 Definition of Terms

The following are the definitions of terms used in the study.

Gender- a culturally shaped group of attributes and behaviors given to the female or to the male.

Sex - is the physical and physiological difference between males and females.

Classroom interaction – a chain of events which occur one after the other in an instructional time during teacher student interaction.

Praise- intellectual: - Teacher's positive reaction to academic statement or response.

Praise-conduct: - Positive reaction to a student's nonacademic behavior.

Praise-appearance: - Positive reaction to a student's physical or work appearance.

Acceptance-intellectual: - Indication of simple correctness of a student's academic response or statement.

Acceptance-conduct: - indication of correctness of student's nonacademic behavior.

Acceptance- appearance: - indication of correctness of students work or physical appearance.

Remediation- intellectual: - teacher's indication of lack of correctness of student's academic statement or response. Teacher may suggest alternatives. Remediation is not explicitly negative.

Remediation-conduct: - teacher's indication of lack of correctness of student's nonacademic behavior.

Remediation- appearance: - teacher's indication of lack of correctness of student's work or physical appearance.

Criticism-intellectual: - teachers negative evaluation of student's academic statement or response.

Criticism-conduct: - teacher's negative evaluation of student's nonacademic behavior.

Criticism- appearance: - teacher's negative evaluation of student's work or physical appearance.

Physical short circuit: - when the teacher does the activity for the student.

Verbal short circuit: - when the student is involved in oral activity and the teacher completes the activity for the student instead of giving the students assistance for independent work.

(Sadker and Sadker, 1982)

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Related Literature

2.1. Teacher Student Interaction

Different scholars have defined interaction in different ways. For example, Malamah-Thomas (1987) defines interaction as the process by which two individuals mutually influence each other's behavior. Moreover, Wagner (1994:8) defines interaction as:

reciprocal events that require at least two objects and two actions. Interactions occur when these objects and events mutually influence one another. An instructional interaction is an event that takes place between a learner and the teacher. Its purpose is to respond to the learner in a way intended to change his or her behavior toward an educational goal. Instructional interactions have two purposes: to change learners and to move them toward achieving their goals.

Interaction involves not just expression of one's own idea but also comprehension of those of others. One listens to others; one responds; others listen and respond. The participants work out interpretations of meaning through this interaction, which is always understood in a context, physical or experiential, with nonverbal cues adding aspects of meaning beyond the verbal (Malamah-Thomas, 1987).

Research has documented that the discourse and interaction that occur in classrooms form a communicative context for learning. "To a great extent, the language used by teachers and students in classrooms determines what is learned and how learning takes place" (Omvgi, 1989). Similarly, Chaudron (1988:10) stated that interaction is viewed as significant because it is argued that:

1. Only through interaction, can the learner decompose the target language structure and derive meaning from classroom events 2. Interaction gives learners the opportunities to incorporate target language structures into their own speech (the scaffolding principle) and 3. The meaningfulness for learners of classroom events of any kind, whether thought of as interactive or not, will depend on the extent to which communication has been jointly constructed between the teacher and learners.

Bluntly, classroom interaction is important because interaction is the outcome of classroom pedagogy. Interaction is the process where by lessons are 'accomplished'. If no person-to-person interaction has occurred in a classroom, we would probably be unwilling to accept that a lesson has taken place at all. From this point of view, then, there is no point in being 'for' or 'against' interaction, since it is an inescapable and inescapably crucial aspect of classroom life (Allwright, 1988).

For many years, researchers have used descriptive procedures to help identify behaviors that are present in typical classrooms. The verbal behavior of both teachers and students has been analyzed in order to create a "picture" of the work of the classroom. In this part of the paper, several of the factors that have been influence the quality and quantity of teacher student interaction are examined.

2.1.1 Teachers Talk in Language Classrooms

As Sadker and Sadker (1997) stated, Flanders (1970) came up with the famous "two-thirds" rule: two thirds of classroom time consists of talk, and two-thirds of that talk is teacher talk. This rule is often quoted to show how in most classrooms, the time available for every individual learner to talk is extremely limited. This is especially important if, as is currently the case, interaction by learner is regarded as a major vehicle for foreign language learning. Recent studies indicate little change in this pattern, revealing that teacher talk does little to foster exploratory talk or risk taking. Instead, teacher talk restricts the quality of pupil talk by controlling both the form and content of pupil responses to teacher-initiated questions or requests for verbal behavior (Long et al., 1984).

A number of researchers have explored the different functions of teacher talk in terms of both their relative distribution and their pedagogical utility. In many cases, the categories used are based on the pioneering work of Bellack, et al. (1966), in Sadker and Sadker (1997), who identified four types of pedagogical moves: *structuring*, *soliciting*, *responding*, and *reacting*. They found that, in an average class of 30 pupils, an individual pupil might make one move for every 100 teacher moves. Most of the pupil moves were responding moves, and the teacher did almost all of the soliciting (e.g. asking questions), structuring (e.g. organizing and directing the interaction), and reacting (e.g. evaluating). The work of Bellack, et al. (1966) can be called comprehensive classroom analysis. As Sadker and Sadker (1997) stated other comprehensive studies include those by Gales (1980) and Mehan (1979). These studies show the frequent occurrence in classrooms of a basic three-part structure that consists of an elicitation by the teacher, a response by a learner, and an evaluation by the teacher. At the end of such a cycle or exchange, the teacher typically continues with the next elicitation. In this way, the pedagogical moves of the teacher can rigidly control the learners' contributions, although detailed description reveals that learners can still find ways to influence the rate and manner of teacher talk. (*Ibid*)

On the other hand, Sinclair and Brazil (1982) identify three aspects of teaching, i.e. the subject matter of lessons, the organization of lessons and the disciplinary element, in all of which teachers are involved in "telling things to pupils, getting pupils to do things, getting pupils to say things and evaluating the things that pupils do". (1982: 22)

The findings of Mitchell, Parkinson and Johnstone (1981), based on a total of 5,252 minutes of foreign language teaching time note that teacher involvement with the class as a whole - as opposed to teacher involvement with small groups or individuals or non-involvement - "predominated overwhelmingly" in their data. Innovations such as the 'communicative approach' and the 'natural

approach' seem to have made little or no difference. This is not surprising since Krashen's own demonstrations of 'comprehensible input', for example, have all the hallmarks of teacher involvement with the class as a whole. Long and Crookes (1986) cite analysis of lessons by teachers professing belief in 'some sort of communicative language teaching'. Their description of lessons reveals the teachers adopting the role of dominant participant with a frequency, which would render natural conversation impossible. It seems that in spite of innovations modern foreign language classrooms differ little from traditional classrooms where "the teacher takes the controlling role and conducts a fairly ritual conversation with pupils. The pupils behave largely as one many-headed participant, avoiding cross-conversation and acknowledging the authority of the teacher in their verbal behavior."(Sinclair and Brazil, 1982: 3)

If we look at local studies, Abdulkadir (1984) and Sisay (1990) found that in the classroom, teachers did most of the talk and pupil talk is minimum. Most of the teachers talk is direct, including lecturing and giving instruction. Due to this, students are forced to take a passive role that results in dependency on the teacher. Using Bellack et.al (1986) pedagogical moves, Tamene (2000) also found that teachers are responsible for most of the moves in the language classroom. They structure, solicit, and react. In contrast, students' participation in these moves of language is typically confined to responding to teachers' questions. In his study of teacher classroom language, Yoseph (1990) finds out, asking questions is the first dominant language function teachers used in the classroom and explanation, exemplifying, summarizing, giving instruction and checking students understanding followed respectively.

2.1.2 Teachers Language Use

A number of studies have looked at the ways in which teachers in L2 classes' structure their language (Chaudron, 1983), perhaps simplifying it in ways similar to those parents and caregivers' use with small children to ensure comprehension. Such adjustment, which may be largely intuitive and

unpremeditated, leads to comprehensible input and is thus conducive to language acquisition in Krashen's (1985) sense. This "teacherese" or "foreigner talk" contains shorter utterances and less complex vocabulary than speech between native speakers. In a review, Long et al (1984) suggests that, although modified teacher's talk is not ungrammatical or inappropriate. While such modified speech would therefore seem to be ideal as input, it may nevertheless be detrimental in another sense, which has been insufficiently investigated. According to Brown (1994), teachers often use a "slow colloquial" form of speech that does not use the elisions, fusions, and rhythmical combinations and contractions of sounds and words that are natural in fast spoken language, and therefore this classroom language does not encourage the learners to process and produce casual conversational speech. Rather, they are exposed only to a carefully edited and idealized version of the target language.

2.1.3 Pupils talk in Language Classrooms

The resulting pupil talk falls far short, however, of the exploratory pupil talk of the type described by Barnes (1976) in which pupils participating in peer-group discussions are involved in comparing observations and perceptions, offering tentative interpretations, conclusions or theories and rejecting or modifying their findings. The outcome of exploratory pupil talk is not a negotiated compromise. It is instead, a group of individual opinions arrived at as a result of considering and evaluating the observations, ideas and conclusions of everyone in the group. This type of outcome can be achieved through a variety of interactional styles, the exception being that if one pupil in the group adopts a 'teacher-style', that of dominant participant, there may be no outcome at all because the discussion itself tends to break down. Successful peer discussion is characterized by mutual co-operation over the style of discourse and by efforts to sustain the discourse while coming to terms with the general topic Barnes (1976).

By contrast, most pupil-talk in modern classrooms still tends to involve pupils in a psycho-linguistic guessing game of the sort described by Goodman (1967) with reference to reading skills. In the classroom, the pupils are on one team, playing a role similar to that of the reader, while the teacher, the sole member of the second team plays a role similar to that of the writer. The purpose of the game is to guess which way the teacher wants the discussion to develop. The rules require the pupils to make guesses and observe the teacher's responses, which, although not necessarily explicit, give clues similar, in content if not in form. This approach inevitably increases pupil-talk; pupils have to use slightly more language in order to identify the teacher's intention than they use in response to closed questions. In this type of discourse, however, pupils know that their views and opinions are not of primary importance since the object of the game is to find out what is in the teacher's mind. It should be noted that the type of interactional behavior displayed by the teacher during this game would be regarded as unco-operative, patronizing, or downright anti-social in most environments outside the classroom. Neither would this type of pupil talk facilitate conversation outside the classroom. Teacher-pupil talk of this variety can hardly be described as providing a model appropriate for use by foreign language pupils outside the classroom.

2.1.4 Questioning Behavior

Long et al. (1984) have researched teacher questioning-techniques in EFL classrooms, making a distinction between 'display' questions and 'referential' questions, i.e. questions to which the teacher already knows the answer versus questions to which the teacher does not know the answer. Referential questions were divided into two types, closed and open, the latter characterized by a wider variety of possible responses although not, as predicted, producing increased syntactic complexity in pupil responses.

The work of Long et al. (1984) is of interest to foreign language teachers because their data shows that the length and complexity of pupil responses

were extended by teacher use of referential questions with slight bias in favor of open referential questions. Open referential questions also tended to elicit more student turns than closed referential questions. Contrary to expectations, however, display questions elicited significantly more student turns than did referential questions. Long et al. (1984) suggest this may be because the teacher is not the only one who already knows the answers to display questions. Students are also more likely to know, or feel they know the answers, a state of mind, which is likely to encourage risk-taking and willingness to respond.

Long et al. (1984) also note that, since the teachers observed tended to use general, rather than personal or individual, solicits regardless of the question type, student turns appeared to occur without bidding on the part of students and in the absence of nomination by the teacher. This may suggest that display questions should be used in foreign language classrooms to generate practice in the target language particularly if the teacher's purpose is to increase student participation and student talk in the form of 'natural' conversation which is characterized by non-solicited turn taking (in the classroom sense).

However, the ability to respond to display questions can thwart the foreign language teacher's attempts to engage pupils in 'spontaneous' conversation in the target language if the pupils treat all teacher initiation as though they are display questions. This may happen because the teacher is using display questions only. Alternatively, it may be the result of pupil perception of the nature of the teacher's questions. Studies of classroom interaction in foreign language classrooms (Van Lier, 1988; Chaudron, 1988) further demonstrate that pupils get plenty of practice in responding to display questions since these features appear prominently in teacher talk. This suggests that in foreign language classrooms pupils have good reason to treat all teacher questions as display questions. It also suggests that pupils are unlikely to develop the ability

to distinguish between display and referential questions and even less likely to learn how to respond appropriately to referential questions.

Mitchell et al. (1981) findings also show that, display questions in foreign language classrooms tend to be more restrictive and manipulative than in other subject classrooms, controlling both the content and range of responses and the linguistic forms to be used and demanding more frequent repetition than is the practice in other subject classrooms. The nature of the display questions and responses in foreign language classrooms indicates that they provide neither useful preparation for formal schooling in the target language nor opportunities for pupils to use the target language as a means of learning. They appear to provide only for the use of language as a (very restricted) goal of learning and for the 'learning' of language content by generating mechanical practice and opportunities for the teacher to check mastery of vocabulary and structural items.

In general, the picture of classroom interaction that results from teachers questions is that the questions alone may not promote a great amount of receiver target language production or other interaction, unless the teacher is aware of the pitfalls of too closed, too fast, or too vague questions, or worse too many repetitions of the same none understood questions. Although modification of questions to improve comprehensibility may be an eventual aid to the learner, the teacher probably cannot rely on multiple questions to solve a problem of non-comprehension.

2.1.5 Wait Time

It is reasonable to suppose that when the teacher asks a question, the learner is given a fair chance to reply, since this will enhance the quality of the answer. It has been observed on numerous occasions that teachers tend not to wait, but expect an answer instantaneously. If they do not get the answer at once, they routinely rephrase the question (scale it down, perhaps), give the answer themselves, make various come-on noises or signals, or let some other learner

answer it. Long et al (1984), among others, have investigated what happens when more time is given to the responder. Their research suggests an increased wait time produces qualitatively and quantitatively superior responses. It is therefore reasonable to train teachers to increase their wait time. It seems that teachers can indeed be trained to do so, and that this produces higher-quality interaction. It is, however, not known how lasting the effect of such training is. Furthermore, different activities may require different amounts of wait time. Casual conversation, for example, typically does not allow for lengthy pauses between utterances (Long et al, 1984).

2.1.6 Error Treatment

The treatment of errors made by learners is perhaps the most enduring and controversial issue in classroom work. In the audio-lingual days, errors were to be avoided at all cost (so as to avoid negative reinforcement). Currently, foreign language educators range from those who say all errors must be consistently corrected right from the start, in order to avoid fossilization (Brown, 1994), to those who say the correction of linguistic errors interrupts the learner's attempts at creative speech, focuses the learner on form rather than meaning, intimidates and encourages the learner and disrupts interaction (Brown, 1994).

There are numerous studies of error treatment, but none has yet managed to resolve the controversy. All researchers agree, however, that learners, if asked, indicate their desire to be corrected whenever they make mistakes (Cathcart and Olsen, 1976). It is also agreed that the treatment of errors by most of teachers is both highly varied and highly inconsistent (Chaudron, 1988).

Descriptive classroom studies have begun to look at error treatment in terms of the most general concept of repair, that is, the various ways in which "trouble" is dealt with in interaction (Van Lier, 1988). Such studies make it clear that different types of interaction lead to different ways of treating problems of speaking, and the questions of which errors to treat, how to treat them, and

who should treat them underlie more global issues of classroom interaction. Descriptions of repair strategies also suggest that learners should use them primarily to correct their own errors (i.e. self-repair) Van Lier (1988). One-way of promoting such self-repair may be through increased wait time (discussed earlier). When a learner makes an error, or hesitates, the teacher may pause briefly rather than immediately pouncing on the learner to correct. This gives the learner a chance to self-monitor and self-correct.

