

PARTICIPATION OF FEMALE STUDENTS IN MIXED AND
SINGLE-SEX GROUP DISCUSSIONS IN EFL CLASSES AT
ADAMA TEACHERS TRAINING COLLEGE

A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN TEACHING
ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE (TEFL)

BY
ABERA KASAYE

FEB. 2007

ADDIS ABABA

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

PARTICIPATION OF FEMALE STUDENTS IN MIXED
AND SINGLE-SEX GROUP DISCUSSIONS IN EFL CLASS
AT ADAMA TEACHERS TRAINING COLLEGE

BY
ABERA KASAYE

INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGE STUDIES

APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS

Amanuel G

Advisor

Gevenew Lemse

Examiner

W. W. W. W. W.

Examiner

[Signature]

Signature

[Signature]

Signature

[Signature]

Signature

Table of Contents

	Page
List of Tables	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Abstract	iii-iv
CHAPTER ONE	1
1.1. Background	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	2
1.3. Objectives of the Study	3
1.4. Significance of the Study	4
1.5. Scope of the Study	4
1.6. Definitions of Terms	5
1.7. Acronyms Used	5
CHAPTER TWO:	
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	8
2.1. Roles of Classroom Interaction in Second Language Learning	7
2.2. Group Work as a Technique to Increase Classroom Interaction in Second Language Learning	9
2.3. Gender Differences in ESL Classroom Interaction	15
2.3.1. Gender/Sex Differences.....	15
2.3.2. Gender Relations in ESL Classroom	18
2.4. Turn Taking in Interaction.....	21
2.4.2. Classification of Turns	24
2.4.3. Studies Made on Classroom Participation in Ethiopian Context	24

CHAPTER THREE:

THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY 27

- 3.1. Introduction 27
- 3.2. Subjects of the Study 27
- 3.3. Instruments of Data Collection 28
- 3.4. Model for the Analysis of Recorded Data 29

CHAPTER FOUR:

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 34

- 4.1. Results 34
 - 4.1.1. Distribution of Turns among Participants in Mixed-sex
Groups 34
 - 4.1.2. Distribution of Turns among Female Participants in
Single-sex Groups..... 42
- 4.2. Discussion 48

CHAPTER FIVE:

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 51

- 5.1. Summary 51
- 5.2. Conclusions 52
- 5.3. Recommendations 53

BIBLIOGRAPHY 55

APPENDICES:..... 59

- I. Discussion Transcripts 59
 - A. Lesson One 59
 - B. Lesson Two 66
- II. INTERVIEW QUESTIONS 73

List of Tables

Table 1: Distribution of Turns among Participants in Mixed-sex Group of Group 1

Table 2: Distribution of Starred Turns among Participants in Mixed-sex Group of Group 1

Table 3: Distribution of Turns among Participants in Mixed-sex Group of Group 3

Table 4: Distribution of Starred Turns among Participants in Mixed-sex Group of Group 3

Table 5: Distribution of Turns among Participants in Mixed-sex Group of Group 5

Table 6: Distribution of Starred Turns among Participants in Mixed-sex Group of Group 5

Table 7: Distribution of Turns among Female Participants in Single-sex Group of Group 2

Table 8: Distribution of Starred Turns among Female Participants in Single-sex Group of Group 2

Table 9: Distribution of Turns among Female Participants in Single-sex Group of Group 4

Table 10: Distribution of Starred Turns among Female Participants in Single-sex Group of Group 4

Table 11: Distribution of Turns among Female Participants in Single-sex Group of Group 6

Table 12: Distribution of Starred Turns among Female Participants in Single-sex Group of Group 6

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Ato Amanuel Gebru, my advisor, for his critical and valuable comments and constructive suggestions. Without his unreserved assistance and encouragement, this thesis would not have been successful.

My special thanks are due to my friends, Geberew Tulu, who encouraged me to conduct the study on this area; and to my colleague Yeshitila H/Mariam, who arranged make-up classes and allowed me to use the class. My special thanks are also due to my colleague Megersa Wadajo, registrar of the college, who identified English courses' CGPA of students in Language Stream.

I am also greatly indebted to my friend Abebe Keno and my wife Aster W/Silase for their encouragement through out the study. My thanks also go to W/t Lomi Etisa who helped me by typing the thesis.

ABSTRACT

This study was carried out to see if there were gender differences in verbal participation in English as Foreign Language classroom group discussions at Adama Teachers Training College. For the study students whose four semesters cumulative grade point average (CGPA) in English courses was 2.00–2.50 were identified from the total five sections of Language Stream students, and from them 36 (27 females and 9 males) were randomly selected. Then they were divided into three same-sex groups of female students and three mixed-sex groups. The data was gathered by video recording the group discussions and by interviewing some of the male students and female students in the sample population. The recording was made two times in the course of two double on-off periods and, on average, one group was video taped for half an hour. The recording was transcribed and Van Lier's (1988) modified model was used to describe the transcribed data.

The overall results reveal that the amount of verbal participation of female students in mixed-sex group discussions was less as compared to the amount of verbal participation of their male counter parts. The results also showed that female students in the mixed-sex groups took less initiative to interact in the group than their male counter parts. The female students did less in areas of topic work, self-selection, allocation, and sequencing of discourse. Besides although each group was given four chances to choose volunteer group leader and change roles, none of the female students in the mixed-sex groups shouldered the responsibility of leading groups, and the overall direction of the discourse was controlled by their male counter parts. The interview results support these findings in that 100% of the male respondents and 80% of the female respondents said they believe that girls are less active participants in group discussions than boys are. As a result,

80% of the male respondents said that they prefer working in mixed-sex groups to single-sex groups in order to 'assist' or encourage the female students ('their sisters', to quote their words). And 80% of the female respondents on their part said they prefer working in mixed-sex groups to single-sex groups because they had trust in the answers the male students give. On the other hand, results indicate that female students interact with better confidence in their same-sex groups than they do in the mixed-sex groups. Girls in their same-sex groups did better in the amount of participation in group discussions, and in the control of the overall direction of the group interaction. They also shouldered the responsibility of group leader in their same-sex group discussions. The findings, therefore, establish gender differences in group discussions in English as Foreign language classroom group discussions.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

There is evidence to suggest that interaction in the classroom promotes language learning (e.g. Allwright, 1984; Ellis, 1988; Van Lier, 1988) as it provides the students with the opportunities to practice the target language with each other. Nevertheless, Long and Porter (1985) argue that one of the main reasons for low achievement by many language learners is simply that the learners are not given sufficient opportunities to interact or to practice the target language. This is because much of the talk in the class period, as Flanders (1970), cited in Berhanu (2000:26) writes, is made by the language teacher. Yet we expect at least part of the time in the classroom to be taken up by purposeful interaction between the participants, on tasks that involve working with the target language.

One technique among the many to increase the opportunities to interact in English as a second language, as Brumfit (1984) and Nolasco and Arthur (1988) say, is group work. They believe that the use of pair and group work in ELT allows for genuine information exchange and provides opportunities for practice which may not otherwise be available to students who are not living in an English speaking environment.

The above views stress the need for interaction in language learning and that the opportunities for interaction in language classroom can be increased by the use of group work.

The question of whether students of both sex groups actively interact and are equally benefited by group work or not also needs focus. Van Lier (1988:91) writes

that interaction presupposes participation and when observing the behavior of students in L2 classroom, one of the salient characteristics is their participation in the interaction that goes on there.

Equal classroom participation by both male and female participants can be constrained by different factors. One factor among the many is gender differences.

Ethiopian studies in areas of general education indicate that Ethiopian females lag behind their male counter parts academically for several gender-related factors. (Tsigie Haile, 1989; Seyoum Tefera, 1991; Genet Zewde, 1991). One of the factors is male students' dominance over female students.

When it comes to language learning/teaching, this problem seems to be more serious, because male students dominance over female students in language class means female students interact less and speak less in mixed-sex group discussions.

Concerning this potential problem in language classroom, while Amanuel's (1996) research on gender differences in verbal participation and assertiveness groups found no gender differences. no other research on participation of girls in relation to participation of boys in English as a foreign language classroom has been carried out so far in the country.

Since Amanul's (1996) study has limitations of being the study of the best students only, it is necessary that a research that addresses the limitations and explores less privileged areas of the country is carried out with a different methodology from that of the previous study by Amanuel.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Adama Teachers Training College (ATTC) is located south of Adama Town on the main road to Wonji Sugar Factory. It was upgraded from Teachers Training Institute

(TTI) to TTC level in 1999. Since then it has been training teachers at diploma level in Regular, Evening, and Summer programs. The college has got four streams: streams of Social Science, Natural Science, Mathematics, and Aesthetics. It has admitted a large number of students or trainees to these streams. In September 2005, for example, it admitted 60 male and 189 female students (a total of 249 students) to Language Stream only, though it did not admit any 'new' students in 2006 to any of its four streams for unknown reason. Many of the female students joined the college with relatively lower Ethiopian General School Leaving Certificate Examination (EGSLCE) results (minimum for girls 1.80; and minimum for boys 2.00) through the Affirmative Action Program constituted by the Regional Education Bureau. As a result, the current female students' figure is by far larger than that in the earlier years.

Although the number of female students in the stream is getting higher, it seems that there is male students' dominance over female students in interpersonal interactions in classrooms, and gender is likely to be an important factor in classroom interactions. Male students' dominance is a significant problem for female students in male dominated educational settings of such kinds. It is significant because it influences girls' verbal participation in all forms of academic interaction: pair work, group work, and teacher-class discussions. Male dominance over female means girls interact less and speak less in mixed- sex group discussions. This problem of girls' reticence in mixed-sex group discussions becomes even more important when one considers that language use is an important aspect of language learning.

1.3. Objectives of the Study

The general objective of the study is to investigate the participation of female students in mixed-sex groups and single-sex groups to see if there is any differential participation. Under this general objective, the specific concerns of the study are to:

- i) examine the participation of female students in mixed-sex groups;
- ii) examine the participation of female students in single-sex groups;
- iii) find out in which group compositions the female students participate better:
and
- iv) investigate the factors for any imbalance in participation.

1.4. Significance of the Study

The study is significant as it takes into account what goes on in the actual classroom and negatively affects language learning. It is hoped that the findings of the study will shed light on the kind of group composition in which female students participate better. This is hoped to benefit language instructors as it can make them be aware of the kind of group composition female students participate in better. The findings of the study can also give some ideas to material developers.

1.5. Scope of the Study

The study is limited to the second year 10+3 diploma Program Language Stream students at Adama Teachers College. More specifically, it concentrates on only one regional college, as it would not be manageable to process data if it were from more than one college.