2.2 The Importance of Teacher Student Interaction

Skolnick (1982) reported that children spend more time with their teachers than any other adult with the exceptions of their parents. Consequently, teachers' expectations and actions have a profound effect on students' achievement as well as self-esteem. What teachers say and do not say, their body language, what they do and who they call upon form a hidden curriculum that is more powerful than any textbook lesson Skolnick (1982).

Tinto (1987) stated that teacher student interaction, which includes both formal classroom experience and informal interaction outside of class, are crucial to the academic continuation and intellectual development of students. According to Tinto (1987), a lack of such interactions is a very significant determinant attrition. Like wise, Pianta, Steinberb and Rollins (1995) reported that positive teacher student interaction defined as "warm, close, communicative" are linked to behavioral competence and better school adjustment. Similarly, Pascarella, Terenzinin and Hibel (1978) found that teacher student interaction focusing on intellectual or course related matters had the strongest association with students' motivation and performance. Further, they found that students, who interacted more frequently with faculty, performed better academically than what was predicted from their pre enrollment characteristics (i.e. SAT scores). On the other hand, students who seldom met with faculty tended to achieve at lower levels than predicted.

Other researchers also found that conflict and dependency in teacher student relationship are related to unfavorable outcomes such as negative school attitude, school avoidance, and hostile aggression (Howes, Hamilton and Matheson, 1994). Resilience literature further indicates when there is no emotional connection to a caregiver at home; supportive school experiences play a critical role in students' adaptations. More specifically, teachers who "provide emotional support, reward, competence and promote self esteem are considered to be one of the factors that decrease the vulnerability of high risk students in response to successful life events" Werner (1990:110).

Given that teacher student interactions have a significant influence on various outcomes, investigations into how the interaction are shaped and what determines the quality of those interactions are of great importance for intervention efforts to foster nurturing, warm relationships between teachers and students. So far, a number of student characteristics have been linked to teacher student interactions. For example, students' social skills and low internalizing scores are positively related to warm, open relationships with kindergarten teachers (Pianta, Steinberg and Rollins, 1995). Students' problem behaviors such as inattention, internalizing, and conduct problems are negatively correlated with the quality of teacher student interactions (Pianta and Nimetz, 1991). Furthermore, disruptive, aggressive, resistant students are especially challenging to many teachers. They are frequently noted as a significant source of teacher stress. Teacher interactions with these students tend to be critical and punishing in nature and are often characterized by high conflict and low warmth (Coie and Koepl, 1990). Although the punishment following a student's problem behavior may be needed to reduce the likelihood of further bad behavior, the student's repeated exposure to punishment, especially in the absence of positive attention from teachers, is more likely to perpetuate a sense of alienation from teachers and school, which may in turn lead to intensified anger and defiance (Baker, 1999).

For students to develop and function as persons, they need help in developing the kind of self concept that allows them to regard themselves as important citizens in a society. The daily interaction of students with their teacher in the classroom is, therefore, crucial in positively influencing pupil behavioral development, his/her intellectual and moral development, as well as adjusting their mentality well (Cohen and Manion, 1977).

2.3. Verbal Teaching Behavior

Verbal teaching behavior includes all the verbal acts of the teacher, which occur in classroom interaction. According to Capel (1995), verbal communication is understood as lecturing, questioning, praising, or criticizing pupils. As Sadker and Sadker (1997) stated, teachers' talk is categorized by Flanders (1970) as direct or indirect teaching behavior. Both direct and indirect have a place in good teaching.

2.3.1 Direct Teaching Behavior

It is highly expository teaching that mostly focuses on academic content. Its features are lecturing, explanation, giving direction, and other highly teacher directed activities (Callahen, 1988).

2.3.2 Indirect Teaching Behavior

Indirect teaching behavior includes, teacher' talk that indirectly influence pupils. It is characterized by teachers' reliance on accepting students feeling, acknowledging pupils' ideas, providing praise, and encouragement to pupil (Perrott, 1982).

2.4. Non-verbal Teaching Behavior

Different authors define the object of nonverbal communication differently. According to Argyle (1972), the following phenomena can constitute nonverbal communication: Bodily contact, proximity, posture, physical appearance, facial and gesture movements, direction of gaze, timing of speech, emotional tone of speech, speech errors, and accent. On the other hand, Darn (2005) considers

the following as nonverbal phenomena: Body motion or kinesis behavior, physical characteristics, touching behavior, paralanguage, proximities, artifacts, and environmental factors.

In a classroom interaction, while the bulk of the teacher teaching is verbal it is inevitable that verbal communication will predominate. However, it is stressed that the non-verbal one also should not be over looked. (Store and Mirries, 1972). Non-verbal communications have form, function, and meaning and if learners do not understand their meanings, a misunderstanding occurs.

2.5 Gender Bias in Schools

“Sitting in the same classroom, reading the same book, listening to the same teacher, boys and girls receive different education” Sadker and Sadker (1997). McConnell-Ginet and Eckert (2003) believe it is the application of gender bias in the school on the part of the teacher and the student that perpetuates gender inequality. They, therefore, urge educators to question their conceptions of gender and examine them in relation to the teaching practice by pointing out that schools often reflect habits of the larger society. The socialization of gender within our school assures that girls are made aware that they are unequal to boys. Every time students are seated or lined up by gender, teachers are affirming that girls and boys should be treated differently. When different behaviors are tolerated for boys than for girls because “boys will be boys,” schools are perpetuating the oppression of females McConnell-Ginet and Eckert (2003).

Teachers socialize girls towards a feminine ideal. Girls are praised for being neat, quite, and calm, whereas boys are encouraged to think independently, be active, and speak up. Girls are socialized in school to recognize popularity as being important, and learn that educational performance and ability are not as important. “Girls in grades six and seven rate being popular and well-liked as more important than being perceived as competent or independent. Boys, on

the other hand, are more likely to rank independence and competence as more important" Bailey (1992).

Bailey's (1992) study further demonstrates how socialization of girls occurs at the school level by tolerating different behaviors from boys than from girls. Assertive behaviors from girls often seen as disruptive and may be viewed more negatively by teachers. This reinforces the notion that "...girl's misbehavior to be looked as a character defect, whilst boys' misbehavior is viewed as a desire to assert themselves" Bailey (1992).

In Sadker and Sadker's (1985) research, they also noted that boys are most likely to receive an acknowledgment response from their teacher. This finding is confirmed by study of Good and Brophy (1974) "...note that teachers give boys greater opportunity to expand ideas and be animated than they do girls and that they reinforce boys more for general response than they do for girls."

Gender bias in schools is an insidious problem that causes very few people to stand up and take notice. The victims of this bias have been trained through years of schooling to be silent and passive, and are therefore unwilling to stand up and make noise about the unfair treatment they are receiving. "Over the course of years the uneven distribution of teachers time, energy, attention and talent with boys getting the lion's share, takes its toll on girls" Sadker and Sadker (1985:56). Teachers are generally unaware of their own bias teaching behaviors because they are simply teaching like they were taught and the subtle gender inequalities found in teaching materials are often overlooked (Sunderland, 2004). Girls and boys today are receiving separate and unequal education due to the gender socialization that takes place in our schools and due to the sexist hidden curriculum students are faced with everyday. Until educational sexism is eradicated, more than half our children will be shortchanged and their gifts lost to society (Sadker and Sadker, 1997).

2.6 Gender Difference in Teacher Student Interaction

If asked whether or not they treat male and female students equally, most contemporary teachers would probably respond somewhat indignantly, "of course I do!" and he or she is likely to be completely sincere in saying this. If observed closely, however, a good many differences can usually be detected (Sunderland 2004).

In the 1970s and 1980s, many studies of teacher talk in classroom- allsorts of classrooms- found that not only did the teacher talk more than the students; he or she talked far more to male than to female students. According to Sunderland (2004), the researcher who did the most to popularize such findings was the teacher and writer Dale Spender, who was aware of the phenomenon and was deeply disturbed by the possibility that it might happen in her (secondary school) classroom. She therefore, audio recorded her own lessons, and noted:

...sometimes I have...thought I have gone too far and have spent more time with the girls than the boys. But the taped have proved otherwise. Out of ten taped lessons... the maximum time I spent interacting with girls was 42% and on average 38%, and the minimum times with boys 58%...it is nothing short of substantial shock to appreciate the discrepancy between what I thought I was doing and what I actually was doing.

Spender (1982) in Sunderland (2004: 224)

As Sunderland (2004) stated, though Spender was not a language teacher, and has been criticized for not being explicit about her methodology, her last sentence is salutary: our perceptions are not reliable. And, given that a teacher of any subject is juggling so many balls when teaching, it is not surprising if giving equal treatment to girls and boys slips through the net. However, Spender's findings were in fact widely echoed elsewhere. Hall and Sandler (1982) for example, found that secondary school boys received significantly more positive and negative teacher responses than did girls. In addition, writing on her own meta analysis of 81 such studies, Kelly (1988:20) noted:

It is now beyond dispute that girls receive less of the teacher's attention in class...It applies in all age groups...in several countries, in various socio-economic groupings, across all subjects in the curriculum, and with both male and female teachers...Boys get more of all kind of classroom interaction. This discrepancy is most marked for behavioral criticism, but...(b)oy's also get more instructional contacts, more high level questions, more academic criticism and slightly more praise than girls...The discrepancies are just as large in teacher-initiated interactions as in pupil-initiated interactions...

The findings of such studies were interpreted as evidence for and a manifestation of male dominance. Due to teachers', frequent interaction with male students, "[females] may develop feeling of low self esteem. As pupil can see teacher attention as evidence of interest in them" Sunderland (1994:150). Below there are some major factors that often observed in teacher-student interaction.

2.6.1. The Distribution of Interaction

Studies show that gender difference in teacher behavior does not begin in the college classroom but rather with the advent of schooling. As Sadker and Sadker (1985) stated, one of the first investigation in the area was conducted by Serbin et al (1973), where they studied 15 preschool classes and found teachers conferring more attention, more instructional time and more hugs to male students, whereas ignored females students, except when they were physically beside them. Cherry (1975) also found more teacher contacts with preschool male students, but indicated that many of these contacts reflected needs to supervise and control boys. Although Honig and Wittmer (1982) found no significant difference in the number of male and female preschool interaction, they did find that girls were asked significantly more personal social questions than boys reflecting a stereotyped line of teacher inquiry. In Ebbeck (1984) study of 30 early childhood classes, males receive more attention from teachers by calling out answers eight times more often than females.

Although much of early work on the frequency of interaction was performed at the preschool level, research rapidly expanded to the higher grades (Sadker and Sadker, 1997). Worrall and Tsarna (1987) reported a higher level of academic contacts at the junior high with boys as well as teachers tend to ask females lower order factual questions while reserving higher order critical thinking questions for males.

At the post secondary level, Sadker and Sadker (1985) in a study of 46 classrooms found that male were twice as likely as females to dominate classroom interaction, whereas females were twice as likely as males to be non participants and to silently sit and observe classroom interaction. Hall and Sandler (1982) also believe females are disadvantaged because of teachers differential treatment of students by gender, teachers ignore or interrupt female students more than male students and they may recall male students names more often or give more eye contact.

Local studies like Semunesh (1997) found that male and female students showed great disparity in verbal interaction in both teacher student and student-student interaction i.e. males surpass females in the verbal output in EFL classrooms. Likewise, Mersha (1999), Diriba (2000) found that female students' participation in classroom interaction is very low. This is mainly because, according to the researchers, teachers treat female students more negatively and also teachers do not adequately motivate females to engage in the classroom interaction as they do to male students. Similarly, Belyou (2000) shows that there is difference in teachers' treatment of female students from that of their male counter parts, which have an effect on female students academic performance.

On the other hand, the findings of Melkamu (1999) shows female students get more and better quality of attention than that of male students. Conversely, Amanuel (1996) finds out gender did not produce any significant difference in

verbal participation in all the groups of the study. The study also looked into assertiveness difference between males and females, but failed to find any such kind.

Several explanations have been offered for the higher frequency of male interactions at all levels. Dickman (1993) suggested that the expected good behavior of girls allows teachers to spend more time with the more "difficult to manage boys." Time devoted to the males results in minimal time and help for the females, who are less likely to demand interaction or offer fewer challenges. Whereas, Sadker and Sadker (1985) reported that boys spoke on average, three times as much as girls and boys called out eight times as often as girls. When boys called out, the teacher's most frequent response was to accept the call out and continue with the class. When girls called out, a much rarer phenomenon, the teacher's most typical response was to remediate or correct the inappropriate behavior with comments such as "in the class, we raise our hands." Furthermore, Becker (1981) found females were generally given fewer opportunities to participate, most of the time they are silent spectators. In addition, Jones and Wheatley (1989) observed 60 secondary school classes and found that males called out answers eight times as often as girls did. They also noted that even when they did not call out teachers more frequently called on them directly. Worrall and Tsarna (1987) also reported that when teachers called for volunteers, males were more likely to be the volunteers. When teachers' organized activities in the classroom 79% were carried out by males and only 21% by females.

The preponderance of study findings at all educational levels indicates that males are both given, and through their behaviors attract, a great number of teacher interactions. Whereas, males generally are the beneficiaries of this higher level of teacher interaction, not all males are recipients. There is not only inequity between genders; there is also inequity within gender. Sadker and Sadker (1985) reported that a few 'salient' or 'star' students tend to receive

much more attention and interaction than one would normally predict. They reported that one or two students receive about 20% of teacher interactions. Tobin and Gallagher (1987) also reported that the dominance of classroom interaction by a few 'target' students. Sadker and Sadker (1985) reported a decreasing level of interaction through the higher grades, with postsecondary classes being the least interactive and the most likely to be dominated by a few salient students who were twice as likely to be male than female.

Research offers us insight into which males are most likely to become target or salient students (Tobin and Gallagher, 1987). Teachers are more likely to interact with high achieving boys than high achieving girls (Good and Brophy, 1974). Reyes and Fenneme (1982) reported that teachers interacted more with boys who indicated a high degree of confidence in classroom participation than with girls who indicated similar level of confidence. Brophy and Good (1974) reported that in addition to gender, student achievement and behavior must be considered as variables in the unequal distribution of teacher attention. High-achieving boys and boys exhibiting behavior problems capture much of the teacher's attention, whereas other boys and girls are less likely to be the target of teacher interaction Brophy and Good (1974).

There is a tendency, when considering the frequency of interactions, of losing one's way in the numbers. In the end, we can attempt to sort out the impact of the differential number of interactions, especially when these numerical differences may not appear to be great. Kelly (1988) estimated, in her meta-analysis of gender differences in teacher student interactions, that teachers are involved in 56% of their interactions with males and 44% with females. Although an 8% discrepancy may not, at first, appear great, over the length of a 15,000-hour school career males would average 1,800 more instructional hours than females. Assuming a class size of 30, the average girl would end up with 60 fewer hours of individual attention than the average boy. When we consider

the disparities within gender that are masked by most studies, the differences are even more pronounced.

Therefore, in order for schools to become suitable learning centers for both sexes in which they can explore and develop their human potential fully, teachers' unfair distribution of interaction with their students must be avoided in all levels of schooling.

Otherwise, girls, as Potter (1987) clearly indicates, will withdraw from the competitive classroom arena. The less interaction girls have with their teachers and the less participation they have in classroom interaction the more these will lead them to develop less skill and confidence.

2.6.2 Teachers' Feedback and Attribution

John and Goodled (1984:111) noted, "Learning is enhanced when students understand what is expected of them, get recognition for their work, learn about their errors, and receive guidance in improving their performance." Other researchers also have emphasized the pivotal role of corrective teacher comments in shaping and directing students' behavior (Brophy 1981; Garder, Mason and Matyes, 1989). Brophy (1981) reported that effective praise delivered by the teacher could improve the academic achievement of students. Effective praise, as defined by Brophy (1981), includes specific comments delivered with sincerity, comments directly related to student performance and using past performance as a context, and remarks that inform students about the importance of their accomplishments and attribute their success to ability and effort. Similarly, corrective teacher comments can also be influential in developing student achievement and maintaining positive student attitudes. Criteria for effective critical comments by teachers include focusing on specific students' performance rather than on the student as a person, providing an environment in which mistakes are permitted, offering a specific plan for improvement and encouraging students to make efforts that will lead to success.

In short, it is not only the number of questions and frequency of teacher student interactions that create classroom learning opportunities and contribute to student success, but also the specificity and skill demonstrated by the teacher in responding to student comments. Research studies suggest that sex difference exist in the influential area of teacher feedback and attribution.

Diller et al (1991), investigating 24 elementary classrooms, found that boys received more comments of both disapproval and approval. Other researchers also stated that males receive more teacher reaction of praise, criticism, and remediation (Baker, 1986; Sadker and Sadker, 1985; Brophy and Good, 1974). Most researchers have found out that in classrooms more precise teacher comments were rendered to males than to females in terms of both scholarship and conduct. Males are more likely than females to be rewarded for a correct answer or remediate or criticized for an incorrect answer. (*Ibid*)

Sadker and Sadker (1986) collected data in more than 100 fourth, sixth and eight grades of language, social studies, and mathematics classrooms. They indicated four types precise teacher reactions: praise-positive remark (very good, excellent), acceptance-neutral remarks (ok, I see, uh huh), remedial-corrective comments (check your sentence), and critical- negative comments (no, that is wrong). They found that male students were more likely to receive all the four types of teacher reactions. When teachers' reaction were precise, remediation comments designed to correct or improve students' answers were the most common. These accounted for about one third of all teacher comments. Praise constituted approximately 10% and criticism 5% of teacher reaction. For all four areas, males consistently received more teachers' reaction than females. However, as the teacher reaction become more specific (praise, criticism, remediation) the imbalance become evaluated the teacher comments, the more likely they were to be directed at male students. Sadker and Sadker's findings are congruent with other studies that indicate that for both academic

and conduct related behavior, male students receive more precise, criticism and assistance than do females, teacher reaction that provide clarity and instruct, encourage and sustain student performance (Baker, 1981). On the other hand, Ashenafi (2000), in local context of high school setting, found out that teachers treat both male and female students equally. They fairly addressed questions to both male and female students. They also provide response opportunities fairly to both sexes. There is also no significant difference in their praising and motivating of students to participate in the classroom.

Although the amount of wait time distributed to male as compared to females have been less definitive, wait time, the silent waiting period after a teacher question and after a student response, has been associated with a number of positive classroom conditions. Longer wait time has been found to increase the frequency and enhance the quality of student responses (Row, 1986). Whereas, some studies suggested that males are given longer wait-time to respond to teacher questions (Gore and Rounagoux, 1983), others have found no sex differences (Mors and Handley, 1982).

One of the more fascinating areas of gender interaction research explores the concept of learned helplessness and the role of attribution in teacher student feedback. Usually males, actively and continuously pursue solutions to problems and usually females, abandon fruitful action and are more likely to give up (Dweck and Goetz, 1978). Females have been reported as entering learning situation with lower expectations of success and with a lack of self-confidence in their ability to accomplish a task, even when such beliefs may be unsupported by objective measures (Goetz, 1981). These attitudes have a negative impact on subsequent efforts and performance, as females are less likely to pursue tasks Goetz (1981).

Along with the concept of learning helplessness, gender differences in casual attribution have been investigated. Boys are more likely to attribute success to

ability and failure to lack of effort. Girls are more likely to attribute success to luck or factors other than ability and failure to lack of ability. As a result, boys are more likely to feel a sense of mastery and control over their fate, to experience a higher level of self confidence, to demonstrate greater persistence in academic tasks, and therefore, to gain greater opportunity for academic achievement (Armstrong 1981; Peterson and Fennema 1985; Reyes 1980; Phillips, 1984).

To explore the reasons for sex differences in learned helplessness and attribution, Dweck and Goetz (1978) analyzed sex differences emerging in teacher criticism of students. They reported that teacher criticism of boys was concerned with nonintellectual behavior such as conduct and neatness. Boys were led to believe that although they made mistakes, these were not reflective of intellectual failings. Dweck and Goetz reported that teachers were eight times more likely to make statements attributing male errors to effort, suggesting that if boys tried harder, they would succeed. In contrast, they found that when teachers criticized girls, the negative feedback was usually directed at intellectual inadequacy (88%). Girls were less likely to be told that their achievement would increase if they would try harder. Dweck and Goetz indicated that the nature of the feedback they receive might cause girls to see their failure because of intellectual inadequacy, beyond their control for alteration or improvement.

A number of studies failed to replicate the findings by Dweck and Goetz that females receive more intellectual criticism. Sadker and Sadker (1985); Simpson and Erickson (1983) found that male students got more interactions and more teacher attention of all kinds including intellectual criticism. Rather than attributing the lower self-esteem and confidence of females to a higher level of intellectual criticism, these researchers see the greater number of interactions and the more precise evaluation being given to boys as serving to boost their confidence and self-esteem. As males become more central in classroom

interaction, their status, attitudes, and achievement are enhanced. These researchers suggest that teachers may be communicating a continuous if subtle set of signals indicating that males are the more valued students (Sadker and Sadker, 1984).

Although studies continue to document attribution and attitudinal gender differences, not all studies consider the teacher as the cause or the potential remediation of these differences. Some investigators explain these differences in terms of pervasive social forces, positing that culturally sex stereotyped messages as to appropriate and inappropriate career paths and the lower value ascribed to females in the society could in fact, be the cause of the lower self confidence expressed by girls in the classroom (Bottomley and Ormerod, 1981; Eccles-Parsons, 1983). Female modesty, as contrasted with male boastfulness, has been advanced to explain this gender gap in confidence and task persistence (Corbin, Landers, Feltz and Senior, 1983). Finally, peer pressure, classroom climate, and subjective personal perceptions (Peterson and Fennema, 1985) have been used to explain these differences as well. Whether the reasons for lower academic confidence and persistence experienced by females are to be found within the classroom or beyond the school walls, research and remediation will continue to be educational objectives in the decade ahead.

The above western studies clearly illustrates that though teachers at all levels wish to interact with their male and female students equally, some may, in fact, interact with their male students differently. They have been found to: ask male students, but not female students, higher order questions (demanding critical thinking), make eye contact more frequently with males than with females. Furthermore, they allow their classrooms to be male dominated by calling on male more frequently, allowing males to interrupt females and responding to males with attention and females with difference, give male students more interaction time than female students, initiate more contact with male students than with female students, and so forth.

However, attempt to investigate foreign language classroom interaction in Ethiopia schools using systematic observation have been limited. Especially the investigations of gender differentiating teacher behavior have been non-existent until recent years. Due to this, it seems hard to show the complete picture of the condition at different levels. This study is, therefore, expected to contribute by way of showing whether the student's gender has an effect on teacher student interaction in Ethiopian context, more specifically in private high schools in Addis Ababa.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

As has been indicated in the preceding sections, the study aims at investigating gender differences in teacher student interaction in EFL classroom in four private high schools in Addis Ababa. In order to identify certain prevailing teachers' classroom behaviors, a descriptive research method was employed. As a result the following subjects, data collection instruments and data analysis procedures were applied.

3.1. Subjects

The target population of this study was English teachers of private high schools in Addis Ababa. The selection procedure for the schools was conducted to ensure that the sample is as representative as possible. From twelve private high schools (that have grades 9 and 11) in Addis Ababa, four of them were not willing to serve as subjects of the study. Thus, from the remaining eight potential sample schools, the researcher selected four high schools by drawing a lot, i.e. 50% of the total available sample. The researcher has chosen private schools samples for the study mainly because in government schools, lessons are transmitted through the plasma screen; dominantly the interaction is between the plasma teacher and the students. The time available for the classroom teacher to involve herself/himself in the teaching process is limited to five minutes before the lesson for the introduction and five minutes after the lesson for conclusion. In the middle of the lesson there are times when the plasma teacher asks the classroom teacher to facilitate group work or lead group discussion, but the time given is too short to allow the teacher have ample time to interact with the students.

Grade nine and eleven English teachers of Dandi Boru, Finote Tibebe, Kokeb, and Ethio Parents private high schools were subjects of this study. Three of the schools (Dandi Boru, Finote Tibebe, Kokeb) have one English teacher for each

grade level. However, Ethio Parents has only one teacher for grade nine and eleven. Therefore, the sample of teachers for this study was seven. Two of the teachers are M.A holders and the rest are B.A holders. All the teachers have more than two years of experience in teaching. From the seven teachers six of them are males and only one is female.

In order to make the data gathering more dependable, the researcher also took a representative sample of grades nine and eleven students from the four schools. There are 190 students in the seven classrooms observed that are taught by the seven teachers selected. Of these, 97 of them are males and 93 of them are females. From these students 25% i.e. 48 students (24 students from each sex) were taken as subjects for the questionnaire designed for this study. Those 48 students were selected from the total number of students using stratified random sampling. And from each classroom a proportional number of students were taken to make the total be 48.

3.2. Instruments and Procedures of Data Collection

To collect the necessary data, the researcher employed two instruments of data collection: observation, and questionnaire.

3.2.1. Theoretical Framework for Data Collection from Observation

“Interaction analysis describes and categorizes various aspects of the instructional practices and verbal interaction that take place between teachers and students in language classrooms” (Spada, 1994:685). Such analysis are typically guided by a systematic observation instrument consisting of a list of predetermined, relevant categories of behaviors that observers look for and record either while observing language lessons as they are taught, or later while working from an audio or video recording and/or written transcription of these lessons. Scholars in the field of language teaching and learning have designed different observation instruments for examining teacher student interaction in the classroom. One of these observation instruments is Sadker and Sadker's INTERSECT (Interactions for Sex Equity in Classroom Teaching). This

instrument is designed based on teacher effectiveness research. And on the idea that all students deserve the teacher's time and attention and that when some get more attention, more specific feedback, etc then the reasons need to be investigated for clearly equity is not being met. Because, equity means, according to the authors, all students should get access to the most important resource in the room, the teacher.

An overview of recent literature on teaching effectiveness reveals no standard, commonly agreed upon definition or list of effective teachers' qualities. Most studies tend to emphasize qualities such as knowledge and organization of the subject matter, skills in instruction, and personal qualities and attitudes that are useful when working with students (Cashin, 1995). When personal qualities are emphasized, effective instructors are described as enthusiastic, energetic, approachable, open, imaginative, and possessing a sense of humor. When teaching skills and mastery of subject matter are emphasized, effective instructors are described as being masters of the subject matter, organized and emphasize important concepts, able to clarify ideas and point out relationships, able to motivate students, able to pose and elicit useful questions and examples, creative or imaginative, and reasonable and fair. Seldin (1999) also suggests the following qualities of effective teachers:

1. Treat students with respect and caring.
2. Provide the relevance of information to be learned.
3. Use active, hands-on student learning.
4. Vary instructional modes.
5. Provide frequent feedback to students on their performance
6. Offer real world practical examples.
7. Draw inferences from models and use analogies
8. Provide clear expectations from assignments.
9. Create a classroom environment which is comfortable for students.
10. Communicate in a way that is understandable to their students.
11. Present themselves in class as "real people"
12. Use feedback from students and others to assess and improve their teaching.
13. Reflect on their own classroom performance in order to improve.

It is important to note from the outset that multiple sources of information should be used for assessing teacher effectiveness. Students are an important source, but are only one source of information. For example, as Seldin (1999) stated, the above 11 qualities could be observed by students and therefore could be rated by students. Other sources of information would be needed to evaluate instructors' use of feedback and reflection on classroom performance. As primary recipients of instruction, the literature is clear that student views of teaching effectiveness are appropriate for evaluating student-instructor interactions, instructor's professional and ethical characteristics, or behavior, student workload, what was learned in the course or curriculum, fairness of grading, and the instructor's ability to communicate clearly Seldin (1999).

Other important sources are self-evaluations and self-reflections of performance and practice, classroom observations, review of classroom materials, and review of instructional development and advising, involvement in faculty development activities, and use of research and service activities to develop and promote teaching effectiveness (Seldin, 1989; Cashin, 1995).

Research consistently shows that teachers have the greatest potential to influence children's education. "The major research finding is that student achievement is related to teacher competence in teaching," Kemp and Hall (1992: 4). Evidence from teacher-effectiveness studies indicates that student engagement in learning is to be valued above curriculum plans and materials. Research on teacher effectiveness has yielded a wealth of understanding about the impact that teacher ability has on student growth.

Taking into account the importance of interaction in the language classroom, there are multitude of observation forms to analyze various aspects of interaction, there is, however, a paucity of instruments specifically directed at analyzing teacher interaction behavior as it pertains to male and female students. In this regard, INTERSECT appeared to have been particularly suitable for this study as it was originally designed to determine patterns of

potential bias or equity in the ways teachers and male and female students interact with one another in active classroom interaction.

3.2.1.1. Observation

Since this instrument was the major tool of the study, the study greatly depended on observation of teacher student interaction in English classrooms. During the observation, the researcher used a video camera. Trying to record information on every interaction occurring between an entire class of students and a teacher for 20 minutes can be difficult at times, especially if the students are engaging in a large group activity with the teacher. So videotaping the class allowed the observers to transcribe and code each interaction afterwards.

A modified Sadker and Sadker's (1982) observation instrument called INTERSECT (Interaction for Sex Equity in Classroom Teaching) was used for the purpose of the study. This instrument was developed to identify certain patterns of potential gender bias by teachers during interaction with students. Following the guidelines designed in the INTERSECT observers manual, the instrument is composed of three sections as developed originally by the authors. Section A deals with, noting the students and teachers race, gender and sketching a seating arrangement chart. Section B codes teacher and student interaction in classroom. Section C is concerned with recording tone setting incidents, which were defined as incidents that create a classroom climate that is detrimental or that is conducive to the attainment of sex equity in classroom interaction. However, the first and the third sections were omitted from this study for the reason that the researcher did not consider these categories, for example race, in the present study. Thus, in the second section, which the researcher adopted in this study, there are ten categories which are: teacher initiation, how it is initiated, student initiation, whether it is private or public, praise, acceptance, remediation, criticism, space for comment, and ancillary teacher behavior (has two parts, attribution and short circuit).

Specifically, the present observational instrument divides interaction into the following categories:

- Whether a teacher initiates an interaction with a male or female student
- how the interaction was initiated (i.e., raising hand, moving towards the student, or calling out),
- whether a student initiates an interaction with a teacher (gender of the initiating student)
- whether the interaction is public or private
- four behaviors a teacher is likely to use in an interaction (i.e., praise, acceptance, remediation, or criticism)
 - ❖ praise (defined by INTERSECT as positive reinforcement of a students response or statement)
 - ❖ acceptance (acknowledgment of an appropriate students characteristics or behavior or correct response)
 - ❖ remediation (deficiency in a students characteristics or behavior or that some corrective action should be taken)
 - ❖ criticism (indication of strong disapproval)
- ancillary teachers behavior
 - ❖ attribution (comments made by teachers that suggest a students success or failure in academic work is due to his/her level of ability or efforts he/she put forth or factors external to ability or effort)
 - ❖ short circuiting (a term specific to INTERSECT that refers to the times a teacher answers his or her question or finishes a classroom task for a student)

Each of the above four types of teacher behaviors are divided into four content areas: intellectual, conduct, appearance, and other.

- ❖ Intellectual - teachers comment (reaction) on students' intellectual work.
- ❖ Conduct- students' behavior that confirms or fails to conform to classroom norms and rules for appropriate conduct.