Although the researcher is aware of the fact that the non-verbal behaviors accompanying the verbal behaviors are very important aspects of communication, the researcher has limited his study to verbal acts to avoid complications.

1.6. Definitions of Terms

Participation: any verbal contribution in group discussion.

Turn: a short utterance or an extended utterance by one person as long as that person speaks and before another one comes in and starts speaking. It may start from a single word and goes to a talk.

Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA): sum of grade points of different semesters divided by credit hours in the semesters.

1.7. Acronyms Used

XL: unidentified learner

LL: several learners simultaneously (including laughter)

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. Roles of Classroom Interaction in Second Language Learning

A great deal of research has been conducted to see whether interaction or amount of learner participation and acquisition/proficiency achievement correlate or not. And studies have exhibited mixed results.

Seliger (1976), Naiman *et al.* (1978) and Strong (1983 and 1984), as reported in Ellis (1994: 592-93), came up with positive correlations. Seliger (1977), cited in Ellis (1994), conducted his study with six adult learners of English and measured their participation by the amount of verbal interaction that occurred. In order to check their learning he gave different tests (such as cloze, structure and comprehension). The results were such that total interaction scores correlate significantly with structure and aural comprehension tests and proportion of initiations correlated significantly with aural comprehension test. Naiman *et al.* (1978), cited in (Ellis 1994), on their part took L2 learners of French from different grade levels and measured their participation through various measures of classroom behavior (e.g. student hand-raising, student complete/partial responses and student correct/incorrect responses). The researchers measured the learning through comprehension and initiation tests and found positive results. Similarly, Strong (1983 and 1984), in Ellis (1994), took 13 kindergarten pupils in bilingual classrooms and measured their participation with responses learners made to utterances produced by others. To see whether they have learnt or not he used various measures of linguistic correctness, vocabulary and pronunciation based on

classroom speech. The result was that children's responsiveness correlated significantly with proficiency measures.

Allwright and Bailey (1991) and Ellis (1994) report that Day (1984), Ely (1986) and Slimani (1987) have found no relationship between participation and proficiency achievement. However, these findings do not seem conclusive because what we practically see in our daily life seems to contradict their findings.

Otherwise, other second language researchers (e.g. Allwright, 1984 and 1989; Allwright and Bailey 1991; Stern 1983; Molamah- Thomas1987; Chaudron 1988; Ellis 1988, 1992 and 1994; Rivers 1987; Van Lier, 1988) have given us much insight into the importance of interaction for better language learning.

Classroom interaction is significant as it is the *sine qua non*, to use Allwright's (1984) words, for language development. Concerning the importance of interaction in the classroom Chaudron (1988:10), quoting Allwright (1984) and Breen (1985), writes the following:

Interaction is viewed as significant because it is argued that; (1) only through interaction can the learner decompose the TL structures and derive meaning from classroom events; (2) interaction gives learners the opportunities to incorporate TL structures into their own speech...; 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.

According to the above view, classroom interaction provides second language learners with opportunities to practice the target language through the input that they encounter.

Adding to this, Ellis (1988: 95) notes that interaction contributes to the students' language development as it is "the means by which the learner is able to 'crack' the code". Rivers (1987:4) on her part says that "through interaction students can increase their language store as they listen to linguistic material, or even the out put of their fellow students in discussion and problem solving tasks.

Interaction is significant not only to get our message across but also to extend our linguistic competence. Through interaction, as Allwright (1984) says, learners practice communicating their ideas and learn linguistic forms, i.e., grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation. The interaction hypothesis proposed by Long (1985), as cited in Ellis (1992), shares this view and stresses the fact that the process of interaction or communication is a learning process.

However, Krashen (1982) argues that interaction assumptions can be materialized only when the learner obtains input that is roughly suited to the level of development the learner has reached. Therefore, language development will take place, as he further says, if the learner obtains 'comprehensive input' as this will ensure that the input is at the right syntactic level. But it can be argued, as Ellis (1988) says, that it is not input in itself that is important rather the interaction as this involves the learners' active contribution to the process of interaction. Swain (1985) in Ellis (1994), when proposing comprehensive input, on her part, believes that learners do not need just comprehensible input but rather the opportunity to use their linguistic resources. She claims that learning/acquisition can be promoted when there are opportunities for pushed output. This is important not only to achieve full grammatical competence but also to convey the message. Swain's argument in her words, as cited in Ellis (1994: 282) is that:

... production may encourage learners to move from semantic (top-down) to syntactic (bottom-up) processing. Whereas comprehension of a message can take place with little syntactic analysis of the input, production forces learners to pay attention to the means of expression.

It is, therefore, important to push learners to produce more since that will aid their acquisition of the language. For interaction to take place both input and out put are very important.

Interaction is a mutual endeavor in the sense that it is at least a two-way process. It requires the active participation of the two parties. Hence, we cannot think of a language classroom without interaction. That is why Allwright (1984: 159) says that interaction in its broad pedagogic sense is “an inescapable and inescapably crucial aspect of classroom life”.

Interaction in language classroom could be between the teacher and the students and/or between students and students. Since student-student interaction, as Varnos and Gass (1985), cited in Aston (1996:130), argue can maximize negotiation for meaning and make input more comprehensible, “students should be encouraged to interact among themselves”. One technique, among the many, to increase student-student interaction is group work. (Group work is discussed under section 2.2.).

It is on the basis of the above views that second language researchers underscore the pedagogical significance of classroom interaction and say that learners learn better in the process of interaction as they negotiate meaning and make input more comprehensible (e.g. Aston .1996; Allwright, 1984; Van Lier, 1988; Ellis, 1992 and 1994).

2.2. Group Work as a Technique to Increase Classroom Interaction in Second Language Learning.

Group work in second language classroom has been recommended based on its pedagogical significances. Its use stands against a traditional teaching model that depicts the teacher as the owner and giver of information, and students as learners

and receivers. The old paradigm considers students as passive recipients of what they are offered.

However, the old paradigm of teaching is being dropped for new paradigm based on theory and research that have applications to learning. The following, as reviewed in Berhanu (2000), are four among many other commonly held assumptions for using group work in education in general and second language teaching/learning in particular. The assumptions are interrelated, and are not distinctly separate.

First, it is believed that “knowledge is constructed, discovered, transformed, and extended by students” (Johnson and Johnson, 1994: 261). These writers suggest that the main role of teachers is to create the conditions within which students can construct meaning from what they are learning. At the core of this assumption is the belief that people can learn from each other as well as from teachers and knowledge is constructed and reconstructed as a social process. Reynold (1994:26) writes, “understanding in any field of enquiry is something which is constantly being created and negotiated and formal education should support that process through its methodology”.

In group discussion, it is assumed that all participants come to see themselves as mutual discoverers making contributions of equal weight in a co-operative and non-threatening atmosphere. Abercrombie (1975), as cited in Berhanu (2000:24) writes that “... if the student receives a body of knowledge from what seems to be a remote monolithic source and swallows it whole in childlike way, he is less likely to question it, less likely to be able to modify it as need arises, than if he has received as a mature person, from a challengeable equal”.

Second is the notion of ‘active’ as opposed to ‘passive’ learning, an idea involving a view of the learner as a seeker of solutions rather than a gatherer of information.

Giving weight to student discovery in the learning process is a view which emphasizes the importance of learner involvement if a deeper and more enduring learning experience is to be achieved. In this frame work understanding comes from the learner actively “manipulating symbols, posing questions and seeking answers, reconciling what is found one time with what is found at another, comparing findings with those of other students” (Piaget 1964), cited in Berhanu (2000:24)

Thirdly, group work is thought to foster creativity and a capacity for critical thinking in students rather than simply the retention and unquestioning acceptance of spoon-fed knowledge. Bruner (1957), cited in Berhanu (2000:24) refers to this kind of creativity as ‘going beyond the information given, a learning process which, through an active dialogue with other students, encourages in students the desire to work things out for themselves, to sort out information and ideas so as to be able to go on to new ways of seeing and understanding the subject.

Finally, group work is seen as vital in “bringing about a change in the authority-dependency relationship” which exists between teacher and student. (Abercrombie and Terry, 1978, cited in Berhanu, 2000:25). It does so by allowing students greater freedom of expression thus promoting an increase in autonomy and willingness to take responsibility for their own learning. Abercrombie (1975), as cited in Berhanu (2000:25) writes “...the distinctive contribution that small group teaching can make to education is in encouraging students to become more autonomous as learners”. The group system aims to emancipate students from the authority-dependency relationship, and to help them develop intellectual independence and maturity through interaction with peers, by glimpsing not only the context in which several equals see the problem. The idea of learner autonomy has also been emphasized in the field of language teaching (Wenden 1987).

In sum, advocates argue that the use of group work in teaching offers participants the opportunity to gain access to a valuable learning experience with the potential to liberate them from over dependency on the 'word' of the tutor, through the development of their own capacity for critical thought, encouraging them to take a more active responsibility for their own learning.

The points discussed so far emphasized the pedagogic value of group work in education in general, including language teaching.

There are also arguments with more emphasis to pedagogic value for group work in ELT. The arguments show that group work increases language practice opportunities, motivates learners, improves the quality of student talk, helps individualize instruction and promotes a positive affective climate.

Long and Porter (1985) argue that one of the main reasons for low achievement by many language learners is simply that they are not given the opportunity to practice the new language. When learners are organized in such a way that the teacher sets the same instructional pace and content for everyone, by lecturing, explaining a grammar point, leading drill work, or asking questions to the whole class, a typical teacher of any subject talks for at least half, and often for as much as two thirds of any class period (Flanders 1970), cited in Berhanu (2000: 26). In a 50 minute lesson, that would leave 25 or less minutes for the students. In an EFL class of 30 students, which is common in Ethiopia, this averages out to 50 seconds per student per lesson. One can imagine how short this time would be per student per lesson. The students are almost not allotted time to interact among themselves.

* Brumfit (1984:87) holds that "the use of pair and group work is the only available basis that can increase the amount and intensity of practice during oral work".

Concerning the idea that group work motivates learners, Reynolds (1994:26) says people learn more when they are involved and are enjoying themselves when they are motivated. Long and Porter (1985) also believe that group work motivates the language learner because it allows for a greater quantity and richer variety of language practice, practice that is better adapted to individual needs and conducted in a more positive, affective climate. Students are also individually involved in lessons more often and at a more personal level.

The belief that group work motivates learners has also been supported by empirical evidence. It has been found, for example, that small group, independent study can lead to increased motivation to study a second language among beginning students. In another study, second language learners responding to a questionnaire also reported that they felt less inhibited and freer to speak and make mistakes in small group discussion than in lockstep organization. (Littlejohnson 1983).

As to the idea that group work improves the quality of student talk, Long and Porter (1985) hold that group work can help a great deal to develop students' communication ability. First, unlike the lockstep where the teacher acts as a distant initiator of talk and students as the interlocutors, face-to-face communication in a small group is a natural setting for conversation. Second, two or three students working together for five minutes at a stretch can engage in cohesive and coherent sequences of utterances, thereby developing discourse competence. In other words, they are not limited to producing hurried isolated "sentences" which are thought to be typical in lockstep teaching. Thirdly, as shown by Long *et al* (1976), cited in Long and Porter (1985), students can have the chance to take on roles and adopt positions and can thus practice a range of language functions associated with those roles and positions. In short, it is argued that when students work in small groups, the quality of student talk improves a lot. Learners can also have the opportunity to

develop at least some of the variety of skills, which make up communicative competence in the target language.

Concerning the belief that group work individualizes instruction, Long and Porter (1985) hold that group work can help consider individual differences among the learners in language learning, as opposed to lockstep organization. Thus, group work is, the writers argue, a first step towards individualization of instruction. Brumfit (1984:77) argues, "Placing students in small groups assists individualization, for each group, being limited by its own capacities, determines its own appropriate level of working more precisely than can a class working in lockstep, with its larger numbers".

As regards the belief that group work promotes a positive affective climate, Brumfit (1984), Berhanu (2000) and Seime (1999), among the many, argue that group work reduces stress. This stress is high in lockstep organization particularly when the students learn that they must respond accurately and above all quickly. "Small group setting, for its size resembles that of natural conversational groupings, is more natural than that of full class and hence reduces the stress which accompanies public performance in the classroom" (Brumfit, 1984:77).

From the aforementioned discussions, group work is highly recommended in second language classroom.

2.3. Gender Differences in ESL Classroom Interaction.

In the field of second language learning and teaching, there are various factors, external and internal, which affect language learning. Gender difference is one among the various factors.

2.3.1. Gender/Sex Differences

Before any discussion of sex or gender differences, it is good to start with the terms “sex” and “gender”. Sex and gender have been variously defined and interpreted. They are often interchangeably used in different literature to refer to biological maleness/ femaleness. Sex/gender distinction, however, is widely used among social scientists. It is considered as a useful analytical tool for studying differences between men and women.

In many cases, ‘sex’ is used in connection with the biological categories of female and male. It refers to “biological characteristics that define humans as female or male”. (World Health Organization 2002 online). While these sets of biological characteristics are not mutually exclusive, as there are individuals who possess both, they tend to differentiate humans as males and females. But some writers do not accept this dichotomy. Treicher and Frank (1989), Shapiro (1991), and Moore (1993), in Amanuel (1996), for instance, claim that sex is problematic as it is inefficient when one considers sexually ambiguous infants.

For many, gender is a socially and culturally constructed difference between men and women within a cultural system. Gender, as defined in World Health Organization (2002) online, refers to “the array of socially constructed roles and relationships, personality traits, attitudes, behaviors, values, relative power and influences that society ascribes to the two sexes on a differential basis”.

Gender is not only a social concept, but also an individual concept in the sense that it is also something people feel about themselves. Money (1989) identifies these two concepts as “psychological sex”, the individual’s self-image, and social sex, the complex of attitudes and expectations that a society attaches to maleness and femaleness.

Our perceptions of gender are not static; they shift with time. As gender roles change in the course of time, our perceptions of gender shift. Besides, because cultures are not homogeneous, within any culture and even subculture our perceptions of gender vary at a given time as well. That is why gender is further defined in World Health Organization (2002) online as “... an acquired identity that is learned, changes over time, and varies widely within and across cultures”.

From the aforementioned points, gender can be understood to be a socially and culturally constructed and changeable concept whereas sex is believed to be natural and unchangeable concept. However, there is an argument by Caplan (1987) cited in Amanuel (1996) that even though the term sex is believed to be something natural, it has contained different meanings at different times and is socially created. This indicates that the sex/gender dichotomy is problematic. Whatever the problematic dichotomy, more important has been the study of sex/or gender differences in several human domains. Generally, it is possible to distinguish between stereotypical and actual distinctions between men and women.

There is an almost universal belief that men and women have innate characteristics that typify them. For instance, women are often described as weak, submissive, dependent, emotional, co-operative (Ababayhu, 1995). Even according to some feminists women are caring, more attuned to personal relationships, less concerned about success, more oriented to the home (Betze and Fitzgerald, (1987), cited in

Amanuel (1996:10). Men on the other hand are considered "independent, aggressive, and decisive (Bukatko and Marvin 1992: 58).

Research into gender differences in certain academic domains and their causes has come up with more actual differences. Maccoby and Jacklin (1974), cited in Amanuel (1996:11) concluded that while the two sexes do not differ in overall brain power, females show higher scores on verbal ability tests. According to them, boys are 3-4 times more likely to stutter than girls are. In modern languages, girls outperform boys at all educational levels (Hughes and Preston in Sunderland, 1994). Nevertheless, whatever sex-based differences there are, they do not clearly appear until adolescence by which time children will have learned culturally appropriate sex roles (Betz and Fitzgerald, 1987). For instances, Sherman's (1979), as cited in Amanuel (1996), sample of 9th and 6th graders showed no sex based cognitive differences. Concerning educational attainments, it appears that sex-based attainments differ culturally. In western cultures in general:

The school progress of girls is superior to that of boys. Girls less frequently need to repeat a grade and girls are more likely than boys to be accelerated and promoted. In college, women consistently receive higher grades than do men in major fields ranging from the humanities to the exact sciences
(Betz and Fitzgerald 1987:100).

This better achievement of girls than boys does not seem to work in developing countries due to various reasons. In Ethiopia, college girls, due to various socio-cultural reasons, are more likely than boys to be forced to withdraw or be dismissed (Tsige Haile 1989) which appears to be a very serious case of what Betze and Fitzgerald (1987) call "female chronic under-utilization of their abilities and talents", (cited in Amanuel 1996). The deep-rooted patriarchal thinking among our people Genet (1991), cited in Tesfaye (1997), contributed its share for the lower status of women educational achievements.

2.3.2. Gender Relations in ESL Classroom.

From the concept of gender comes the concept of gender relations: relations between males and females, females and females, males and males. They are important in the school compound in general and in the classroom in particular because much of the learning that takes place is embedded within them (Sundrland, 1994). Studies into friendship system and playgroups tend to be unisex (Best, 1883; Etaugh Liss, 1992; Maccoby and Jacklin, 1987; Thorne, 1993; Bailey 1993; as cited in Amanuel 1996). "Fairly distinctive styles of interaction develop in all-boy and all-girl groups" Maccoby (1990), in Bailey (1993: 516)

Jones and Smart (1995) argue that girls have higher confidence in their same-sex groups than in mixed-sex groups. Girls in mixed-sex discussion groups feel they are conversing with their superior partners while boys feel they are interacting with their inferiors (Eagly and Wood, 1985 and Unger, 1975; as cited in Amanuel 1996). Lockehead and Harris (1984) support this idea that while mixed-sex grouping creates opportunities for boys to dominate, such grouping makes females subordinates.

In support of this, (Zimmerman and West, 1975; West and Zimmerman, 1983; and Williams, 1989; in Shehadeh 1999) have found that in native speaker-native speaker (NS/NS) interaction females were subject to interruptions more frequently than males with males attempting to exercise more dominance over the conversation. They observed that males assert an asymmetrical right to control topics and do so without evident 'repercussions'. They also observed that men tend to deny equal rights to women as conversational partners, with respect to rights to the full utilization of their turns and support for the development of topics.

Similarly, in a study designed to investigate the effect of gender in non-native speaker-non-native speaker (NNS/NNS) language classroom interaction, Gass and Varonis (1986) have found that there are differences between men and women in the amount each participates in the conversation, and in the control each has over the direction of the interaction. Gass and Varonis (1986: 349) summarize the findings of their study as: "Men took greater advantage of the opportunities to use the conversation in a way that allowed them to produce a greater amount of comprehensible output, whereas women utilized the conversation to obtain a greater amount of comprehensible input"

In a more detailed study, Shehadeh (1994) found that same-gender dyadic interaction provided better contexts for females to (a) self-initiate repair and (b) produce comprehensible output than males; whereas mixed-sex group interaction provided better contexts for males to (a) request clarification, (b) self-initiate repair, and (c) produce comprehensible output than females.

The findings of Shehadeh's study support those reported by Gass and Varonis (1986) and Pica *et al* (1989) in that men appear to take greater advantage in the group activity (a mixed-sex task) to use conversation in a way that allowed them to retain the turn, enjoy a greater amount of talk, and thus produce a greater amount of comprehensible output than women. On the other hand, Shehadeh's study also revealed that same-sex dyads offered women comparatively greater opportunities to produce comprehensible output than men.

One aspect of Shehadeh's findings shows that difference of gender enables men and women to play different roles in conversation. Namely, in mixed-gender conversations, males seem to take more opportunities to talk, to dominate the conversation, to make a greater number of self-and other-initiated repairs, and to produce comprehensible output; whereas females seem to utilize the conversation to

obtain a greater amount of comprehensible input. These differences are important when we realize that conversation plays an important role in the development and progress of L2. For example, Hatch (1978), cited in Shehadeh (1999: 259) argued that syntax develops out of conversation: one learns how to do conversation, one learns how to interact verbally, and out of this interaction, syntactic structures are developed. Gass and Varonis (1986: 348) also argue that 'conversation...provided the input that learners used for building syntactic structure', while Long (1996) suggests that conversation creates more opportunities for the negotiation of meaning. This negotiation of meaning, in turn, creates greater opportunities for the provision of comprehensible input (Krashen 1994) and for the production of comprehensible output (Swain 1995). And these_the provision of comprehensible input and the provision of comprehensible output_are crucial requirements for progress and development in the second language, since the former assists L2 learners' receptive skills (listening and reading), and the latter assists their performance/productive skills (speaking and writing).

But that female students seem to utilize mixed-gender interaction to obtain comprehensible input does not compensate for the opportunity they lose to develop comprehensible output and they remain disadvantageous in mixed-gender group interaction in the EFL classroom.

Viewed from this perspective, the results of the studies imply that males in mixed-gender interaction have greater and better opportunities to communicate, promote their productive skills, and progress in the second language, than females. In other words, it means that female students fail to benefit equally from learner-centered, co-operative activities that are nowadays recognized as beneficial for language acquisition. If they cannot equally benefit from mixed gender communicative activities, it may turn out to be that communicative language teaching methodology has little to offer for female students.