- ❖ Appearance - personal appearance of a student or to the appearance of a student's work.
- ❖ Other- any characteristics or behavior of students other than the above three.

The interaction types represent a range of highly positive to highly negative interactions. Praise was considered to be a highly positive teacher reaction. An accepting interaction demonstrates acceptance or approval of accuracy of a student behavior or characteristics. Remediation is a type of interaction that encourages the student to correct an inappropriate or inaccurate characteristics or behavior in the most positive way possible. The criticism category is used to record highly negative reaction that denotes strong disapproval.

Space is provided for an observer to indicate certain tough to code teacher or student behaviors, and to describe the classroom situation. INTERSECT does not code for interaction length and for non verbal teachers behavior. Examples of teacher responses fitting each of these behaviors are provided in an accompanying manual, to help researchers code interactions as precisely as possible.

3.2.2 Questionnaire

To triangulate the data gathered from the observation the researcher also used a questionnaire. In preparing the questionnaire, an attempt has been made to include different aspects of interaction. For example, questioning, participation, feedback and issues in relation with gender like discriminatory teachers' behavior. The questionnaire includes 10 items, 5 of the items are closed type, and 5 of the items give the students a chance to state their reason other than the options given. From these questions number 1, and 2 consider participation; 3, 4, and 5 are relevant to teachers' feedback 6, and 7 deal with questioning; 8, and 9 are on discriminatory teachers' behavior; and item 10 focuses on wait time.

The questionnaire was prepared in English and translated to Amharic by translator and then back translated to English by another translator to check for accuracy of content. After the observations were made the questionnaire was distributed among the sample students and collected immediately after being filled in the classrooms.

3.2.3 Procedure

There were a total of eighteen sections in all the schools, in order to complete classroom observation in such a short time, seven sections which could best fit the observation schedule were chosen, that is, one section from each teacher. Each section was observed for approximately twenty minutes on three occasions. To reduce the distraction caused by the presence of the video camera on the teachers and students, all groups were fake-filmed for couple of periods, so that it would be possible to make the data as authentic as possible.

The questionnaire and the observation checklist were piloted at Yengew Sew Secondary School. In order to pilot test the questionnaire, 60 students were used from four sections of the school. And necessary corrections were made before the final study was carried out. For the observation grade 9 and 11 teachers of the school were observed.

Inter observer agreement in coding teaching behavior using the categories stated earlier was calculated, the agreement between the researcher and the co observer was found to be significantly high (.81). This enables the researcher to be confident to use the co observer for data gathering for the main study.

By the time, the data collection began, the teachers were not told the main purpose of the observation. This is done to prevent possible artificial performance of the subjects. When the questionnaire was distributed, explanations were given to students about the general purpose of the instrument in order to get genuine information.

CHAPTER FOUR

Data Analysis and Interpretation

As stated in the preceding chapters the main objective of the study is to explore gender differences in teacher student interaction in four private high schools in Addis Ababa. In order to achieve this objective, the four questions that mentioned in the introductory chapter of this study need to be addressed properly. Thus, the questions focused on EFL teachers' interaction with male and female students, whether the interactions vary by the students' gender, the differences that observed.

In seeking answer to this questions different categories that measure teacher student interaction were set and a questionnaire was administered. These categories were used to determine patterns of potential bias or equity in ways teachers and female and male students interact with each other in active classroom interaction.

This chapter, therefore, deals with the presentation and analysis of the data gathered through consecutive classroom observation and students questionnaire. In this chapter, the first part deals with analysis of each of the sample teachers' interaction behavior in accordance with the evaluative interactions included in the observation. The second part is devoted to the analysis of data gathered from the classroom observation from different perspectives. The last part is concerned with the analysis of the students' questionnaire.

In all the cases the data is organized using tables followed by relevant interpretation.

4.1 Analysis and Interpretation of the Classroom Observation

In this part, data gathered through observation were analyzed and interpreted.

4.1. 1 Analysis of Teaching Behavior of Teachers Based on Individual Data

In this section the observed behavior of each teacher in relation with the categories included in observational instrument was analyzed. These categories provided more precise information about content and nature of each teacher's comments as well as about the student behavior or characteristics to which these comments refer. It may be helpful to think of these columns as a continuum of teacher reaction ranging from highly positive (praise) to highly negative (criticism). Praise and criticism reflect opposite extremes of potential teachers' reaction. Accept and remediate designate less extremes of teacher reaction. Accept indicates teacher's acceptance of the appropriateness or accuracy of a student characteristics or behavior. Remediate indicates that the teacher does not accept the student behavior or characteristics as appropriate or accurate; rather, remediate indicates that the teacher's reaction is designed to correct the student characteristics or behavior so that appropriateness or accuracy can be achieved.

With in four of the above mentioned teacher reactions there are four initials which signify the student behavior or towards which teachers' reaction is directed. 'Intellectual' (I) refers to the intellectual quality of a student's answer or work. Conduct (C) refers to a students conduct or deportment. It is not concerned with the intellectual quality of students work. Rather conduct pertains to student behavior that conforms or fails to conform to classroom norms and rules for appropriate conduct. Appearance (App) refers to the personal appearance of a student or the appearance of a student's work. A teacher comment that would be coded as appearance would be directed at how a student looks or how a student's work looks in terms of neatness, handwriting, general appearance etc. Short circuit occurs when the teacher takes over a student task and does it for the student instead of giving the student instruction on how to complete the task himself/herself. A physical short circuit occurs when the teacher does the activity for the student. Verbal short circuit occurs when the student is involved in oral activity and the

teacher completes the activity for the student instead of giving the student assistance for independent work.

The next table summarizes the number of times an individual teacher addresses the above mentioned categories to male and female students. These instances are also presented in percentage. The teachers, for convenience sake, hereafter are referred to as: D1 and D2 (for Dandi Boru teachers); E3 (for Ethio parents); F4 and F5 (for Finote Tibeb teachers); K6 and K7 (for Kokeb teachers).

Table 1. Frequencies and percentage of each category to individual teachers

Categories				D1	D2	E3	F4	F5	K6	K7	Total
Praise Towards	Male	Intellectual	Freq.	17	2	-	1	2	5	10	37
			%	45.9	5.4	-	2.7	5.4	13.5	27	100
		Conduct	Freq.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
			%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Female	Intellectual	Freq.	5	-	-	-	-	1	2	8
			%	62.5	-	-	-	-	12.5	25	100
		Conduct	Freq.	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	2
			%	-	-	50	-	-	50	-	100
Acceptance Towards	Male	Intellectual	Freq.	21	8	15	20	13	20	19	116
			%	18.1	6.8	12.9	17.2	11.2	17.2	16.3	100
		Conduct	Freq.	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	4
			%	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	100
		Appearance	Freq.	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	3
			%	-	-	-	-	-	100	-	100
	Female	Intellectual	Freq.	12	4	4	7	5	7	8	47
			%	25.5	8.5	8.5	14.8	10.6	14.8	17	100
		Conduct	Freq.	-	-	3	2	-	2	2	9
			%	-	-	33.3	22.2	-	22.2	22.2	100
		Appearance	Freq.	2	-	-	-	1	-	3	6
			%	33.3	-	-	-	16.6	-	50	100
Remediation Towards	Male	Intellectual	Freq.	9	3	2	4	2	2	1	23
			%	39.1	13	8.6	17.3	8.6	8.6	4.3	100
		Conduct	Freq.	10	3	7	8	6	8	11	53
			%	18.8	5.6	13.2	15	11.3	15	20	100
	Female	Intellectual	Freq.	6	1	1	1	5	1	2	17
			%	35.2	5.8	5.8	5.8	29.4	5.8	11.7	100
		Conduct	Freq.	12	1	9	3	2	4	9	40
			%	30	2.5	22.5	7.5	5	10	22.5	100

Criticism towards	Male	Conduct	Freq.	-	-	3	-	1	2	3	9
			%	-	-	33.3	-	11.1	22.2	33.3	100
		Appearance	Freq.	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
			%	-	-	-	-	100	-	-	100
	Female	Conduct	Freq.	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	3
			%	33.3	-	33.3	-	-	-	33.3	100
		Appearance	Freq.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
			%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Student Initiation	Male	Freq.	20	3	9	3	5	10	12	62	
		%	32.2	4.8	14.5	4.8	8	16.1	19.3	100	
	Female	Freq.	16	1	8	4	4	13	9	55	
		%	29	1.8	14.5	7.2	7.2	23.6	16.3	100	
Short Circuit	Male	Physical	Freq.	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
			%	-	-	-	-	-	100	-	100
		Verbal	Freq.	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	4
			%	-	-	-	50	-	-	50	100
	Female	Physical	Freq.	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	3
			%	33.3	-	-	-	33.3	-	33.3	100
		Verbal	Freq.	1	-	-	1	2	1	1	6
			%	16.6	-	-	16.6	33.3	16.6	16.6	100
How the interaction was initiated	Male	Hand	Freq.	16	10	9	11	9	11	8	74
			%	21.6	13.5	12.1	14.8	12.1	14.8	10.8	100
		Move	Freq.	6	4	5	4	5	8	11	43
			%	13.9	9.3	11.6	9.3	11.6	18.6	25.5	100
		Call	Freq.	36	3	13	20	11	22	26	131
			%	27.4	2.2	9.9	15.2	8.3	16.7	19.8	100
	Female	Hand	Freq.	9	4	4	3	3	4	6	33
			%	27.2	12.1	12.1	9	9	12.1	18.1	100
		Move	Freq.	2	2	2	1	2	3	5	17
			%	11.7	11.7	11.7	5.8	11.7	17.6	29.4	100
		Call	Freq.	14	-	6	9	5	8	10	52
			%	26.9	-	11.5	17.3	9.6	15.3	19.2	100

*attribution segment of the ancillary teachers' behavior, praise-appearance, remediation appearance and intellectual criticism were not used in the analysis of the data because the observers did not come across such kind of teachers' behavior during the observation.

To start with the first category, the figures for the praise category indicate that the highest percentage of praise-intellectual for males were recorded in teacher D1 (45.9%), while the lowest was in teacher E3, he did not forwarded any praise- intellectual at all. The percentage of this category in teachers D2, F4, F5, K6 and K7 were 5.4%, 2.7%, 5.4%, 13.5%, 27% respectively. On the other hand, when seen against praise forwarded to female students, teacher D1 recorded the highest percentage i.e. 62.5%. Teacher K7 ranked as second (25%)

and teacher K6 as third (12.5%). The other teachers (D2, E3, F4, F5) had not totally given any praise- intellectual to female students but teachers E3 and K6 gave 50% each praise- conduct to female students.

The data from the second category, i.e. acceptance, shows that the percentage of acceptance-intellectual for teachers D1, F4, K6, K7 are alike, 18.1%, 17.2%, 17.2%, 16.3% respectively. The rest of the teachers, D2, E3, F5, gave 6.8%, 12.9%, and 11.2% respectively. The figures for acceptance-intellectual forwarded towards female students were similar in most of the teachers. For instance, the percentage of this category in teacher D2 and E3 were 8.5%; teacher F4 and K6 were 14.8%. But still teacher D1 had the highest tallies in this category (25.5 %).

When we come to the third category, i.e. remediation, the data shows that remediation-intellectual for male students in teachers E3, F5 and K6 is the same i.e. 8.6%. The highest tallies for this category were recorded for teacher D1 (39.1%) while the lowest was for teacher K7 (4.3%). Similarly the figures for the females' category showed that teacher D2, E3, F4 and K6 gave the same result to remediate-intellectual category i.e. 5.8%.

The above table also shows the criticism forwarded towards male and female students. The figure (33.3%) indicates that teachers E3 and K7 criticized more male students conduct than other teacher. Teacher K6 (22.2%) ranked as second and teacher F4 (11.1%) as third. The other teachers D1, D2, and E3 did not criticize male students at all. When we look at criticism-conduct forwarded towards female students, except in teachers D2, F4, F5, K6, who did not criticize female students at all, the other teachers (D1, E3, and K7) this category accounted for 33.3%.

The results obtained from students talk initiation clearly stated that in teacher D1, the highest male students talk initiation percentage recorded, had about 32.2 %, while teachers D2 and F4 with the lowest (4.8%). In all the other cases,

(E3, F5, K6, K7) the student initiation category accounted for 14.5%, 8%, 16.1%, and 19.3% respectively. In the case of female students talk initiation, the highest female students talk initiation was recorded for teacher D1 (29%) and the lowest was for teacher D2 (1.8%). The figures are the same for teachers F4 and F5 (7.2%). For the other teachers (E3, K6, K7), the figures are 14.5%, 23.6% and 16.3% respectively.

The last part, that is short circuit, the times a teacher answers his/her question or finishes a classroom task for a student, the figures showed that almost all teachers except teacher K6 (100%), had no physically short circuited their male students. The figures for teachers F4 and K7 showed the same verbal short circuit, i.e. (50%). The rest of the teachers did not show any verbal short circuit. On the other hand, the figures for verbal and physical short circuit for female students showed that teachers D1, F5 and K7 gave the same (33.3%) physical short circuit to their female students. The figures for the rest of the students did not show any physical short circuit forwarded. In the verbal short circuit category, the highest percentage (33.3%) was recorded for teacher F5. Teachers D1, F4, K6 and K7 had the same figure (16.6%). While, teachers D2 and E3 had not forwarded any such behavior.

On the whole, comparing the conditions in each of the teachers and the observers' personal description of the classroom interaction behavior of each teacher, teacher D1 relatively gave more praise to both sexes, gave more chance to male and female students talk initiation. She also gave much attention to individual students by going around the class and talking with each student. She addresses students by name or moves forward closer to each of them when she wants to address them personally. For example, she calls students names 50 times (36 males and 14 female students), which is the highest.

4.1.2 Analysis of Gender Differentiated Teaching Behavior of English Teachers

In order to highlight certain aspects of the gender differentiating teaching behaviors of teachers as a group: evaluative type (praise, acceptance, remediation, criticism), evaluative content (intellectual, conduct, appearance), student as initiators, comparison of teacher and student talk initiation and other features were investigated using the data obtained by combining the individual data of the teachers. This was done to include the general description of the extent and feature of the gender differentiating verbal teaching behavior of teachers in classroom interaction. Chi square statistical test was used to check whether the figures showed any significance difference or not.

4.1.2.1 Evaluative Type of Interaction

The teacher student interaction were broken down into evaluative types (the four evaluative types of interaction were praise, acceptance, remediation and criticism) to see which types were used more often.

Table 2. Total evaluative type frequencies forwarded towards male and female students

Praise		Acceptance		Remediation		Criticism		Total	
Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
47	12.4	185	48.9	133	35.1	13	3.4	378	100

As the above table indicates, 48.9% of teachers' interaction fell into acceptance category. This high rate of acceptance responses created classroom environments best characterized as flat, bland and unexciting. Remediation, comments assigned to correct or improve students answer or behavior, ranked second. This accounted for 35.1% of all teachers' reactions. Praise category, which helps to develop a positive classroom climate and to reinforce pupil success, was also comparatively low at 12.4%. Interestingly, the lowest proportion of all interactions fell under the heading of criticism (3.4%).

Thus, it was evident to verify that the English teachers seemed to give less emphasis to praising students' contributions. A closer look at the table also indicated that the teachers used criticism less frequently in language classrooms.

Table 3. Proportion of evaluative type interaction directed towards male and female students

	Praise		Acceptance		Remediation		Criticism		Chi square
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq	%	Freq.	%	8.49
Male	37	78.7	123	66.5	76	57.1	10	76.9	
Female	10	21.3	62	33.5	57	42.8	3	23	
Total	47	100	185	100	133	100	13	100	

A discrimination analysis was also conducted to see if gender of student differentiated the evaluative type of teacher to student interactions. As can be observed from Table 2, teachers' statements of praise for students' contribution were observed low for both male and female students. However, a close look into the data on Table 3 shows that the percentage of teachers praises for male students which is 78.7% was greater than that of female students 21.3%. The low frequency of praise directed towards females in these classes indicated that females were praised by their teachers less frequently than males. As regards this, Curran's (1988) study on teacher praise indicates that the less praised students are deprived of the vital advantages of teachers praise that are highly rewarding for students in establishing warm and productive interaction with their teachers, there by developing positive attitude to learning and its stimulating role for their further development in learning.

When we see acceptance and remediation teachers' interaction in comparison with students' sex, it was observed to have some imbalance. The above table shows the occurrence of highest percentage of frequencies for male students

(66.5% for acceptance and 57.1% for remediation). On the other hand, the percentage of the same teachers' behavior was observed less in the case of female students (33.5% for acceptance and 42.8% for remediation).

Criticisms, which in any case formed a low proportion of the interactions, were directed towards male students (76.9%) almost three times as many as to female students (23%). This supports the findings of Lee and Groper (1984:76), that reported "males do not fit the stereotype of the ideal student- quite, orderly and conforming- but rather act out, interrupt, and misbehave, and in general, much more frequently than do females". These behaviors constitute successful attempts in attracting attention (and interaction with the teachers) and are an important element in gender related activity in the classroom that must be understood by teachers and accounted for in striving for gender equity in total interaction.

Therefore, it can be concluded that male students received more praise, acceptance, remediation and criticism than female students. This was confirmed by the calculated chi square value which showed significant differences in teachers giving more evaluative type interaction to males than to females. The calculated chi square value ($\chi^2=8.49$) was greater than the critical chi square value (7.82) at 0.05 level of significance.

All of the interactions outlined would serve to enhance the self-esteem of pupils. Females are involved consistently, and statistically significantly, less often in interactions in their classrooms. Although it is difficult to be certain what the implications of such patterns are for pupils, it has been suggested that the impact of similar patterns of interaction found in classrooms in other countries is on the self-esteem of female pupils (Reisby, 1995). Similar findings in an American study led to the conclusion that females have lower expectancies for themselves in classrooms in which they were treated in a qualitatively different manner from the males (Eccles & Blumenfeld, 1985).

4.1.2.2 Evaluative Content of Interaction

The teacher student interactions were broken into evaluative content (intellectual, conduct, appearance) to see which evaluative contents were used more often.

Table 4. Total evaluative content frequencies forwarded towards male and female students

Intellectual		Conduct		Appearance		Total	
Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
248	65.6	120	31.7	10	2.6	378	100

It was found that more than half of teachers' interactions i.e. 65.5% were intellectual, 31.7% of the interactions were based on students conduct and 2.6% were on appearance (work). There were no interactions recorded on 'other'. From this it can be said that teachers spent much of the interaction on commenting or reacting on students' intellectual work and they did not gave much emphasis to the physical as well as work appearance of students.

Table 5. Proportion of evaluative content forwarded towards male and female students.

	Intellectual		Conduct		Appearance		Chi square
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	11.9
Male	176	70.9	66	55	4	40	
Female	72	29	54	45	6	60	
Total	248	100	120	100	10	100	

A second discriminant analysis was conducted to see if gender of student differentiated the evaluative content of teacher to student interactions. As indicated in table 5, except for interaction about work appearance of students, which accounted for 60% for females and 40% for males, all the other

evaluative content figures showed that males received more intellectual(70.9% for males; 29% for females) as well as conduct (56% for males; 45% for females) interaction from their English teachers.

This finding is in conformity with the report published by the American Association of University Women (1995) in Sadker and Sadker (1997). This report noted that females received less attention from teachers and this attention is more often on their work or physical appearance. For example, females may receive praise or acceptance for the neatness and timeliness of the work. Males, on the other hand, are more frequently rewarded for intelligent answers and innate ability. Content is praised and appearance of work is criticized. Female students often begin to doubt themselves and their abilities; which potentially lead to less participation in class and results, in lower self confidence and underachievement. In addition, the statistical chi square result indicates that the teachers' differences in giving the evaluative content of interaction to males and females were significant. This was shown by the calculated chi square value 11.9, which was greater than the critical chi square value 5.99, at 0.05 level of significance.

4.1.2.3 Students as Initiators of Interaction

This section related to male and female students talk initiation in the class, to see private or public talk initiations were used more often.

Table 6. Total private and public student initiations by male and female students

	Private		Public		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Male	24	38.7	38	61.2	62	100
Female	30	54.5	25	45.4	55	100

As the above table indicated out of the total student talk initiation by male students 61.2% was done publicly and 38.7% privately (with the teacher only).

On the other hand, if we look at the females' figures, out of the total, 54.5% was done privately and 45.5% publicly. With regard to this point, different scholars affirmed that accepting the implausibility of a straightforward teacher student interaction and achievement, leads females to adopt alternative 'compensatory strategies' and which impact on the learning process and not on its outcome. Interestingly, Good et al (1980) and Dart and Clarke (1988) report females making individual approaches to teachers more often than males. This means that, if males are dominant in whole class arena while females operate in one to one interaction, then evidence is already emerging that the learning of males is a more public process than the learning of females. Certainly, Taber (1992) makes precisely this point. Similarly Boustead (1989) found that, in her own classroom, it was the males who were 'confident and articulate' and who dominated by interruption. She sees females cast as listeners and suggest that classroom patterns reproduce and maintain 'the public/private distinction of men's and women's lives'.

Table 7 Proportion of private and public talk initiations by male and female students

	Private		Public		Chi square
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	
Male	24	44.4	38	60.3	2.94
Female	30	55.5	25	39.6	
Total	54	100	63	100	

An analysis was also conducted to see if the gender of students differentiated students talk initiation during classroom interaction. As signified in table 7, females private talk initiation (55.5%) is greater than that of male students (44.4%). The figures were reversed in the case of students public talk initiation (60.3% for males and 39.6% for females). Even though the above table demonstrated some disparity between male and female students talk initiation, the chi square computed showed that there is no significant difference between

male and female students talk initiation. The chi square statistics indicates that the calculated chi square value ($\chi^2=2.94$) was less than the critical value (3.84) at 0.05 level of significance. From this one can understand that student's sex has limited role in students talk initiation.

Therefore, the implication of this is that, as Tamene (2000) and Abdulkadir (1984) stated, English classroom instruction was best characterized by less students talk initiation and more teachers verbalization. In other words, classroom talk tended to associate more feature of teacher centeredness than features of student centeredness. This situation does not allow students more freedom of expressing their ideas, which influences their way of learning.

Previous studies (Bailey, 1993; Altermatt et al, 1998) have suggested that the greater number of teacher interactions directed towards male students might be due to male students initiating more interaction. But in this study there were no significant differences in the number of interactions initiated by male versus female students.

4.1.2.4 Comparison of Teachers and Students Talk Initiations

Table 8. Proportion of teachers and students talk initiation

	Male	Female	Total	%	Chi square
Teacher initiation to	251	141	392	77	4.63
Student initiation by	62	55	117	22.9	
Total	313	186	509	100	

A close observation of the above table indicates that English classrooms have been dominated by teachers talk initiation. According to the data obtained, out of the time devoted to teaching, total teachers talk initiation amounted for 77% and students talk initiation accounted for only 22.9% of elapsed coding time. From this result one can make an interpretation that students of both sexes as

a whole hardly made any act of initiation. Thus, this implied that grade 9 and 11 English teaching in the schools under discussion was associated with high teacher use of talk initiation category.

The chi square computed inveterate this interpretation, as its calculated chi square value ($\chi^2=4.63$) is greater than the critical value (3.84) at 0.05 level of significance.

Incidentally, the present study is in line with Flanders' findings, it seems clear that a great deal of classroom talk is non interactive, being limited via lecturing to what Barnes (1973) calls the 'transmissive' mode. However, the occurrence of asking questions suggests some interactive behavior, but interactive behavior which is very much teacher-led. This impression is confirmed by the research of Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), which demonstrates, firstly, that classroom interaction typically follows an initiation-response-feedback structure and, secondly, that responsibility for initiation and feedback lies almost exclusively on teachers. Commenting on Sinclair and Coulthard's work some years later, Edwards and Mercer (1987) attest to the continuing truth of its claims. The basic exchange structure is, they point out, once seen, impossible to ignore in any observed classroom talk. Accepting then that the characteristics pattern of classroom interaction is teacher initiation, student response and teacher feedback.

4.1.2.5 Overall Interactions

The previous analyses were conducted on the four evaluative types, three evaluative contents, students as initiators of interaction, and on comparison of teachers and students talk initiations separately. Chi square analyses were conducted to look at the overall differences in the use of the 11 types of evaluative interactions. A significant difference was found in the overall interaction forwarded towards male and female students. As it can be seen

from table 9, the chi square calculated ($\chi^2= 32.6$) showed great variation from the critical chi square value (18.31), at 0.05 level of significance.

Table 9. Gender of student and the 11 types of evaluative interactions received

	Praise intellectual	Praise conduct	Accept intellectual	Accept conduct	Accept Appearance	Remediation Intellectual	Remediation Conduct	Criticize conduct	Criticize appearance	Short Circuit physical	Short Circuit Verbal	Total	Chi square
Male	37	0	116	4	3	23	53	9	1	1	4	251	32.6
Female	8	2	47	9	6	17	40	3	0	3	6	141	
Total	45	2	163	13	9	40	93	12	1	4	10	392	

This result of the present study is found to be consistent with (Smith, 1992; Sadker and Sadker, 1994) who suggested that boys typically have a disproportionate share of contributions in classroom interaction partly due to their being selected by the teacher more frequently than girls, and also due to their ability to create conditions (positive and negative)which attract teachers' attention and facilitate their participation and dominant position in classroom interaction. This 'conversationally focal' position of the boys provides them with an important learning experience, i.e. the confidence of being listened to and responded to within the public domain, thus stimulating them to participate more (Howe, 1997). Girls may thereby be unintentionally pushed out of the centre of the action, learning to expect a lower participation level than the boys. Other studies (Wingate, 1984; Stanworth, 1983) have also found similar patterns and have suggested that, with in the classroom, teachers often exploit rivalry between the sexes to motivate or manage pupils. Boys tend to dominate

classroom talk and there is evidence to suggest that teachers deliberately gear the content of lessons towards boys' interests in order to retain attention and control. Girls remain largely passive and 'invisible' in class and teachers have been found to downgrade their achievements (Stanworth, 1983). These studies suggest that such negative interactions between boys and girls affect girls' self-esteem and their confidence.

In contrast, this study is contrary to the study made by Melkamu (1999). According to his findings female students get more and better quality of attention than male students.

The present observational study looked at how high school classroom interactions are related to gender of students. It was found that teachers directed more interactions towards male students than toward female students. Previous studies at elementary level (Bailey, 1993; Holdon, 1993), junior high level (Sadker and Sadker, 1986), and high school level (Robinson, 1992; Smith, 1992) have found that teachers tend to direct more interactions toward male students than toward female students.

More specifically, the findings of the study showed that males received more praise, acceptance, remediation and criticism than did females. Although teachers generally wanted to interact with male and female students in a similar fashion, this study came up with a tendency of teachers to interact more with male students than with female students. Teachers were likely to comment (praise, remediate...) on the behavior or academic responses of male students than of female students. Teachers were also more likely to criticize the conduct of male students. This inequality in teachers' interactions does not appear to be the result of more direct verbal interactions being initiated by male students. Future research may wish to focus on whether male students are initiating more interactions through nonverbal communication.

4.2 Analysis and Interpretation of Students' Questionnaire

In addition to direct classroom observation, questionnaire was also used to collect data for the study. Respondents to the questionnaire were 24 male and 24 female students from the seven observed sections. The 10 items of the questionnaire that were administered to the students are grouped into five categories according to the relationship of the items in it. These are:

- Classroom participation
- Teachers' feedback
- Questioning
- Teachers' discriminatory behavior
- Wait time

In this part, each of these categories are analyzed and interpreted in relation with the findings of the observation.

Table 10. Classroom Participation

No.	Items	No. of respondents and percentage					
1	The English teacher gives me an opportunity to participate in the teaching learning process.	Male		Female		Total	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq.	%
	Nearly always	7	87.5	2	22.2	9	18.7
	Often	12	60	8	40	20	41.6
	Sometimes	2	18.1	9	81.8	11	22.9
	Rarely	3	37.5	5	62.5	8	16.6
	Never	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	What is your personal opinion about male and female students' participation in English classes?	Male		Female		Total	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
	► females participate more than males	5	62.5	3	37.5	8	16.6
	► males participate more than females	12	66.6	16	88.8	28	58.3
	► they participate equally	7	58.3	5	41.6	12	25

In order to know whether teachers make any discrimination in giving opportunity of participation to male and female students, the subjects were asked to indicate how frequently their English teachers gave them a chance to

take part in the teaching learning process. And a large number of female respondents, compared with male respondents, claimed that their English teachers give them opportunity to participate 'sometimes' (81.8%) and 'rarely' (62.5%).

In item 2, further question was asked in connection with male and female students' classroom participation. As can be seen from the above table, majority of the students (58.3%) asserted that male students' participation is more than that of female students.

It seemed that what the students responded to in items 1 and 2 concord with the results obtained from the observation. As it was mentioned during the analysis of the observation, distribution of teachers' classroom interaction to male and female students showed great disparity. Teachers gave more interaction chances to male students than to female students. Item 2 also strengthen the idea that female students' participation in classroom interaction is very low. This means that the predominance of males is partly, though not entirely, due to teachers selecting males to participate more frequently than they do females.

Table 11. Teachers' feedback

No.	Items	No. of respondents and percentage					
3	How does the teacher react when you make active participation in the teaching learning process	Male		Female		Total	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
	▶ S/he praises, encourages me	14	60.8	9	39.1	23	47.9
	▶ S/he does not react	10	40	15	60	25	52
4	What does the teacher do when you fail to express your idea or comment?	Male		Female		Total	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
	▶ S/he waits until I express it out	15	55.5	12	44.5	27	65.8
	▶ S/he gives the chance to other student	4	28.5	10	71.4	14	34.1
5	If a teacher finds you doing other things when s/he presents a lesson, what kind of measure will s/he take?	Male		Female		Total	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
	▶ s/he insults me	7	100	-	-	7	14.5
	▶ s/he advises me	3	33.3	6	66.6	9	18.7
	▶ s/he only tells me to stop	13	51.7	14	48.2	27	56.2
	▶ s/he does not say anything	1	20	4	80	5	10.4

The other teacher behavior, sought to be investigated through questionnaire was teachers' use of feed back. For this reason, subjects were asked about the reaction of their teachers when students actively participate in the classroom. According to the data obtained, teachers did not give encouragement or praise when students, as a whole, actively participate in the classroom. Moreover, out of the total 24 female students only 9(39.1%) of them claimed that their teachers give them encouragement or praise when they actively participate in the classroom. The rest 15(60%) of female students replied that teachers do not show any reaction.

It is, therefore, possible to conclude that female students believed that their teachers do not show any reaction even when they participate actively in classroom interaction.

With regard to item 4, which assess what English teachers do when students fail to express their idea, more than half of the students 27(65.8%) asserted that their teachers wait until they finished expressing their ideas. Out of these, 15(55.5%) are males and 12(44.5%) are females. Fourteen percent (34.1%) of the students replied that teachers gave the chance to other students when they fail to express their idea. None of the students replied that their teachers condemn them.

One can, therefore, safely conclude that teachers do not criticize intellectual work of both sexes.

Another question under teacher feedback was about the kind of measures teachers take when students do other things in the classroom. Results show that 14.5% [7(100%)] male students replied that their teachers insulted them when they do other things. This shows that teachers use negative comments for male students rather than for females.