2.4. Turn Taking in Second Language Classroom Interaction

Conversation analysis is important in dealing with social interaction in general and classroom interaction in particular in rigorous empirical and formal ways (Cook, 1989; Coulthard, 1985; Schiffcin, 1994). It deals with classroom interaction, (which is important in this study), on the basis of the analysis of turns or the exchange of turns. Conversation analysis tries to give solutions to problems related to the distribution of turns or the exchange of turns at talk (Schiffcin, 1994).

It seeks answers to questions such as: how are participants allocated turns at talk? How do they know the current speaker has finished speaking and other person can hold the floor? How does the next speaker get the turn? Under what circumstances do turns overlap or silence or gap occurs? and other related questions. This requires close investigation of turn taking in classroom discourse in this case. The study of the nature or the pattern of turn taking is, therefore, important if we want to know how interaction is organized and managed by the participants in the classroom discourse (Taddese, 1997). This is because it is impossible to think of interaction without at the same time raising the issue of turn taking. As Van Lier (1984: 94) writes, "turn taking studies the systematic nature of speaker change in different settings". In doing so, Van Lier adds, it addresses the basic problem of discourse analysis _ the question of how one utterance follows another in a rational, rule governed manner. Van Lier further adds, the matter of who speaks and when is not random; it is governed by regularities of some kind, whether we call them rules, regulations, procedures or conventions. These non-randomness (or let us call them procedures) may be determined in advance in the form of strict rules (e.g. debates) or they evolve as norms in the interaction itself .In relation to this Van Lier (1988;96) identifies three major issues that such procedures basically address :

1. the proper size or length of a turn;
2. the identification of the end of a turn; and
3. the sequence of turns or who comes next.

2.4. Turn Taking in Second Language Classroom Interaction

Conversation analysis is important in dealing with social interaction in general and classroom interaction in particular in rigorous empirical and formal ways (Cook, 1989; Coulthard, 1985; Schiffcin, 1994). It deals with classroom interaction, (which is important in this study), on the basis of the analysis of turns or the exchange of turns. Conversation analysis tries to give solutions to problems related to the distribution of turns or the exchange of turns at talk (Schiffcin, 1994).

It seeks answers to questions such as: how are participants allocated turns at talk? How do they know the current speaker has finished speaking and other person can hold the floor? How does the next speaker get the turn? Under what circumstances do turns overlap or silence or gap occurs? and other related questions. This requires close investigation of turn taking in classroom discourse in this case. The study of the nature or the pattern of turn taking is, therefore, important if we want to know how interaction is organized and managed by the participants in the classroom discourse (Taddese, 1997). This is because it is impossible to think of interaction without at the same time raising the issue of turn taking. As Van Lier (1984: 94) writes, "turn taking studies the systematic nature of speaker change in different settings". In doing so, Van Lier adds, it addresses the basic problem of discourse analysis _ the question of how one utterance follows another in a rational, rule governed manner. Van Lier further adds, the matter of who speaks and when is not random; it is governed by regularities of some kind, whether we call them rules, regulations, procedures or conventions. These non-randomness (or let us call them procedures) may be determined in advance in the form of strict rules (e.g. debates) or they evolve as norms in the interaction itself .In relation to this Van Lier (1988;96) identifies three major issues that such procedures basically address :

1. the proper size or length of a turn;
2. the identification of the end of a turn; and
3. the sequence of turns or who comes next.

In any form of interaction such issues exist and the interlocutors should abide this progress for proper exchange of meaning or for communication to occur. Although there is a simple set of ordered rules equally available to all participants, turn taking systems, as Fairclough (1992:152) and Short (1996:213), cited in Taddese (1997) indicate, are not always organized around equal rights and obligations for all participants. This is because turn taking is highly affected by power. There is a difference in distribution of rights and obligations between powerful and non-powerful interlocutors. All other things being equal, we observe the following differences in turn distribution between powerful (P) and non-powerful (NP) interactants; (a) P may select NP to speak, but not vice versa; (b) P may self-select, but NP may not do; (c) P may take the longer turn, but not NP; (d) P may initiate exchange, but not NP; (e) P may have the most turns and so on. In many institutional type of discourse where there are no equal rights and obligations we see an asymmetrical distribution of rights (e.g., to self-select, or to interrupt, or to control the floor for a long time) and obligations (e.g., to speak if chosen to do so).

One of the problems in the study of turn taking is that there is no clear-cut definition for the concept 'turn'. Many discourse and conversation analysts have tried hard and found extremely difficult, if not impossible, to give a precise definition to the concept 'turn'. Hence the problem we encounter when exploring the nature of turn taking in informal conversations or institutional types of discourse (e.g. classroom), as Nunan (1985), in Taddese (1997) points out, is to decide what a turn is and to identify when one turn has ended and another has begun.

Van Lier (1988:100) says that while an interaction is going on it may not be difficult to identify a turn as we can simply point out at the person currently holding the floor and speaking. Furthermore, he adds, we might tend to say that a turn occurs whenever one person speaks, for as long as he or she speaks, and until another person speaks. But

the problem here is that in the course of the interaction some one else may jump in and hence turns may overlap as a consequence of which we may have problems in deciding whether to accept the later as a new and separate turn or not.

Not only that, we may encounter false starts, restarts, half-finished or cut-off turns, and so on in which the borderlines are likely to be blurred and make it difficult to separate and demonstrate the turns (Nunan, 1985; Van Lier, 1988). Such problems can be easily observed predominantly in natural or informal conversations where turns are not pre-allocated; they are locally managed.

Defining a turn in a more specific and precise way is very difficult since a turn cannot be understood as a static unit. In relation to this, Goodwin (1977), as cited in Van Lier (1988:102-103) writes the following:

A definition of the turn as a static unit with fixed boundaries does not accurately describe its structure. Rather, the turn has to be conceptualized as a time bound process.... It...does not seem possible to first define the turn and then work out how it is to be exchanged. Rather, intrinsic structural elements of the unit being exchanged, its boundaries, seem implicated in the process of exchange itself.

According to the above view, the turn should be understood and conceptualized as a time-bound process. It is the time that matters and determines the structure of the turn. In an attempt to define the turn, the question 'what is a turn?' may not be answered. What can be answered rather is 'when is a turn' since this takes us to description of what a turn will 'turn out to be' (Van Lier, 1988).

For the purpose of this study, a turn is defined as a short utterance or an extended utterance by one person as long as that person speaks and before another one comes in and starts speaking. When put in a continuum, it starts from a single word at the left extreme and goes to a stretch of talk at the right extreme. It should be remembered that listening responses or back-channels are not regarded as turns; they are rather

considered as lubricators, to use Orestorm's (1983) term (as cited in Van Lier, 1988:116).

2.4.2. Classification of Turns

Classification, as Van Lier (1988:107) writes, is an "exercise in the clarification of concepts". Its significance depends on how useful it is for any subsequent work.

The difficulty of giving a clear-cut definition to turn in the study of turn taking has a consequent result upon categorizing or classifying turn taking. And there are problems in categorizing or classifying turn taking in the second language classroom. One basic problem is the difficulty to get readymade classification model that matches ones purpose of study. The researcher used Van Lier's (1988) modified classification model so that the model fits the purpose of the study. The detailed discussion is found in chapter three of this study.

2.4.3. Studies Made on Classroom Participation in Ethiopian Context

Some studies have been conducted in the Ethiopian context on issues such as classroom interaction, participation, explanation, turn taking patterns, and gender differences in participation and assertiveness groups.

Abdulkadir Ali (1983) carried out a study to find out the kind and frequency of verbal and non-verbal behaviours that transpire when teachers and students in four selected 12th Grade English classes interact. Two of the questions he investigated were how much of all events in the class comprised teacher's talk and how much students' talk. The findings showed that three out of the four teachers did 57% to 84% of the talk in the class and the remaining teacher did 57% of the talk. And the other finding was that in the three classes students did 12% to 18% of the talk and in

the fourth one 35%. It was observed that although students' participation in class discussion was minimal, the teachers did a great deal of prompting.

Meselech Habte (1991) undertook a study to describe the methods senior secondary school English language teachers used. Her findings showed that the lessons were dominated by teacher talk and grammar explanations with very little student involvement.

Woldu Michael (1996) in his attempt to describe the nature of explanations given by grade ten English language teachers investigated the amount of class time spent on giving explanations. His finding was that the six sample teachers on average spent 40% of the class time on giving explanations. He also found out that out of the explanations given teacher initiated explanations constituted a significant proportion.

Fikirte H/Mariam (1996) also tried to find out the extent to which social and pedagogic factors influence the participation behaviours of (i) AAU Freshman students in general; and (ii) relatively 'high', 'average', and 'low' classroom participators in particular. Her study showed that both social and pedagogic factors have positive influences on the participation behaviours of the majority of the students. However, the positive influences of pedagogic factors were found to be greater than the positive influences of social factors. The study also revealed that there was no significant difference between the influences of social and pedagogic factors for the 'high' and 'average' participants. However, pedagogic factors were found to have greater influence on the participation behaviour of 'low' participants.

Amanuel Gebru (1996) in his study investigated gender differences in verbal involvement in Freshman English classroom group discussion. His subjects were students who scored A in ESLCE in English. The subjects were divided into

majority-female, majority-male, and half male-half female groups. Interactional turns which were used to measure participation were divided into long and short turns. These were counted and the means for the females and males in majority-male, majority-female, half male-half female groups computed and compared. T-test results showed that gender did not produce any significant differences in verbal participation in all the groups in the study. The study also looked into assertiveness differences between males and females. Correlations were performed to determine any relationships between assertiveness and verbal involvement, but no significant correlations were found either for males or females.

Taddese Habte (1997) in his attempt to describe the nature of turn taking found out that the great majority of the turns the students took were in response to specific solicits, i.e., by allocation. The study showed that students did not self-select frequently and were dependent on the teacher's and group leaders' allocations for opportunities to talk. The study also revealed that even if the students were characterised as taking less speaking turns on their own initiative and as being more dependent on teacher-allocated turns, the class was to some extent interactive. The study indicated that the turn taking patterns showed students were using the target language to communicate their ideas. The study also showed that most of the students were taking long turns.

majority-female, majority-male, and half male-half female groups. Interactional turns which were used to measure participation were divided into long and short turns. These were counted and the means for the females and males in majority-male, majority-female, half male-half female groups computed and compared. T-test results showed that gender did not produce any significant differences in verbal participation in all the groups in the study. The study also looked into assertiveness differences between males and females. Correlations were performed to determine any relationships between assertiveness and verbal involvement, but no significant correlations were found either for males or females.