The insights detected during classroom observation also appeared to correlate with and support the results of the questionnaire. During successive classroom observation, teachers were observed to use negative evaluative type interaction less than positive evaluative type interaction. These positive (praise) and negative (criticism) feedback of teachers were more likely to be directed towards male students. The observation also revealed that teachers do not use intellectual criticism at all. However, they criticize male students' conduct than they did females'. There are also some evidence to suggest that the tolerance level of teachers is lower to males' misbehavior than to that of females (Lodge and Pickering 1996).

Table 12 Questioning

No.	Items	No. of respondents and percentage					
6	Do you participate in asking and answering questions in English classes?	Male		Female		Total	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq.	%
	Nearly always	8	72.7	3	27.2	11	22.9
	Often	7	58.3	5	41.6	12	25
	Sometimes	5	38.4	8	61.5	13	27
	Rarely	4	33.3	8	66.6	12	25
	Never	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	If your answer to question number 6 is 'sometimes', 'rarely' or 'never' what is your reason?	Male		Female		Total	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq.	%
	►The teacher does not encourage me to participate	3	42.8	4	57.1	7	43.7
	►The teacher does not offer me a chance to ask and answer questions	1	16.6	5	83.3	6	37.5
	►The teacher does not accept my questions and answers	-	-	3	100	3	18.7
	►State if you have a different opinion						

When investigating students questioning behavior, students were asked on how frequently they participate in asking and answering questions. Results of the questionnaire show that from the total female students 8(16.5%) and 8(66.6%) of them answered that they participate in asking and answering questions 'sometimes' and 'rarely' respectively.

In item 7, the students were asked to state the reasons why they participate 'sometimes' and 'rarely' in asking and answering questions, 43.7% {3 (42.8%) males and 4(57.1%) females} students answered, it is because the teachers do not encourage them to ask and answer questions. 16.6% males and 83.3% females students replied that teachers do not offer them a chance to ask and answer questions. Three (100%) of female students replied that the teachers do not accept their questions and answers. The remaining female students attributed their minimal participation to fear of speaking in the classroom; they

do not have confidence on what they are about to ask and answer, as they claim to be afraid of their classmates. And male students answered that they do not see the importance of asking or answering questions, they do not want to actively participate in asking or answering questions.

Although there was no separate category in the observational instrument that detects questioning behavior, different scholars (Howe, 1997) points out that male students often monopolize whole class interaction by asking and answering questions requiring short answers with outlandish and detailed opinion. Coates (1993) also states males' confidence apparent in the way they respond to and ask questions, they participate actively and make out a lot of guesses, while females listen more passively. Male students also took the floor from the females more often than the reverse. On the other hand, female students contribute to their low level of participation by raising their hand only when teachers had directed their gaze to the students they intend to select. Coates (1993)

Table 13. Teachers' discriminatory behavior

No.	Items	No. of respondents and percentage					
8	Do you think that your English teacher makes partiality by giving more chance to participate only for some group of students?	Male		Female		Total	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
	Yes, s/he always does	8	53.3	7	46.6	15	31.2
	No, s/he does not	6	50	6	50	12	25
	Sometimes s/he does	7	43.7	9	56.2	16	33.3
9	I never noticed	3	60	2	40	5	10.4
	If your answer to question number 8 is 'yes, s/he always does' or 'sometimes s/he does' to whom s/he usually give a chance	Male		Female		Total	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
	► to males	11	45.8	13	54.1	24	77.4
	► to females	4	57.1	3	42.8	7	22.5

The other teacher behavior that wanted to be probed was teachers' discriminatory behavior. For this, the students were asked whether their teachers show any discrimination in giving more chance for some group of students. As can be seen from the above table, 31.2% and 33.3% of the total students answered that their teachers show discrimination 'nearly always' and 'sometimes' respectively.

When students were asked to whom the teachers usually gave more chance, a large number of students 77.4% asserted that teachers usually give more chance to male students.

The results of the observation tended to support and substantiate the results of the questionnaire. As it was stated in the analysis of the observation, teachers' interactions with their male and female students showed significant difference. Teachers of the observed schools gave more attention to males and the intensity of academic interaction of teachers was qualitatively different with males than with females. It was male students and teachers who dominated the teacher student interaction, it was males who were reprimanded and praised much more regularly, males to whom teachers directed more chance of participation.

Table 14 Wait time

No.	Item	No. of respondents and percentage					
		Male		Female		Total	
	Does the teacher give you enough time to answer questions?	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
10	Nearly always	11	55	9	45	20	41.6
	Often	8	53.3	7	46.6	15	31.2
	Sometimes	5	55.5	8	44.4	13	27
	Rarely	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Never	-	-	-	-	-	-

For question number 10, regarding teachers giving enough time to their students when students answered questions, majority of the students (41.6%) replied that their teachers 'nearly always' gave them enough time to answer

questions, 11(55%) of them are males and 9(45%) of them are females. The remaining 15(31.2%) and 9(18.7%) of the students asserted that their teachers gave them enough time to answer questions 'often' and 'sometimes' respectively. This shows that teachers give enough time to their students as a whole to answer questions.

Both the observational data and the students' questionnaire provided indications that male and female students are treated quite differently in classrooms. As prior studies suggested, interaction differed significantly when the student gender differs. This study also showed that the instructional time was dominated by the involvement of male students. Teachers interacted highly with male students than with female students, and generally females got less evaluative type interaction and evaluative content interaction. These findings are similar to the results of other studies cited earlier. The results of some local and western studies, that there is no differential treatment of males and females in the classroom and females receive more interaction from their teachers in teacher student interaction, are not borne out by the observational evidence as well as by the questionnaire in this study.

The present comparison of questionnaire and observational methodologies suggests that the two approaches lead to similar conclusions regarding teachers' interaction with male and female students. Yet, each type of data provides a means for interpreting and validating the other, and the combination of information sources adds to our understanding of teacher student interactions in the classroom.

CHAPTER FIVE

Summary of the findings, Conclusions and Recommendations of the Study

5.1. Summary of the Findings

The major concern of this study was to explore gender differences in teacher student interaction in EFL classrooms in four private high schools in Addis Ababa. In order to achieve the purpose of the study, the research questions were specifically designed to provide answers that would appropriately address the issue. Taking the basic questions into account, the study was conducted using modified Sadker and Sadker INTERSECT observational instrument and questionnaire as data gathering tool. The data obtained from the observation, using INTERSECT and questionnaire were analyzed using percentage, and chi square was computed to test the level of significance.

The results of the findings can be summarized as follows:

- Application of the selected INTERSECT categories in classroom interaction by English teachers with male and female students was found imbalanced. The instructional time which was mostly dominated by teachers' talk was used for interaction with male students and the teachers. In other words, teachers used less time to interact with female students.
- As both the questionnaire and the observation clearly indicate, it is significant that in most cases, across all the observed schools, teachers use of praise and criticism was very limited. Nevertheless, male students averaged more instances of praise, acceptance, remediation and criticism than did females.
- Teachers directed the two evaluative content (intellectual, conduct) to male students than to female students. However, females received more work-appearance interaction from their teachers than that of male students.

- Although male and female students' talk initiations were not significant, the proportion of teachers' initiated talk in relation to student initiated talk was higher.
- Male students participate more by way of asking and answering questions in classroom interaction.
- Teachers gave more chances to males to participate in the teaching/ learning process than they did to their female students.

5.2. Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that:

- Teachers interact more with male students than with female students. They were more likely to comment on the academic responses and behaviors of male students than on female students. There appeared an unequal share of teacher attention to male and female students in language classroom interaction.
- The absence of significant difference between male and female students in terms of talk initiation reflects that, students' sex may not be attributing to less students talk initiation in the classroom. This show that students, as a whole, accomplished limited share of the instructional time as individuals or as a group. Most of students' classroom roles are limited to, as Belleck's four classroom discourse moves explained, responding. The rest of the three moves are restricted to the teacher: structuring, soliciting and reacting.
- The participation of female students in asking and answering questions is very low compared to that of male students. Among the reasons that attributed to such low participation of females are; lack of confidence, lack of teachers encouragements, fear of speaking in the classroom etc.
- Male students contribute more than female students to classroom interaction and they receive more feedback on their contribution, both positive and negative. These are likely to have relevance on academic performance of students.

- Teachers select male students to participate more often than female students, partly because males attract teachers' attention in whole class context.
- The putatively more 'public' strategy of males and the putatively more 'private' strategy of females may resembles the commonly perceived role of the genders in other institutions of the society at large.

From all these, it still seems true that the cumulative average impact of gender biased teachers behavior was found to be significantly more influencing and severe for females than for their male counterparts. Given the findings about teacher student interactions, common sense suggests that this is not what should happen. The valuable resource in the classroom is the teacher's attention. If the teacher gives that valuable resource to one group, it should come as no surprise that, that group gains greater educational benefits.

5.3. Recommendations

Considering the gender-biased teacher student interaction in the observed classrooms, the following recommendations are made: to promote gender equity, not only would teachers need to be educated about gender equitable teaching during a workshop or through an informational handout, but they should also be consistently reminded of the need for gender equitable classrooms. These reminders could be instituted in any number of ways. Administrators could incorporate observations of gender equity into their regular classroom observations and include their thoughts on what they observed in their teachers' feedback reports. It would also be beneficial to provide teachers with current articles regarding gender equity as they are published. Hopefully, with consistent reminders, teachers would be able to consciously inhibit gender biases in their interactions with their students.

Bibliography

- Abdulkadir Ali. 1984. Student Teacher Interaction in English Classes in Four Schools of Addis Ababa. (Unpublished M.A Thesis). AAU. AA.
- Allwright, D. 1988. *Observation in Language Classroom*. London: Longman.
- Altermatt, E.R ; Jovanovic, J. and Perry, M. 1998. *Bias or Responsively? Sex and Achievement-level Effects on Teachers' Classroom Questioning Practices*. London: Longman.
- Amanuel Gebru .1996. Gender Differences in Participation in Group Discussion in Freshman English Classes at AAU. (Unpublished M.A Thesis) AAU. AA
- Armstrong ,J.M. 1981. Achievement and participation of Women in Education: Results of Two National Surveys. *Journal of Education*. 12, 356-372.
- Ashenafi Berihun.2000. Teacher Treatment of Students in EFL classrooms-the Gender Perspectives: A Case of Kokeb Tsebah High School of grade 10. (Unpublished B.A Thesis). AAU. AA
- Bailey, S. 1992. *How Schools Shortchange Girls*. New York: Marlowe Company.
- Bailey, E.1993. The Current Status of Gender Equity Research. *Educational Psychology*. 28/45.
- Baker ,D.1986. Sex Differences in Classroom Interactions in Secondary Schools. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*. 22, 212-218.
- Baker, J. A. 1999. Teacher-Student Interaction in Urban at-risk Classrooms: Differential Behavior, Relationship Quality, and Student Satisfaction with School. *Elementary School Journal*, 10(1), 57-70
- Barnes, D. 1976. *From Communication to Curriculum*. Hammondsport: Penguin.
- Barnes, H.1973. *Language in the Classroom*. Milton Keyes. Open University Press.
- Becker, J.R. 981. Differential Treatment of Males and Females in Classroom Interaction. *Journal of Education*. 12, 40-53.
- Belyou Begashaw. 2000. The Treatment of Female Students By their English Teachers and its Effect on Their Participation in two Senior Secondary Schools in A.A (Unpublished B.A Thesis) AAU. AA.
- Bottomley , J. and Ormerod, M. B. 1981. Stability and Labiality in Science Interest from Middle School to the Age of Science Choices. *European Journal of Science Education*. 3, 329-338.

- Bousted, M. W. 1989. Who Talks? The Position of Girls in Mixed Sex Classroom. *Journal of Education*. 23, 41-52.
- Brophy, J. E. 1981. Teacher Praise: A Functional Analysis. *Review of Educational Research*. 51, 5-32.
- Brown, H. D. 1994. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Callahan, J. and Clark, L. 1988. *Teaching in the Middle and Secondary Schools Planning for Competence*. New York: Mc Millen Publishers Company.
- Capel, S. 1995. *Learning to Teach in Secondary School a Comparison to School Experiences*. New York: Routledge.
- Cashin, T. 1995. Teachers Characteristics and Successful Teaching. *Journal of Educational Research*. 95, 278-299.
- Cathcart, R. and Olsen, J. 1976. Teachers' and Students' Preferences for Correction of Classroom Errors. *TESOL Quarterly*. 76, 41-53.
- Chaudron, C. 1988. *Second Language Classrooms Research on Teaching and Learning*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Cherry, L. 1975. The Preschool teacher Child Dyad: Sex Differences in Verbal Interaction. *Child Development*. 46, 532-535.
- Coates, J. 1993. *Women, Men and Language*. London: Longman.
- Coffey, A. and Delamont, S. 2000. *Feminism and the Classroom Teacher: Research, Praxis and Pedagogy*. London and New York: Routledge/Falmer.
- Cohen, L. and Manion, L. 1971. *A Guide to Teaching Practice*. London: Methuen Co. Ltd.
- Coie, J. D., & Koepl, G. K. 1990. Adapting Intervention to the Problems of Aggressive and Disruptive Children. In S. R. Asher & J. D. Coie (Eds.), *Peer Rejection in Childhood*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Corbin, C. B.; Landers, D. M.; Feltz, D. L. and Senior, K. 1983. Sex Differences in Performance Estimates: Females Lack of Confidence vs. Male Boastfulness. *Research Quarterly*. 54, 407-410.
- Darn, S. 2005. Aspects of non verbal Communication. The Internet TESL Journal. <http://www:iteslj.org>.
- Dart, B. and Clark, J. 1988. Sexism in Schools: A New Look. *Educational Review*. 40, 41-49.

- Dickman, C. B. 1993. Gender Differences and Instructional Discrimination in the Classroom. *Journal of Invitational Theory and Practice*. 82.83-108.
- Diller, A.; Houstou, B.; Moran, K. P and Ayin, M. 1991. *The Gender Questions in Education: Theory, Pedagogy and Politics*. Oxford. OUP.
- Dweck, C. and Goetz, T. 1978. Attributions and Learned Helplessness. In Harvey, J.; Ickes, W. and Kidd. R (Eds.) *New Directions in Attribution Research*. Hillside: Erlbaum.
- Ebbeck, M. 1984. Equity for Boys and Girls: Some Important Issues. *Early Child Development and Care*. 18/34.
- Eccles, J. and Blumenfeld, P. 1985. Classroom Experiences and Student Gender: Are there Differences and Do They Matter? In Wilkinson, L. C. and Marrett, C.B.(Eds.) *Gender Influences in Classroom Interaction*. Orlando: FL Academic Press.
- Edwards, D. and Mercer, N. 1987. *Common Knowledge: The Development of Understanding in the Classroom*. Methuen: Mc Grew.
- Gardner, A.L; Mason. C. L. and Matyas. M. L. 1989. Equity, Excellence and just Plain Good Teaching. *American Journal of Education*. 51, 72-77.
- Genet Zewdie. 1991. Women in Primary and Secondary Education. *In Gender Issues in Ethiopia*.
- Gollnick, D. and Chinn, P.C. 1998. *Multicultural Education in Pluralistic Society*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Good, J. and Brophy, J. 1974. *Teacher Student Relationship. Cause and Consequences*. New York:
- Good, T.; Cooper, H. and Blakely. S. 1980. Classroom Interaction as Function of Teacher Expectation, Student Sex and Time of Year. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 72, 378-385.
- Good, T.; Sikes, N. and Borphy, J. 1973. Effects of Teacher Sex, Student Sex on Classroom Interaction. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 65, 74-87.
- Goodman, K. S. 1980. Reading a Psychological Guessing Game. *Journal of Reading*. 6/13.
- Gore, D. A and Roumagoux, D. V. 1983. Wait- time as a Variable in Sex-related Differences During Fourth grade Classroom Instruction. *Journal of Educational Research*. 76, 273-275.
- Hall, R. M. and Sandler, B .R. 1982. *The Classroom Climate: A Chilly One for Women*. Association of American Colleges.

- Holden, C.1993. Giving Girls a Chance pattern of Talk in Cooperative Group Work. *Gender and Education*. 5, 179-189.
- Howe,C. 1997. *Gender and Classroom Interaction*. Liverpool: SCRE Publishers.
- Howes, C., Hamilton, C. E., & Matheson, C. C. (1994). Children's Relationships with Peers: Differential Associations with Aspects of the Teacher-child Relationship. *Child Development*. 65, 253-263.
- Jones, K. ; Evans, C.; Byrd, R.; and Campbell, K. 2000. Gender Equity Training and Teachers Behavior. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*. 27. 173-177.
- Jones, G. and Wheatley, J.1989. Gender Influence in Classroom Displays and Student Teacher Behavior. *Science Education*. 73, 535-545.
- Kelly, A. 1988. Gender Differences IN teacher Pupil Interactions: A Met Analytical Review. *Research in Education*. 39, 1-23.
- Krashen, S. D.1985. *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. London: Longman.
- Lee, V. 1997.*Gender Equity and Organization of Schools*. New York: Garland Publishers.
- Lodge, C. and Pickering, J. 1996. Boys Under Achievements: Challenging some Assumptions about Boys. *British Educational Research*. 10,162-181.
- Long, M. H. and Crookes, G. 1986. Intervention Points in Second Language Classroom Processes. *Second Language Classroom Research*. 5/25.
- Long, M. H. ; Brock, C.; Crookes, G.; Deicke, C.; Potter, L. and Zhang, S. 1984. The Effect of Teachers Questioning Patterns and Wait Time on Pupil Participation in Public High Schools in Hawaii for Students Limited English Proficiency. *Journal Educational Research*. 23, 214-231
- Malamah-Thomes, A.1987. *Classroom Interaction*. Oxford. OUP.
- McConnell-Ginet, S. and Eckert, P. 2003. *Language and Gender*. London: Longman.
- Melkamu Yezachew.1999. Female Students participation in EFL Classroom; The Case of Yekatit 12 and Cathedral Senior Secondary Schools.(Unpublished B.A Thesis) AAU. AA.
- Mersha Yilema.1999. The Move of Teachers to Enhance the Participation of Female Students in English Language Classes with particular Reference to Selected Senior Secondary Schools in A.A.(Unpublished B.A Thesis) AAU. A.A.

- Mitchall, R.; Parkinson, B. and Johnstone, R.1981. The Foreign Language Classroom. *Second Language Classroom Research*. 9/29.
- MOE. 1998. Promoting Girls Education (unpublished Material) A.A.
- Morse, L. W. and Handley, H. M.1982. Relationship of Significant Others, Parental and Teacher Influences to the Development of Self Concept, Attitudes and Achievements Among Adolescence Girls. *Educational Research*. 47, 385-396.
- O'Gara, C. and Kendall, N.1996. *Beyond Enrollment: A Handbook for Improving Girls Experience in Primary Classroom* .Washington D.C: Creative Associate International Inc.
- Omvig, C. 1989. *Teacher/Student Classroom Interaction in Vocational Education*. Kentucky: Kentucky University Press.
- Pascarella, M.; Terenzina, G. and Hibel, P.1978. Student Faculty Interactional Settings and Their Relationships to Predicted Academic Performance. *Journal of Higher Education*. 49,450-463.
- Perrot, T. 1982. *Effective Teaching: A Practical Guide to Improve Teaching*. Singapore: Longman Publishers.
- Peterson, L. and Fennema, E. 1985. Effective Teaching, Student Engagement in Classroom Activities and Sex Related Differences in Learning .*American Educational Research Journal*. 22, 309-335.
- Philips ,D. 1984. The Illusion of Incompetence among Academical Content Children. *Child Development*. 55, 200-216.
- Pianta, R. C., & Nimetz, S. L. 1991. Relationships Between Children and Teachers: Associations with Classroom and Home Behavior. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 12,379-393.
- Pianta, R. C., & Steinberg, M. S. 1992. Teacher-child Relationships and the Process of Adjusting to School. *Child Development*, 57, 61-80.
- Pianta, R. C., Steinberg, M. S., & Rollins, K. B. 1995. The First Two Years of School: Teacher-Child Relationships and Deflections in Children's Classroom Adjustment. *Development and Psychopathology*, 7, 295-312.
- Potter, E. F.1987. Sex differences in Classroom Participation, paper presented at the Annual Meeting Southern Psychological Association. Maran. Atlanta.
- Reisby, K. 1995. The development of self-esteem in students. What does this mean and What Can teachers do about it? In A.L. Arnesen (ed.) *Gender and Equality as Quality In School and Teacher Education*. Oslo: Apostrof-Oslo College-Bislet Publications.

- Reyes ,L.H. and Fennema, E. 1982. *Sex and Confidence level Differences in Participation in Classroom Processes*. New York: American Educational Research Association.
- Reyes ,L.H.1980. Attitudes and Language. In Lindquist, M. M.(Ed.) *Selected Issues in Education*. California: Mc Cutchan.
- Robinson, K. H. 1992. Classroom discipline: Power, Resistance and Gender. A Look at Teacher Perspectives. *Gender and Education*. 4, 273-287.
- Rowe, M. B.1986. Wait-time: Slowing down may be of Speeding up! *Journal of Teacher Education*. 37, 43-50.
- Sadker, D. and Sadker, M. 1984. *Promoting Effectiveness in Classroom Instruction*. Washington D.C.: McGraw Publishers.
- _____ 1985. Sexism in the Schoolroom of 80s. *Psychology Today*. March 54-57.
- _____ 1997. *Teachers, Schools and Society*. New York: Mc Graw. Companies.
- Sanders. et al. 1997. Gender Equity: Sources and Resources for Education Students. New York: Laurence Erlbaum Publishers.
- Seldin, U.1999. Designing Successful Classroom Environments for Different Types of Students. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*. 10,75-81.
- Semunesh Abebe.1997. Female Students' Level of Assertiveness and their Verbal Interaction in EFL classrooms in High Schools in A.A (Unpublished M.A thesis) AAU, AA.
- Serbin , L. et al. 1973. A Comparison of Teacher Response to the Pre-academic and problem Behavior of Boys and Girls. *Child Development*. 44, 796-804.
- Seyoum Teferra.1991. The Participation of Women in Higher Education in Ethiopia. In *Gender Issues in Ethiopia*.
- Simpson, R and Erickson, T.1983. Teacher Verbal and Nonverbal Communication Patterns as a Function of Teacher Race, Student Gender and Student Race. *American Educational Research Journal* .20, 183-198.
- Sinclair, J. M. and Coulthard, R. M.1975. *Towards an analysis of Discourse. The English used by Pupils and Teachers* .Oxford: OUP.
- Sinclair, J. and Brezil, D.1982. *Teacher Talk*. Oxford: OUP.
- Sisay Aseffie.1990. Classroom Interaction and its Influence on the Development of Students Speaking Skill in English at Grade 11 level in Government School. (unpublished M.A Thesis) AAU.AA.

- Skolnick, K. 1982. *How to Encourage Girls in Math and Science*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Smith, D. 1992. A description of Classroom Interaction and Gender Disparity in Secondary School Instruction. *Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*. 34, 183-193.
- Spada, N. 1994. Classroom Interaction Analysis. *TESOL Quarterly*. Vol.28 No.4
- Sunderland ,J. 1994. Differential Teachers Treatment Based on Gender in the EFL classrooms: using Ex-participants Perspectives . In Sunderland, J.1994. (ed.) *Exploring Gender: Questions and Implications for English Language Education*. Will Sire G.B: Prentice-hall.
- _____. 2004. Classroom Interaction, Gender and Foreign Language Learning. In Norton, B. and Toohey, K.2004. *Critical Pedagogies and Language Learning*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Taber,K.S.1992. Girls Interaction with Teachers in Mixed Classes-Results of Classroom Observation .*International Journal of Education*. 14,163-180.
- Tamene Kitila.2000. Classroom Verbal Behavior and Learning Opportunities in Selected Secondary School EFL Classrooms. (Unpublished Ph.D thesis). AAU. AA
- Tinto,V.1987. *Leaving College Rethinking the causes and Cures of Student Attribution*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Tobin ,K. and Gallagher, J. J. 1987. The Role of Target Students in Classroom. *Journal of Teaching*. 24, 61-75.
- Van Lier, L.1988. *The Classroom and the Language Lerner*. New York: Longman.
- Weldekidan Kefle.1998. Gender Related Child Treatment with in the Family. (Unpublished B.A Thesis). AAU. AA
- Werner, E. E. 1990. Protective Factors and Individual Resilience. In S. J. Meisels, J. P. Shonkoff (Eds.), *Handbook of Early Childhood Intervention*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wingate,n.1991.Sexism in the classroom. *Integrated Education*. 22,105-135.
- Worrall, N. and Tsarna, H.1987. Teachers Reported Practices towards Girls and Boys in Science and Language .*British Journal of Psychology*. 53, 350-312.
- Worrall, P. and Tsarna, F.1987. Gender inequalities in classroom talk. *English in Education* 22, 48-65.
- Yosephe Mokonnen.1990. A study of Classroom Language of Junior Secondary Schools Teachers of English. AAU. Unpublished M.A Thesis.

Appendixes

APPENDIX A

Observational Instrument

Observer	Date	School	Grade Level	Teaching context					

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Teacher Initiates to	By	Student Initiates	In	Praise	Accept	Remediate	Criticize	Comment	Ancillary Teacher Behavior
M F	Hand Move Call out	M F	Private Public	P-I P-C P-App ^w P-O	A-I A-C A-App ^w A-O	R-I R-C R-App ^w R-O	C-I C-C C-App ^w C-O		<u>Attribution :A Eff. X</u> Short circuit: physical Verbal
M F	Hand Move Call out	M F	Private Public	P-I P-C P-App ^w P-O	A-I A-C A-App ^w A-O	R-I R-C R-App ^w R-O	C-I C-C C-App ^w C-O		<u>Attribution :A Eff. X</u> Short circuit: physical Verbal
M F	Hand Move Call out	M F	Private Public	P-I P-C P-App ^w P-O	A-I A-C A-App ^w A-O	R-I R-C R-App ^w R-O	C-I C-C C-App ^w C-O		<u>Attribution :A Eff. X</u> Short circuit: physical Verbal
M F	Hand Move Call out	M F	Private Public	P-I P-C P-App ^w P-O	A-I A-C A-App ^w A-O	R-I R-C R-App ^w R-O	C-I C-C C-App ^w C-O		<u>Attribution :A Eff. X</u> Short circuit: physical Verbal
M F	Hand Move Call out	M F	Private Public	P-I P-C P-App ^w P-O	A-I A-C A-App ^w A-O	R-I R-C R-App ^w R-O	C-I C-C C-App ^w C-O		<u>Attribution :A Eff. X</u> Short circuit: physical Verbal

APPENDIX B በአዲስ አበባ የንብርስቲ

በውጭ ቋንቋዎችና ስነ ጽሁፍ ተቋም
የድህረ ምረቃ ትምህርት ክፍል

በተማሪዎች የሚሞላ መጠይቅ

ይህ የጥናታዊ ጽሁፍ መጠይቅ የዘጠነኛና የአስራአንደኛ ክፍል የእንግሊዘኛ መምህራን ክፍሉና ከወንድ ተማሪዎቻቸው ጋር ያላቸውን ግንኙነት ለማወቅ የቀረበ ነው። ተማሪዎች እያንዳንዱን ጥያቄ በተቻለ መጠን በጥንቃቄ አንብባችሁ ትክክለኛ የሆነውን መልስ ከምርጫዎቹ ፊርማ በተሰጡት ሣጥኖች ውስጥ የራይት (✓) ምልክት ወይም በተሰጡት ክፍት ቦታዎች ላይ መልሳችሁን በማስቀመጥ እንድትመልሱ በትህትና ትጠየቃላችሁ።

ለትብብራችሁ በቅድሚያ አመሰግናለሁ።

ስም መጻፍ አያስፈልግም

ጾታ----- ክፍል-----

1. የእንግሊዘኛ መምህሩ በክፍል ውስጥ ጥያቄ እንደጠይቅ ወይም እንደመልስ ሀሳቤን

እንደገልጽ -----

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ ሁልጊዜ እድል ይሠጡኛል | ☐ አብዛኛውን ጊዜ እድል ይሠጡኛል |
| ☐ አንዳንድ ጊዜ እድል ይሠጡኛል | ☐ አልፎ አልፎ እድል ይሠጡኛል |
| ☐ ፈፅሞ እድል አይሰጡኝም | |

2. በክፍል ውስጥ ጥያቄ በመጠየቅ ወይም በመመለስ-----

- | | |
|--|---|
| ☐ ሁልጊዜ እሳተፋለሁ | ☐ አብዛኛውን ጊዜ እሳተፋለሁ |
| ☐ አንዳንድ ጊዜ እሳተፋለሁ | ☐ አልፎ አልፎ እሳተፋለሁ |
| ☐ ፈፅሞ አልሳተፍም | |

3. ለተራ ቁጥር 2 መልስ/ሽ አንዳንድ ጊዜ እሳተፋለሁ፣ አልፎ አልፎ እሳተፋለሁ ወይም ፈፅሞ

አልሳተፍም ከሆነ ምክንያትህ/ሽ ምንድን ነው?

- | |
|--|
| ☐ መምህሩ እንደሳተፍ ስለማያበረታቱኝ |
| ☐ መምህሩ ለመጠየቅ ሆነ ለመመለስ እድል ስለማይሰጡኝ |
| ☐ መምህሩ ጥያቄ ወይም መልሴን ስለማይቀበለኝ |

ሌላ ካላ ጥቀስ/ሽ -----

የላቀቅ ይህንኑ ☐ የወገኖች ይህንኑ ☐ እኩል ☐ ወይ

ወይም ከላይኛው ጋር ይወሰዳል

9. በአንተ/አንቺ እመላካክት በእንግሊዘኛ ክፍል ገዢ የላቀቅ ይወገኖች ክፍል ውስጥ ተሳትፎ

አለቅ ☐ አለቅ ☐

ከሆነ ይህንኑ ይጻፍ

8. ለትራፒክ ሪፖርት ላይ ያለው ወይም አልፎ ያለው የትራፒክ ሪፖርት ይጻፍ

አልፎ ☐ አልፎ ☐

አልፎ ☐ አልፎ ☐

ይጻፍ/ይጻፍ

ወይም ተሳትፎ የላቀቅ ይወሰዳል

7. በአንተ/አንቺ እመላካክት በመግባት ላይ ያለው ወይም አልፎ ያለው የትራፒክ ሪፖርት ይጻፍ

-----የትራፒክ ሪፖርት

አልፎ ☐

አልፎ ☐

በመግባት ላይ ያለው ወይም አልፎ ያለው የትራፒክ ሪፖርት ይጻፍ

6. በመግባት ላይ ያለው ወይም አልፎ ያለው የትራፒክ ሪፖርት ይጻፍ

-----የትራፒክ ሪፖርት

አልፎ ☐

አልፎ ☐

አልፎ ☐

መግባት ይጻፍ

5. በመግባት ላይ ያለው ወይም አልፎ ያለው የትራፒክ ሪፖርት ይጻፍ

አልፎ ☐ አልፎ ☐

አልፎ ☐ አልፎ ☐

4. መግባት ላይ ያለው ወይም አልፎ ያለው የትራፒክ ሪፖርት ይጻፍ

10. መምህሩ እያስረዱ (እያስተማሩ) አንተ/አንቺ ሌላ ትምህርት (ስራ) እየሰራህ/ሽ ከሆነ ምን ይሉህ/ሽ?