Taddese Habte (1997) in his attempt to describe the nature of turn taking found out that the great majority of the turns the students took were in response to specific solicits, i.e., by allocation. The study showed that students did not self-select frequently and were dependent on the teacher's and group leaders' allocations for opportunities to talk. The study also revealed that even if the students were characterised as taking less speaking turns on their own initiative and as being more dependent on teacher-allocated turns, the class was to some extent interactive. The study indicated that the turn taking patterns showed students were using the target language to communicate their ideas. The study also showed that most of the students were taking long turns.

CHAPTER THREE

THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

3.1 Introduction

It has been stated that the main objective of the study is to investigate the patterns of participation of female students in single-sex groups and mixed-sex groups. Under this general objective, the specific objectives of the study are to:

- ❖ examine the participation of female students in single-sex groups;
- ❖ examine the participation of female students in mixed-sex groups;
- ❖ find out in which group compositions female students participate better; and
- ❖ investigate causes of differential patterns of participation of female students in the given group compositions, if any.

3.2. Subjects of the Study

The subjects were second year first semester 10+3 Diploma Program Language Stream students taking English in Use III (Eng 211) at Adama Teachers College. They were 36 (27 female and 9 male) students from different zones of Oromia Regional State. Language stream students were purposively selected under the assumption that their English Language competence is better than that of other students and does not hinder their participation much in their group activities. Second year students of the given stream were purposively selected because a colleague who was willing to cooperate by arranging make-up class was offering the course to the mentioned year students. Out of the five sections of the given stream students, those whose four semester cumulative grade point average (CGPA) in English courses was 2.00–2.50 were purposively selected; and from them 27 female

students, five from each of three sections and six from each of the remaining two sections, and 9 male students, two from each of four sections and one from the remaining fifth section, were randomly selected. The students were made to form groups of six members, and three single-sex groups and three mixed-sex groups were formed. The students learned for three double periods in the given group composition. The researcher observed the class for the first double period. In the last two double on-off periods the participation of female students in both single-sex groups and mixed -sex groups was examined.

3.3. Instruments of Data Collection

Since the study concentrates on student-student interaction in their group discussions, turn taking of the students in their group discussions was described to find out the pattern of participation of female students in both single-sex groups and mixed-sex groups, and hence is descriptive. To this end, the data-gathering instruments were video recording the group discussions and interviewing some of the female students and the male students in the classroom.

A video camera with a built-in sound mechanism that needed no additional light than the day light was used to record the discussions. The video recording was preferred to the audio recording for easy identification of each participant (i.e., students) as she/he takes the turns and for detecting how they get and give turns and how often and for how long they use their opportunity for discussion. The interview helped the researcher to get information as to why the female students' verbal behaviors in single-sex groups and mixed-sex groups vary.

Although the researcher is aware of the fact that the non-verbal behaviors accompany the verbal behaviors and that they are very important aspects of

communication, the researcher has limited his study to verbal acts to avoid complications.

The students were divided into six groups (three mixed-sex groups and three single-sex groups) and the recording was made while they were discussing in their groups. The recording was made two times (i.e., once in each double period). For the observation period, the students were fake-filmed to develop familiarity with the recording. Since the course has double period which lasts 1 hour and 40 minutes, on the average one group was videotaped for 15 minutes in each of the double periods. In general, the video recording was made for 3:00 hours.

At the end of the last double period, five female students and five male students were randomly selected for the interview. The female students were interviewed at a time and the male students were interviewed at another time. Although he is aware of the fact that female students may not feel at ease when interviewed by a male teacher, the researcher himself made the interviewing with both groups, since there was no female English teacher to help him interviewing the female students.

3.4. Model for the Analysis of Recorded Data

In order to achieve the objective of the study, the video-recorded data was transcribed verbatim with a special focus on turns and turn types as turns can help us describe the pattern of classroom participation among students.

The researcher used Van Lier's (1988) modified model to describe the data on turn taking. Van Lier generally classifies turns as primary distinctions into four major categories; namely, *prospective* (the way the turn is linked to the subsequent turn), *retrospective* (the way the turn is linked to the preceding turn), *concurrent* (a turn that is taken during a current turn which is related to that turn in a servicing sense), and *neutral* (a turn which is indeterminate as any of the above three and

which is not implicative of prospective or retrospective relations to its surrounding turns). Van Lier further explains the more specific distinctions of each category. He identifies the following sub-categories under each major classification/ category:

1. Prospective

- A. Allocating: nominate, signal or gaze
- B. Soliciting: verbal (general solicit) or behavioral
- C. Ending: end, give up or give way

2. Retrospective

- A. Allocated: pre-allocated or locally managed
- B. Unallocated: response to solicit, self-select, floor seeking, negative feedback or stolen.
- C. Ok-pass.

3. Concurrent

- A. Listening response.
- B. Intra-turn repair/repair initiation

4. Neutral

- A. Rehearsal
- B. Private

Van Lier's (1988) classification is complex and detailed. It contains concepts that are too detailed and are irrelevant to this study. It also contains the non-verbal categories, which are not considered in this study.

Allwright (1980) and Seliger (1983) focus on prospective and retrospective categories to analyze turn taking, without considering if a turn subsequently allocates a next turn or activity, to which Van Lier objects. They believe that these two categories would enable them to identify the learner's initiative, for example.

whether a particular contribution was initiated by the learner or made in response to a teacher's allocation. This may help to analyze participation in teacher-centered language classes. But it seems clear that these two major categories do not suffice to measure participation of group discussion. Van Lier (1988) suggests that the issues of topic control and management are also important manifestations of active participation in group discussion. We thus have four basic categories in which personal involvement of group interaction is expressed:

1. Retrospective actions (self-selection);
2. Prospective actions (allocation);
3. Topic management; and
4. Activity management.

Van Lier suggests that this is sufficient for a close analysis of active participation based on turn taking. Van Lier (1988:128) says, "it is particularly well suited for the analysis of group work and group relations, and that it is very learner-friendly, as opposed to most other coding systems which are largely teacher-oriented.

Having seen what it is in the interaction that marks a participant's active involvement, a next step is to find a way to score every contribution in terms of the criteria identified. This is possible by preparing a 'schedule' containing columns for the four criteria and rows for the participants and coding the transcripts from the recorded data.

Van Lier (1988: 123-125) suggests a series of questions intended to permit a detailed coding for active participation, based on a micro-analysis of recorded and transcribed data. Particularly important questions, from the point of view of initiative, are asterisked, and the researcher focuses on these areas.

A. Topic work.

1. Is the turn or turn-part on-stream (continuing)?
2. Is the turn or turn-part on-stream discourse (i.e. private, involuntary, the result of schism)?
- *3. Is the turn or turn-part off-stream (discontinuing, divergent, marked-for-change); does it introduce something new? Or does it deny/dispute a proposition or request for a prior turn?

B. Self-selection

- *1. Does selection to speak originate from this speaker?
2. Does selection to speak originate from a previous speaker, or from a pre-allocation rule?
3. Indeterminate.

C. Allocation

- *1. a) is part of the work of this turn or turn-part that it selects from among those present one specific next speaker?
b) Does it specify next activity or content?
c) Does it continue the work mentioned under a) and/or b) done by the speaker in a previous turn?
2. Does the turn or turn-part not specifically select next speaker or specify next activity/content?
3. Indeterminate.

D. Sequence, Activity

1. Is the turn or turn-part part of a sequence of turns (but excluding listening responses and neutral turns)? If yes, is it:
*a) first part (whether or not other parts in fact follow);

- b) subsequent part (continuing part, or repetition of first part);
 - *c) closing part (if the sequence is more than two turns long)?
- *2. Is the turn or turn-part independent of sequence, but not a listening response, OK-pass, or neutral turn?

Van Lier further suggests that affirmative responses to the asterisked questions indicate some degree of initiative on part of the speaker. Any turn or turn-part (or turn-constructive unit, or turn consisting of several such units) may thus be given one or more stars. Van Lier believes the important and significant advantage of this procedure is that only clear cases need to be coded so that ambiguities and unclear turns in the transcript can be ignored.

The procedure of starring turns in the way suggested allows for quantitative work of two kinds; a) a crude quantification of total stars per participant, which can be shown as a percentage of total stars for a stretch of classroom discourse, or divided for each participant by the number of his/her turns that have one or more stars, to give a rough level of participation. (See Table 1 for further explanation). This quantification provides a measure of the amount of active participation of learners during certain lessons or parts of lessons. However, as Van Lier (1988:128) writes, the list of criteria allows us to go "beyond this and identify also various kinds of participation". A more interesting and revealing procedure is the tabulation of starred turns per question area A- B-C-D. (See Table 2 for further explanation). This shows if there is a pattern for certain participants to employ initiative in the areas of topic work, self-selection, allocation and sequencing of discourse.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Results

4.1.1. Distribution of Turns among Participants in Mixed-sex Groups

One of the specific objectives of this study was to examine the participation of female students in mixed-sex groups in relation to the participation of their male counter parts. Tables 1-6 present the relative participation of female and male students in mixed-sex groups in Lesson One and Lesson Two.

Before the tabular presentation of the data, the explanations of columns of the tables are given as follows:

A: total turns taken by each participant;

B: percentage of the total number of turns in the extract;

C to G: number of turns allocated no stars, one, two, three, or four stars respectively;

H: total number of turns starred;

I: total number of stars obtained;

J: participation level (PL): I divided by H, or star-average of starred turns;

K: participation index (PI): the square of J multiplied by B, which takes into account star-average, and also share of total turn taking;

L: rank order, including the teacher

M: rank order, excluding the teacher

Table 1. Distribution of Turns among Participants in Mixed-Sex Group of Group 1

	Total Turns	TT%	β	*	*	*	*	Total Starred Turns	Total Stars	Part. Level (PL)	Part. Index (PI)	PI Rank Order	PI Rank Order (PI)
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
T	2	5.88	-	-	-	-	2	2	8	4	94.08	5	-
*M1	9	26.47	-	1	3	3	2	11	24	2.18	125.90	1	1
*M2	6	17.64	-	1	4	-	1	6	13	2.16	82.30	4	4
*M3	7	20.58	-	2	2	2	1	7	16	2.28	107.25	2	2
F1	4	11.76	2	-	1	-	1	2	6	3.00	105.84	3	3
F2	3	8.82	2	-	-	1	-	1	3	3.00	71.01	6	5
F3	2	5.88	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LL	1	2.94	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
XL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	34	100	6	4	11	6	5	29	2.69	-	-	-	-

As can be observed from Table 1, *M1, M2, *M3, F1 and F2 got Participation Index (PI) of 125.90, 82.30, 107.25, 105.84 and 71.01 respectively (see column K) and accordingly stood first, fourth, second, third, and fifth respectively when put in rank order (see Column C). The male participants stand 1-3 whereas the female participants are on the other extreme of the rank order. Besides, although the teacher asked the group to choose volunteer group leaders now and then (four times in the course of the group discussion), purely male participants got all the four chances. M1, M2, and M3 are starred to show that they were group leaders in the group discussion. F3 is out of rank because she got no starred turn. This means that she did not take any initiative to take part in the group discussion. In general, the table indicates that the amount of verbal participation of female participants is by far less than the amount of verbal participation of male participants.