☐ ይሠድቡኛል ☐ እንዳቆም ብቻ ይነግሩኛል

☐ ይመክሩኛል ☐ ምንም አይሉኝም

APPENDIX C

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE POST GRADUATE STUDIES

Students' Questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to investigate interaction of grade 9 and 11 teachers with their male and female students. Please read each questions very carefully and put (✓) mark the option you agree.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation

Sex _____

Grade _____

1. The English teacher gives me opportunity to participate in the learning process.

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

2. I participate in asking and answering questions in the classroom.

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

3. If your response to question number 2 is 'sometimes', 'rarely' or 'never' what is your reason?

- ☐ The teacher does not encourage me to participate
☐ The teacher does not offer me a chance to ask or answer questions
☐ The teacher does not accept my questions and answers

State if you have a different opinion _____

4. Does the teacher give you enough time to answer questions?

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

5. What does the teacher do when you fail to express your idea or comment in the teaching learning process?

- ☐ She/he waits until I express it out
☐ She/he gives the chance to other students
☐ She/he condemns me

State if you have a different opinion _____

6. How does the teacher react when you make active participation in the teaching learning process?

☐ She/he praises, encourages or motivates me

☐ She/he does not react

State if you have a different opinion _____

7. In your personal opinion, do you think that your English teacher makes partiality by giving chance to participate only for some group of students?

☐ Yes, s/he always does ☐ No, s/he does not

☐ Sometimes s/he does ☐ I never noticed

8. If your answer to question number 7 is 'yes, s/he always does' or 'sometimes s/he does', to whom s/he usually give chance?

☐ To males

☐ To females

9. What is your personal opinion about male and female students' classroom participation?

☐ Females participate more than males

☐ They participate equally ☐ males participate more than females

10. If the teacher finds you doing other things when s/he presents a lesson, what kind of measure will s/he take?

☐ S/he insults me

☐ S/he only tells me to stop

☐ S/he advises me

☐ S/he does not say anything

Appendix -D

Calculation of the Chi-square (X^2) statistics for the data in Table 3-8

Formula $X^2 = \frac{(o - e)^2}{e}$

$$e = \frac{(\text{row total} \times \text{column total})}{\text{grand total}}$$

$$df = (\text{rows} - 1) \times (\text{columns} - 1)$$

O = observed value

e = expected value

For the Data in Table 3

O	E	$\frac{(o - e)^2}{e}$
37	30.5	1.3
123	120.3	0.05
76	86.5	1.2
10	8.4	0.2
10	16.4	2.5
62	64.6	0.1
57	46.4	2.3
3	4.5	0.5
Total X^2		8.4

Degrees of freedom: 3

Chi-square = 8.49981581553974

p is less than or equal to 0.05.

The distribution is significant.

For the Data in Table 5

O	E	$\frac{(o-e)^2}{e}$
176	161	1.3
66	78.09	1.8
4	6.5	0.9
72	86.6	2.4
54	41.9	1.8
6	3.4	1.9
Total X²		11.9

Degrees of freedom: 2

Chi-square = 11.9157463700737

p is less than or equal to 0.05

The distribution is significant.

For the data in Table 7

O	E	$\frac{(o-e)^2}{e}$
24	28.6	0.7
38	33.3	0.6
30	25.3	0.8
25	29.6	0.7
1	2.67	1.04
3	1.33	2.08
Total X²		2.9

Degrees of freedom: 1

Chi-square = 2.94093003770423

For significance at the .05 level, chi-square should be greater than or equal to 3.84.

The distribution is not significant.

p is less than or equal to 0.05

For the data in Table 8

O	E	$\frac{(o-e)^2}{e}$
251	241	0.4
141	150	0.6
62	71.9	1.3
55	45	2.19
Total X²		4.6

Degrees of freedom: 1

Chi-square = 4.6372584305597

p is less than or equal to 0.05.

The distribution is significant.

For the Data in Table 9

O	E	$\frac{(o-e)^2}{e}$
37	28	2.3
0	1.2	1.2
116	104	1.2
4	8.3	2.2
3	5.7	1.3
23	25.6	0.2
53	59.5	0.7
9	7.6	0.2
1	0.6	0.2
1	2.5	0.9
4	6.4	0.9
8	16.1	4.1
2	0.7	2.2
47	58.6	2.3

9	4.6	3.9
6	3.2	2.3
17	14.3	0.4
40	33.4	1.2
3	4.3	0.4
0	0.3	0.3
3	1.4	1.6
6	3.5	1.6
Total X²		32.6

Degrees of freedom: 10
Chi-square = 32.6406417574191
p is less than or equal to 0.05
The distribution is significant.

APPENDIX E

Lesson Transcriptions

The transcripts of the lessons were written like the script of a play with no special marks used to indicate tone of voice, speech overlap, or other linguistic features. Whenever necessary comments were made in brackets.

The following initials were used to identify the participants.

T-teacher

Ss- Students

MS- male student

FS-female student

Example One

T- Today we are going to discuss about relative clauses, a relative clause start with a relative pronoun. Give me one example of relative pronoun, a single example of relative pronoun; 'EZANA' give me an example of relative pronoun.

MS- he

T- He is a pronoun; it is not a relative pronoun. ABEL

MS- that

T- Yes, that

Ss- Whom, which.....

T-these are relative pronoun (pointing at the blackboard) relative pronoun are the starting words of the relative clause. Is clause a sentence?

Ss-(hand raising)

T- (Nominates male student)

MS- no, clauses are not sentences

T-yes, first we start with what sounds. Meaningfully if we combine sounds they can give us words. Do you remember the passage about babies, how they start to speak certain language, they combine the sounds which are most of the time meaningless and they go to the words. After words there are phrases, after phrases

Ss- Clauses

T- After clauses simple sentences, after simple sentences, complex sentences after complex sentences.

Ss- Paragraphs

T- Yes, there is going to be paragraphs

MS- and then essay

T- Yes, essay we can continue, look at the sequences of formation up to essay (showing at the blackboard), a combination of sounds can give us meaningful words, a combination of meaningful words can give us a phrase. At the same time if we combine the phrases it may give us a clause and a clause add with another clause can give us a complete sentence. If you remember the conditional sentences, do you remember conditional sentences?

Ss- Yes

T- The three kinds of conditional sentences. Tell me one

Ss- (Hand raising)

T- (Nominates a male student)

MT- impossible, likely, improbable AYDELEM ENDE teacher

T- Good, which one is improbable, likely or unlikely

MS- unlikely

T- What about likely

MS- probable

T- Very good EYOB, SENAY what happen to you, you sick? You know what to do if you are sick. If you remember the conditionals, the difference between the three, last time we discuss about what if clause and main clause are, what comes first the main clause or the if clause

Ss- (Hand raising)

T- (Nominates a male student)

MS- the main clause

T- Yes the main clause, what do we use to separate the two?

Ss- Comma

T- Yes, we use comma to separate the clauses. If we take out the main clause, if we only put the if clause can it be meaningful alone?

Ss- No

T- For example, if she works hard... (writing on the blackboard) if I stopped here can it be meaningful? What happen to her if she works hard, it is not stated here, we need another clause added to this clause so that the meaning of the clause can be meaningful. So we need another clause here. By the way if you look at here what kind of conditional sentence is this one **ASTER**

FS- probable

T- Yes, it is a conditional sentence which can be taken as probable or likely. Can you finish this one **EZANA**. If she works hard...

MS- if she works hard, she will die.

T- **EZANA**, I am warning you, be serious. What kind of tense do we use here?

Ss - Hand raising

T- (Nominates male student)

MS- simple present with a future

T- Very good, what about the improbable, what kind of tense do we use for the if clause and what kind of tense do we use for the main clause

Ss- (Hand raising)

T- (Nominates female student)

FS- simple past with would

T- Is it simple past?

Ss- No

T- What is it then **ESKINDER**

MS- past perfect

T- yes, past perfect with would, let us come back to this one a relative pronoun, you see how clauses can be separated from this, I say every relative clause starts with a relative pronoun, these are (showing at the blackboard) relative pronouns, from these relative pronouns which one is a possessive relative pronoun, that can show possessiveness, which one show possessiveness **FREHOWIT**

MS- what is possessiveness teacher?

T- To be owned by the noun in the sentence. FREHOWIT

FS- whose

T- yes, from the five alternatives as we consider them as a relative pronouns they start a relative clause we say, if we consider these four things which one are used for humans or living things and which one are used for non living things

Ss- (Hand raising)

T- (Nominates male student)

MS- whose

T-whose for what?

MS-non living things

T-what about the rest, can you be specific SENAY which one are used for human and which one is used for non living things.

FS-we use who for humans

T- Good TEGENET

FS- which

T-which?

FS- whom

T-yes, we use who and whom for human beings

MS- we can also use which for human beings

T- Can you give me an example?

MS- (inaudible)

T- Yes, when we finished it as a question to ask, but these are relative clauses (inaudible) what about the rest, which one are used for non living things including animals

Ss- Which

T-and

Ss-that

T- Yes, that, can be used for both animate and non animate things, so let us copy a certain short explanation about the two kinds of relative clauses then we

see the differences between them and the similarities between them, do you have questions?

Ss-no

T- (Write down some notes on the black board), as I said earlier a relative clause start with a relative pronoun. KASSA shut up and listen to me, a relative pronoun is the one that we saw earlier that, which, who and so on, a relative clause talks about the noun it refers to, look at this examples first, The woman who lives next door, which one is the relative clause here MOHAMMAD can you tell me where the relative clause starts?

MS- who, starting from who

T- Good, this who tell us about the woman who lives next door, there are two kinds of relative clauses; these are defining and non defining relative clauses. The difference between the two is, a defining relative clause, when we see its physical layout we can see a simple difference between the two that can be taken as the presence of comma. In which one do we find a coma MESFIN, in the first one or in the second one?

MS- in the second one

T- Yes, that is a difference that can be considered. The main difference between the two is not the presence of comma. There are other things that can be taken in to consideration. But a comma is used in the non defining clause, whereas we do not use comma in the defining relative clause. Let me come to this one first, it defines, identifies exactly the noun it refers to. This is the general purpose of relative clause but specifically if we talk about defining relative clause, this non defining relative clause identifies exactly or defines the noun it refers to, are you listening MEAZA?, the noun. Look at here the woman who lives next door is a doctor, you can see a comma, if there is a comma this shows that, this is not part of the real sentence, if take it out the underlining clause, which is a non defining clause, the meaning of the sentence will be understandable. Let us take of this one My brother Jim, who lives in London, is a doctor. Who lives in London give us extra information about whom ABEL

MS- the brother Jim

T-yes, this is separated from the sentence by using a comma because the sentence still can be meaningful without the presence of the non defining relative clause. What about this one, The woman is a doctor, which woman, it creates confusion because we are not sure about the exact woman which the person is talking about, that is why we say it defines the noun the other one is giving extra information. Do you understand the difference between defining and non defining clauses?

Ss-yes

T- Let's do some activities.

Example Two

T- Today we are going to do some activities, so MATIAS face here please, I want to write couple of things down. First of all, one question, why do we give examples? Why is it helpful to give examples while people listen to us talking? Why is it helpful to give examples?

Ss-(hand raising)

T- (Nominates female student)

FS-(inaudible)

T-right, good, it really help people to understand what you are saying, if you give examples, it really really helps. I am going to write a couple of things on the blackboard

MS- do you have extra pen?

T-I only got one extra pen and I gave it to LUEL. (Start writing on the blackboard) ok, what we are going to do is, we are going to do little activity. You are going to finish some sentences I am going to write on the blackboard. EDEN are you listening? For example the first one is, I have many good friends... how can you finish that sentence off giving an example of some of your friends ADONAY

MS-by using the word like

T-very good, tell me the whole sentences

Ss- (Hand raising)

T-(nominates female student)

FS- I have many good friends like Daniel, Genet...

T- Good, you use the word like and you give the name of some of your friends. ADAM, what about, there are many famous runners from Ethiopia...

MS- like Haile G/Selassie beau beau beau

T-very good, well done, you are going to finish these sentences that I am going to write about and I want you to use a variety of these words to give examples, do not just use only like like like try to use different words use such as, for example. So finish the exercise by giving a variety of these words and list the words and ALEXANDER what do I do in terms of punctuation? what punctuation do I need?

MS- use comma

T- Where

MS- between words

T- Good, so make sure you use comma to separate your words in the example list. What shall I do to combine the words?

Ss- (Hand raising)

T-(nominates male student)

MS- use and

T- Yes, so make sure and is there

MS- before and do we put comma

T-well, there is a controversy about that but I prefer no comma before and (Writing the sentences on the black board and the students are copying the sentences and the teacher check their exercises)

T- Shee, some of you are not even listening to me when I am talking to you NARDOS keep quite. We are going to write a short description of going to the zoo. So first remember what is on your list. What is a zoo?

Ss- (Hand raising)

T- (Nominates female student)

FS-it is a place where animals live

T-good, so, what about Awash national park animals living there, is that a zoo?

Ss - Yes, no

T- What is the difference between a place like awash and a zoo? SEMON

MS- animals are on display

T- So how

MS- they are in cages

T- Right, good, sometimes with bars. Have you been to the lion zoo at Sidist Kilo?

Ss-yes

T- Sometimes like that which is a very nice zoo. Sometimes with a glass so you can look through the glass. Uh, in the zoo they try to make the place as nice as possible to the animals. They try to make the habitat. To make the place look like the place where they come from. What is habitat BREHANU?

MS-(inaudible)

T- Yes, the place where the animals live. So what we are going to do is, we are going to writ four paragraphs. Look at this (showing at the blackboard) this is my plan for what you going to write for your description. The title is here 'My trip to the zoo'. There are four paragraphs. These numbers 1, 2, 3, and 4 are telling you what you need to put into those four paragraphs. So, we are going to use this to practice giving examples. I want lots of these things like for example, such as, like all those things we have been doing. You need to use this in your paragraphs. The first paragraph is going to be all about getting there and the preparations to going to the zoo. For this you need to write down who went... so you can say, on last Saturday, I went to the zoo with a lot of my friends including... (the names of your friends) what kind of things you might want to take with you like extra films, cameras, sunglasses and an umbrella in case of rain all those kinds of things. If you want to take what you going to take with you to the zoo and you need to give examples in the first paragraph, examples of those things. And this is the purpose of practice using examples. Right, at the zoo what animals can you see, what birds can you see what insects and what reptiles. So at the zoo there are lots of animals to see for example....now, next paragraph, paragraph three, I want you to describe your favorite animals,

so you can choose animals, birds, insects you like and here you have to give examples of where it lives what it eats

T- BENYAM what is your favorite animal?

MS-lion

T-so for example where do you find it? Where do you find lions?

MS- Kenya

T- Are there any in Ethiopia?

MS-yes

T- So you can say, lions are found in many places including Kenya Tanzania, Ethiopia and finally in your conclusion give good things about your trip and the bad things. Please ask questions now

MS- (inaudible)

T- Yes, if you have to but you have to write it in four paragraphs.

APPENDIX F
Inter Observer Agreement

Categories			Observer A	Observer B
P	M	I	3	3
		C	2	-
	F	I	2	2
		C	1	1
A	M	I	10	10
		C	5	5
	F	I	7	7
		C	2	1
R	M	I	5	3
		C	2	1
	F	I	4	4
		C	2	3
C	M	C	2	2
		A	-	-
	F	C	-	1
		A	-	-
STI		M	7	7
		F	5	5
S.C	M	P	1	1
		V	1	-
	F	P	-	-
		V	1	1

TA

Inter observer agreement = $\frac{TA}{TA+TD}$

TA=total agreement

$\frac{96}{96+23} = 0.81$

TD=total disagreement

96+23