The quantification outlined in Table 1 provides a measure of the amount of participation of the participants in Lesson One and Lesson Two. This does not show if there is a pattern for certain participants to employ initiative in the areas of topic work, self-selection, allocation, and sequencing of discourse. This can be indicated by the tabulation of starred turns of participants. The tabulation of starred turns for Group 1 is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Distribution of Starred Turns among Participants in Mixed-sex Group of Group 1.

	Turns	TT%	Topic Work (A)	Self-selection (B)	Allocation (C)	Sequence (D)	Total
T	2	5.55	2	2	2	2	8
*M1	11	30.55	5	4	6	8	23
*M2	11	30.55	7	7	8	9	31
*M3	9	25.00	2	6	6	8	22
F1	2	5.55	1	1	1	1	4
F2	1	2.77	1	-	1	1	3
F3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	36	100	18	20	24	29	91

It can be seen from Table 2 that the female participants in the mixed-sex group discussion took less initiative in the group interaction than their male counterparts. *M2 took more initiative in the interaction than any other participants in the group. He did more topic work (7), voluntarily took more turns (8), did more allocation of speaker and activity by controlling the 'agenda'(7), and started more sequences (9) than other participants in the group. *M1 and *M3 were next performers to *M2. *M1 did more topic work (5) than *M3 (2) whereas *M3 did more self-selection (6)

The quantification outlined in Table 1 provides a measure of the amount of participation of the participants in Lesson One and Lesson Two. This does not show if there is a pattern for certain participants to employ initiative in the areas of topic work, self-selection, allocation, and sequencing of discourse. This can be indicated by the tabulation of starred turns of participants. The tabulation of starred turns for Group 1 is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Distribution of Starred Turns among Participants in Mixed-sex Group of Group 1.

	Turns	TT%	Topic Work (A)	Self-selection (B)	Allocation (C)	Sequence (D)	Total
T	2	5.55	2	2	2	2	8
*M1	11	30.55	5	4	6	8	23
*M2	11	30.55	7	7	8	9	31
*M3	9	25.00	2	6	6	8	22
F1	2	5.55	1	1	1	1	4
F2	1	2.77	1	-	1	1	3
F3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	36	100	18	20	24	29	91

It can be seen from Table 2 that the female participants in the mixed-sex group discussion took less initiative in the group interaction than their male counterparts. *M2 took more initiative in the interaction than any other participants in the group. He did more topic work (7), voluntarily took more turns (8), did more allocation of speaker and activity by controlling the 'agenda'(7), and started more sequences (9) than other participants in the group. *M1 and *M3 were next performers to *M2. *M1 did more topic work (5) than *M3 (2) whereas *M3 did more self-selection (6)

than *M1 (4). Except these differences, both did equal speaker allocation (6) and equal sequencing of discourse (8).

When it comes to the female participants, F1 and F2 did only 1 topic work, 1 allocation, and 1 sequencing of discourse each. F1 did only 1 self-selection whereas F2 did none. F3 got no starred turns. It means that she did not propose any new ideas, did not deny or object to what was proposed by others (no topic work), did not voluntarily originate any speaking (no self-selection), did not verbally select others to speak and assign activity (no allocation), and did not start any sequencing of discourse (no sequence).

In sum, Table 2 indicates that female participants in the mixed-sex group discussion took by far less initiative in the areas of topic work, self-selection, allocation, and sequencing of discourse.

Table 3. Distribution of Turns among Participants in Mixed-Sex Group of Group 3

	Total Turns	TT%	g	*	*	*	*	Total Starred Turns	Total Stars	Part. Level (PL)	Part. Index (PI)	PI Rank Order	PI Rank Order (PI)
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
T	1	3.44	-	-	-	-	1	1	4	4	55.04	4	-
*M1	6	20.68	1	-	1	3	1	5	15	3	186.12	1	1
M2	4	13.79	-	2	1	1	-	4	5	2.5	86.18	3	3
*M3	9	31.03	-	-	1	4	-	5	16	2.28	161.30	2	2
F1	2	6.89	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
F2	2	6.89	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	6.89	5	4
F3	2	6.89	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LL	1	3.44	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
XL	2	6.89	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	29	100	8	3	3	8	2	16	37	2.31	-	-	-

It is shown in Table 3 that *M1, M2, *M3, and F2 got PI of 186.12, 86.18, 161.30, and 6.89 respectively and accordingly stood first, third, second and fourth respectively. *M1 and *M3 played the role of group leaders and made by far better contribution than other participants made. No female participants in the group, except F2, got a starred turn. This placed F1 and F3 out of the rank order. F2 got only 1 starred turn.

The table in general shows that the amount of verbal participation of female students in the given mixed-sex group discussion is by far less than the amount of verbal participation of their male counter parts in the group.

Table 4. Distribution of starred turns among participants in mixed-sex group of Group 3.

	Turns	TT%	Topic Work (A)	Self-selection (B)	Allocation (C)	Sequence (D)	Total
T	1	5.26	1	1	1	4	7
*M1	5	26.31	2	3	5	19	29
M2	4	21.05	1	3	4	11	19
*M3	9	47.36	1	7	9	20	37
F1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
F2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
F3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	19	100	5	14	19	54	92

Table 4 indicates that *M3 did more self-selection (7), more allocation of speaker and activity (9) and more sequencing of discourse (20) than other participants in the group. Nevertheless, he did less topic work (1) than the next performer *M1. *M1 did 2 topic work, 3 self-selection, 5 allocations and 19 sequencing of discourse. The self-selection M2 did (3) is equal to the self-selection *M1 did. Except this, M2 did less allocation of speaker and activity (4) and less sequencing of discourse (11) than other male participants did.

When it comes to the initiative the female participants took in the given mixed-sex group discussion, the table indicates that none of them did any contribution in the four question areas. They did no topic work, no self-selection, no allocation and no sequencing of discourse. The overall direction of the group interaction was controlled by their male counter parts in the group.

Table 5. Distribution of Turns among Participants in Mixed-Sex Group of Group 5

	Total Turns	TT%				*	*	Total Starred Turns	Total Stars	Part. Level (PL)	Part. Index (PI)	PI Rank Order	PI Rank Order (PI)
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
T	2	5.12	-	-	-	-	2	2	8	4	81.92	4	-
*M1	11	28.20	-	-	3	3	1	7	19	2.71	207.10	2	2
*M2	7	17.94	-	-	1	4	1	6	18	3	161.46	3	3
*M3	6	15.38	-	-	1	3	1	4	15	3.75	215.85	1	1
F1	3	7.69	1	-	1	-	-	1	2	2	30.76	6	5
F2	3	7.69	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	1	7.69	7	6
F3	3	7.69	1	-	-	-	-	1	3	3	69.	5	4
LL	2	5.12	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
XL	2	5.12	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	39	100	5	1	6	11	5	22	66	3.00	-	-	-

In Table 5, it is seen that *M1, *M2, *M3, F1, F2 and F3 got PI of 207.10, 161.46, 215.85, 30.76, 7.69 and 69.21 respectively and stood second, third, first, fifth, and sixth in the rank order respectively. The male participants stood 1-3 with very big differences of PI from the female participants. The female participants are on the other extreme of the rank order. M1 and M3 took the responsibility of group leaders whereas none of the female participants shouldered the responsibility despite the equal opportunity given to all of the group members to be chosen as group leaders.

Table 6. Distribution of starred turns among participants in mixed-sex group of Group 5.

	Turns	TT%	Topic Work (A)	Self-selection (B)	Allocation (C)	Sequence (D)	Total
21T	2	5.5	2	2	2	2	8
*M1	11	30.00	4	9	2	11	26
*M2	7	19.44	3	5	3	7	18
*M3	6	16.66	3	4	2	7	16
F1	4	11.11	-	1	-	1	2
F2	3	8.33	-	-	-	1	1
F3	3	8.33	1	1	-	1	3
Total	36	100	13	22	9	30	74

Table 6 shows that *M1 did more topic work (4), voluntarily took more turns (9) and started more sequences (11) than other participants did. However, the allocation of speaker and activity he did (2) was less than the ones *M2 did (3). Both *M2 and *M3 did equal topic work (3) and equal sequencing of discourse. However, *M2 did 5 self-selection, and 3 allocation whereas *M3 did 4 self-selection, and 2 allocation.

When it comes to the initiative female participants took in the group discussion, none of the three (F1, F2 and F3) did any allocation of speaker and activity, two of them (F1, and F2) did no topic work, and one of them (F2) did no self-selection. All of them (F1, F2 and F3) started only one sequence each. Both F1 and F3 did only one self-selection each. Only F3 from the female participants did topic work, which was only 1.

It is indicated in the table that the initiative the female participants took in the four question areas is very less when compared to the initiative their male counter parts took in the mixed-sex group discussion.

4.1.2. Distribution of Turns among Female Participants in Single-sex Groups

One other specific objective of the study was to examine the participation of female students in single-sex groups. This is presented in Tables 7-12.

Table 7. Distribution of Turns among Female Participants in Single-Sex Group of Group 2

	Total Turns	TT%				*	*	Total Starred Turns	Total Stars	Part. Level (PL)	Part. Index (PI)	PI Rank Order	PI Rank Order (PI)
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
T	3	7.89	-	-	-	-	3	3	12	4	126.24	2	-
F1	5	13.15	-	2	2	2	-	6	12	2	52.60	4	3
*F2	10	26.31	-	4	2	2	2	10	22	2.2	127.34	1	1
F3	3	7.89	-	-	2	1	-	3	7	2.33	42.83	6	4
*F4	7	18.42	1	2	2	2	-	6	12	2	73.68	3	2
F6	3	7.89	-	-	1	1	-	2	5	2.5	39.94	7	5
XL	2	5.26	-	-	1	-	1	2	6	3	47.34	5	-
LL	3	7.89	1	1	1	-	-	2	3	1.5	17.75	8	-
Total	38	100	2	2	11	8	6	34	79	2.32	-	-	-

It can be observed from Table 7 that F1, F2, F3, F4, and F6 got PI of 52.60, 127.34, 42.83, 73.68 and 39.94 respectively and accordingly stood third, first, fourth, second

and fifth respectively. F5 was absent from Lesson Two and her contribution is incomplete and is not taken into account.

*F2 and *F4, who stood first and second in the rank order, shouldered the responsibility of group leader. *F2, who was given two chances to be selected as group leader is by far ahead in the amount of participation.

Table 8. Distribution of Starred Turns among Female Participants in Mixed-sex Group of Group 2.

	Turns	TT%	Topic Work (A)	Self-selection (B)	Allocation (C)	Sequence (D)	Total
T	3	10.34	3	3	3	3	12
F1	5	17.24	3	3	-	5	11
*F2	10	34.48	3	6	4	10	23
F3	3	10.34	1	3	-	3	7
*F4	6	20.68	2	5	1	7	15
F6	2	6.89	-	-	-	1	1
Total	29	100	12	20	8	29	69

Table 8 indicates that *F2 did better in voluntarily taking turns (6), allocating speakers and activities (4), and sequencing of discourse (10) than other participants in the group, except that she did equal topic work to the one F1 did(3). F1 did 3 topic work, 3 self-selection and 5 sequencing of discourse, but did not allocate speaker and activity. *F4, the next group leader to *F2, did 2 topic work, 5 self-selection, 1 allocation, and 7 sequencing of discourse. The table shows that all participants except F6 did topic work, and self-selection. F6 did not allocate speakers and activities and so did F1 and F3.

The table indicates that unlike in the mixed-sex group, the female participants in their same-sex group got many starred turns, taking initiative in the four question areas of A–D. *F2 and *F4 shouldered the responsibility of group leader controlling the overall direction of the group interaction.

Table 9. Distribution of Turns among Female Participants in Single-Sex Group of Group 4

	Total Turns	TT%				*	*	Total Starred Turns	Total Stars	Part. Level (PL)	Part. Index (PI)	PI Rank Order	PI Rank Order (PI)
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
*F1	5	16.66	-	2	1	2	-	5	10	2	66.64	3	3
*F3	10	33.33	-	1	3	5	1	10	26	-2.6	225.310	1	1
F4	3	10.00	-	-	-	3	-	3	9	3	90.00	2	2
F5	6	20.00	1	-	4	-	-	5	8	1.6	51.20	5	5
F6	2	6.66	-	-	-	1	-	1	3	3	59.94	4	4
LL	1	3.33	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
XL	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	30	100	3	3	10	12	1	27	63	2.33	-	-	-

From Table 9, we see that F1, F3, F4, F5, and F6 got PI of 66.64, 225.310, 90.00, 51.20, and 59.40 respectively and stood third, first, second, fifth and fourth respectively. *F3 showed more active involvement in the group discussion than other participants in the group. She stood first with high score of PI, scoring more than double of F4, who stood second. *F1 and *F3 shouldered the responsibility of group leader. *F3 got two chances of leadership of the group. F2 was absent from Lesson Two, and her contribution is not taken into account, as it is incomplete.

The table indicates that unlike in the mixed-sex group, the female participants in their same-sex group got many starred turns, taking initiative in the four question areas of A–D. *F2 and *F4 shouldered the responsibility of group leader controlling the overall direction of the group interaction.

Table 9. Distribution of Turns among Female Participants in Single-Sex Group of Group 4

	Total Turns	TT%	B	* *	* *	* *	* *	Total Starred Turns	Total Stars	Part. Level (PL)	Part. Index (PI)	PI Rank Order	PI Rank Order (PI)
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
*F1	5	16.66	-	2	1	2	-	5	10	2	66.64	3	3
*F3	10	33.33	-	1	3	5	1	10	26	2.6	225.310	1	1
F4	3	10.00	-	-	-	3	-	3	9	3	90.00	2	2
F5	6	20.00	1	-	4	-	-	5	8	1.6	51.20	5	5
F6	2	6.66	-	-	-	1	-	1	3	3	59.94	4	4
LL	1	3.33	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
XL	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	30	100	3	3	10	12	1	27	63	2.33	-	-	-

From Table 9, we see that F1, F3, F4, F5, and F6 got PI of 66.64, 225.310, 90.00, 51.20, and 59.40 respectively and stood third, first, second, fifth and fourth respectively. *F3 showed more active involvement in the group discussion than other participants in the group. She stood first with high score of PI, scoring more than double of F4, who stood second. *F1 and *F3 shouldered the responsibility of group leader. *F3 got two chances of leadership of the group. F2 was absent from Lesson Two, and her contribution is not taken into account, as it is incomplete.

Table 10. Distribution of starred turns among female participants in mixed-sex group of Group 4.

	Turns	TT%	Topic Work (A)	Self-selection (B)	Allocation (C)	Sequence (D)	Total
*F1	5	22.72	2	3	-	5	10
*F3	10	45.45	1	8	4	10	23
F4	3	13.63	3	3	-	3	9
F5	3	13.63	1	1	1	3	6
F6	1	4.54	-	-	-	1	1
Total	22	100	7	15	5	22	49

Table 10 indicates that *F3 did better in voluntarily taking turns (8), allocating speakers and activity (4), and sequencing of discourse (10), though she did less topic work(1) than F4(3). F4 did 3 topic work, 3 self-selection, and 5 sequencing of discourse, but did not do any allocation of speaker and activity. *F1 did 2 topic work, 3 self-selection, and 5 sequencing of discourse, but did not do any allocation of speaker and activity though she was a group leader. F5 did 1 topic work, 1 self-selection, 1 allocation and 3 sequencing of discourse. F6 started 1 sequence, but did none of the remaining question areas (topic work, self-selection, and allocation).

From the table, it can be seen that the female participants in their same-sex group took fair initiative in the four question areas of A–D, controlling the direction of the group interaction.

Table 11. Distribution of Turns among Female Participants in Single-Sex Group of Group 6

	Total Turns	TT%	B	*	*	*	*	Total Starred Turns	Total Stars	Part. Level (PL)	Part. Index (PI)	PI Rank Order	PI Rank Order (PI)
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
T	1	4	-	-	-	-	1	1	4	4	64.00	4	-
F1	4	16	-	1	2	1	-	4	8	2	64.00	4	4
*F2	5	20.00	-	-	5	1	-	6	13	2.16	93.31	3	3
*F3	7	28.00	1	2	2	2	-	6	12	2	112	2	2
F4	2	8.00	1	-	-	-	1	4	4	4	128	1	1
F5	4	16.00	-	1	2	1	-	4	8	2	64	4	4
LL	2	8.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	25	100	2	4	11	5	2	22	49	2.22	-	-	-

Table 11 shows that F1, *F2,*F3, F4, and F5 got 64.00, 93.31, 112.00, 128.00 and 64.00 respectively and stood fourth, third, second, first, and fourth respectively. All of them got starred turns of various numbers (from 1-6). Both F2 and F3 played the role of group leaders. F6 was absent from Lesson Two; her contribution was incomplete and thus was not considered.

Table 12. Distribution of starred turns among Female participants in mixed-sex group of Group 6.

	Turns	TT%	Topic Work (A)	Self-selection (B)	Allocation (C)	Sequence (D)	Total
T	1	4.34	1	1	1	1	4
F1	4	17.39	2	2	-	4	8
*F2	6	26.08	3	6	-	6	15
*F3	6	26.08	2	4	-	6	12
F4	1	4.34	1	1	-	1	4
F5	4	17.39	1	3	1	3	7
Total	23	100	10	17	2	21	50

It is possible to see from Table 12 that *F2, one of the group leaders, did better in topic work, and self-selection than other participants in the group, but the sequencing of discourse she did is equal to the one *F3 did (3). The table indicates that all the participants in the group did topic work and sequencing of discourse. But none of them except F5 allocated speaker and activity, which seems to have been compensated by self-selection, as all of them self-selected to take turns to speak (see column B).

The table also indicates that, unlike in the mixed-sex group discussions the female participants in their same-sex group discussion did reasonably fair topic work, self-selection, and allocation.

4.2. Discussion

The research points to gender disparity in classroom participation. The research findings support the findings of Lockhead (1970), Gass and Varonis (1986), Pica et al (1989), and Shehadeh (1994). However, the present findings contradict the findings of Amanuel (1996). This could be attributed to that Amanuel's subjects were the most privileged and the best students whereas the subjects of this study were less privileged and low achievers. The methodology used by Amanuel is again different from the methodology used in this study. In Amanuel's study turns were divided into short and long whereas in this study the distinction between short and long turns was not made as a turn can go from a single word to a stretch of talk. Also in Amanuel's study pattern for certain participants to employ initiative in the areas of topic work, self-selection, allocation, and sequencing of discourse, which are important to mark a participant's active involvement in group interaction, was not considered whereas it is considered in this study.

The results of the transcribed data indicate that the amount of participation of female students in mixed sex groups was less than the amount of participation of their male counter parts. The female participants took the other extreme of the rank order whereas the male participants stood on the top subsequently (1-3) in each mixed-sex group. The results also indicate that in mixed-sex groups female participants took less initiative than their male counter parts in areas of topic work, self-selection, allocation and sequence. Female participants did not take the responsibility of group leader in mixed-sex groups though each group was given four chances to choose volunteer group leader and change roles. All the four chances went to the male participants in each mixed-sex group and the male participants controlled the overall direction of interaction among the mixed-sex groups.

The interview results support the aforementioned findings. 100% of the male respondents and 80% of the female respondents said they believe that girls are less active participants in group discussions than boys are. As a result 80% of the male respondents said, they prefer working in mixed-sex groups to single-sex groups because they want to 'assist' or encourage the female students (their 'sisters', to quote their words). Twenty per cent of the male respondents said they prefer working in mixed-sex groups to single-sex groups because the female students do not contribute much in group discussions. Eighty per cent of the female respondents on their part said they prefer working in mixed-sex groups to single-sex groups because they had trust in the answers the male participants give or the answers they themselves give after discussing the issue with the male participants and they feel that they would academically benefit from such groups. Twenty per cent of the female respondents said they prefer working in the girls-only group because boys dominate them in group discussions.

The results, therefore, validate the presence of male dominance in mixed-sex group discussions. The male participants in such groupings took greater advantage to use discussion in a way that allowed them to retain the turn, enjoy a greater amount of talk, and thus produce a greater amount of comprehensible output than the female.

On the other hand, the findings also revealed that single-sex group discussion offered female participants comparatively greater opportunities to produce comprehensible output than mixed-sex group discussion. The results of the recorded transcripts show that female participants in single-sex groups took more initiative in areas of topic work, self-selection, allocation and sequence than they did in mixed-sex groups. The female participants shouldered the responsibility of group leader in their same-sex groups whereas they did not do any in mixed-sex groups. Therefore, single-sex group interaction provided better contexts for females to produce

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Summary

The study aimed at finding if there are gender differences in verbal participation in mixed-sex group discussions. To this end, mixed-sex groups of half females-half males and single-sex groups of females were formed and their verbal participation in group discussions was video-taped and transcribed verbatim. Van Lier's (1988) modified model was used to describe student-student interaction in group discussions in terms of interactional turns.

Results showed that the amount of verbal participation of female students in mixed-sex groups was by far less than the amount of participation of their male counterparts. The female students in all mixed-sex groups took the other extreme of the rank order whereas their male counterparts took the top position. Female students in the mixed-sex groups took less initiative in the four question areas of topic work, self-selection, allocation and sequencing of discourse than their male counterparts. None of the female students in the mixed-sex groups shouldered the responsibility of group leader though each group was given four chances in the course of the group discussion to choose volunteer group leaders. All the chances were given to the male participants and the overall direction of the discourse was controlled by them.

The female students in the single-sex groups, however, shouldered the responsibility of group leader and the discourse was controlled by them. Results also indicate that the amount of verbal participation of female students in the single-sex groups seems to be more than the amount of verbal participation of female students in the mixed-sex groups.

On the other hand, female students shouldered the responsibility of group leader in their same-sex group discussions. They made more active personal involvement in their same-sex group discussions than they did in mixed-sex groups. The amount of participation they made in their same-sex group discussions also seems more than the amount of participation they took in mixed-sex groups.

The turn taking patterns observed show that even if their English was poor, the students were using the target language to communicate their ideas. The findings give us some insights that female students in mixed-sex groups tend to be dependent on their male counter parts in group activities. On the other hand, the findings also give us some insights that female students in their same-sex groups take the risk to shoulder their responsibilities in group activities.

5.3. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are recommended based on the findings:

1. Instructors should aware their students that student-student interaction in classroom promotes language learning as it provides the students with the opportunities to practice the target language among themselves;
2. Female students should be encouraged to take turns and use the target language in mixed-sex group discussions as they do in their same-sex group discussions and;
3. Female students should also be encouraged to take risks in playing the role of group leader to practice controlling the overall direction of the discourse.

Implications for Further Research

The study has considered only gender differences as likely factor affecting classroom participation in group discussions. However, there is an assumption that many variables, other than gender, may be at work in verbal participation in group discussions. Further research may consider the following areas with a more thorough description of subjects:

1. Such factors as quality of background education, student intelligence, cultural background, social and economic classes, and tradition (city vs country):
2. A number of personality characteristics, which may be associated with participation; and
3. Non-verbal participations as they are very important in participation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdulkadir Ali. 1983. "Student-teacher Interaction in English Classes in Four Schools in Addis Ababa. Addis Ababa: AAU (M.A. Thesis.)
- Abebayehu Amero. 1995. "Women's Participation in Educational Administration in Ethiopia". Addis Ababa: A.A.U (M.A. Thesis)
- Allwright, D. and K.M. Bailey. 1991. **Focus on the Language Classroom: An Introduction to the Classroom Research for Language Teachers.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Allwright, R. L. 1984. "The Importance of Interaction in Classroom Language Research in Language Learning." 5(2):156-171
- Allwright, R. L. 1989. "Interaction in the Language Classroom: Social Problems and Pedagogic Possibilities." Paper Presented at Les Etats Generaux des Langues, Paris. **Language Teaching in Today's World.** Vol. 3 of the Proceedings of the International Symposium on Language teaching and Learning.
- Amanuel Gebru. 1996. "Gender Difference in Participation in Group Discussions in Freshman English Classes at Addis Ababa University". Addis Ababa: AAU (MA. Thesis).
- Aston, G. 1996. "Trouble-Shooting in Interaction with learners. The more the merrier?" **Applied Linguistics.** 7(2): 128-143
- Bailey, 1993 "The Current Status of Gender Equity Research in American School. **Educational Psychology.** 28 (4) 321-339.
- Berhanu Bogle 2000. "Verbal Participation in Group Work: A case Study of First Year Students at Addis Ababa University". Addis Ababa: AAU (Ph. D. Thesis)
- Betz, N. and I. Fitzgerald. 1987. **The Career Psychology of Women.** London: Academic pressing.
- Breen, M. 1985. "Contemporary Paradigms in Syllabus". **Language Teaching Teaching.** 20/3:4.

- Brumfit, C.1984. Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching. **TESOL Quarterly**. 17/4:595-608.
- Bukatko, Da and D. Marvin (1992). **Child Development: A Traditional Approach**. Boston: Mifflin Company.
- Choudron, C. 1988. **Second language classroom: Research on Teaching and learning**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Cook, G. 1989. **Discourse**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coulthard, M. 1985. **An Introduction to Discourse Analysis**. (2nd ed.). London: Longman.
- Day, R.(ed). 1984. "Student Participation in the ESL Classroom or Some Imperfections in Practice." **Language Learning**. (3) 69-96
- Ellis, R 1988. **Classroom second Language Development**. New York: prentice Hall International
- Ellis, R. 1992. **Second Language Acquisition and Language Pedagogy**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis,R. 1994. **The Study of Second Language Acquisition**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gass, S. and E. Varonis. 1986. 'Sex Differences in Non-native Speaker Non-native-Speaker Interactions' in R. Day (ed). **Talking to Learn**. (327-52). Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.
- Johnson, D. W. and Johnson, R. T. 1994. **Learning Together and Alone**. London: Allyn and Bacom.
- Krashen, S. 1982. **Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition**. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Krashen, S. 1994. 'The Input Hypothesis and its Rivals' in N.Ellis (ed.). **Implicit and Explicit Learning of Languages**. (pp.45-77). London: Academic Press.

- Littlejohnson, A.P. 1983. Increasing Learner Involvement in Course Management. **TESOL Quarterly** 17/4: 595-608.
- Lockhead, M. and A. Harris. 1984. Cross-sex Collaborative learning in Elementary Classrooms in **American Educational Research Journal**. 21, 275-294.
- Long, M. 1996. 'The Role of the Linguistic Environment in Second Language Acquisition' in W. Ritchie and T.J. Bhatia (eds.). **Handbook of Second Language Acquisition** (pp. 413-68). Orlando: Academic Press.
- Long, M. Porter, P. 1985. "Group Work, Interlanguage Talk and Second Language Acquisition." **TESOL Quarterly**. 19/2:207-228.
- Molamah- Thomas, A. 1987. **Classroom Interaction**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Money, J. 1989. "The conceptual Neutering of Gender and the criminalization of Sex." **Archives of Sexual Behaviour**. 14, 279-290
- Pica, T., L. Holliday, N. Lewis, and Morgenthaler. 1989. "Comprehensible output as an Outcome of Linguistic Demands on the Learner". **Studies in Second Language Acquisition**. 11/1: 63-90.
- Reynolds, M. 1994. **Group Work in Education and Training**. London: Kogan Page.
- Rivers, W (ed) 1987. **Interactive language Teaching**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffcin, D. 1994. **Approaches to Discourse**. Oxford: Backwell.
- Seime Kebede. 1999. An Exploration of the Relationship between Uptake and Classroom Questions: A Case Study. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University (Ph.D Thesis).
- Shehadeh, A. 1994. 'Gender Differences and Second Language Acquisition'. **Research Journal of Aleppo University** (Arts and Humanities Series) 26:73-98.
- Shehadeh, 1999. "Gender Differences and Equal Opportunities in the ESL Classroom." **ELT Journal**. 53/4:256-261

- Short, M. 1996. **Exploiting the Language Poems, Plays and Prose.** (Mimeographed)
- Stern, H. 1983. **Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching.** New York: Oxford University Press
- Sunderland, J (ed) 1994. "Differential Treatment by Gender in EFL class room. Using Expatriants perspectives". In Sunderland, J (ed) **Exploring Gender. Questions and Implications for English Language Education.** Prentice Hall
- Swain, M. 1995. 'Three Functions of Output in Second Language Learning' (eds.). **Principle and Practice in Applied Linguistics: Studies in Honour of H. G. Widdowson** (pp. 125-44). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Taddese Habte. 1997. "The Nature of Turn-Taking Among Freshman Students in an EFL Class in Their Group Discussions at Addis Ababa University." Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University (MA Thesis).
- Tsige Haile. 1989. "Academic Performance of Females in Institutions of Higher Education: The Case of Addis Ababa University". In **Women and Development in Eastern Africa: An Agenda for Research.** (ed) Zeinab El-Barki and Besha, R.M. OSSREA; AAU.
- Van Lier, L. 1988. **The Classroom and the Language Learner.** London: Longman
- Weidu Mikael. 1996. "The Nature of Explanations Given by Grade Ten English Language Teachers". Addis Ababa: AAU. (MA Thesis).
- Wenden, A. 1987. "Incorporating Learner Training in the Classroom." In **A. Wenden and J.**

APPENDICES

I. Discussion Transcripts

A. Discussion Transcripts of Lesson One

Group 1

A B C D

- * * * * 1. T. Okay, you are going to choose two tasks out of the following four.
Let me write them on the blackboard. [After writing the four tasks].
Well, I now want you to get in to groups of six members. Boys
together, and girls together. Harry up, please. Jamal, you come here
and join the girls group; you also do the same. Now choose two tasks
from the given four, one to discuss today and the other to discuss next
period. Discuss in your group to choose the two and you will tell us
why you have chosen the two from the given four. Fifteen minutes.
Quick. Don't forget to choose volunteer group leader.
- * * * * 2 M₁. Okay, let us talk or discuss. Shall we start by choosing group
leader?
- * * * * 3 M₂. Yes, you are group leader. I choose you.
- * * * * 4 M₃. We take, em, we accept. Do you object?[Looking at F2]
- 5 F2. No.
- * * * * 6 M₃. And you? [Looking at F3 and F1]
- 7 F3. No.
- 8 F1. The same.
- * * * * 9 M₁. You say that, okay. Let us talk; which topic shall we select?
- * * * * 10 M₃. Em, which then?
- * * * * 11 M₁. Quickly. time is ...
- * * * * 12 M₂. Em, I'm reading. The second; yes that. Drinking alcohol, chat,

cigarette. yes, bad habit, is it not?

13 F₁. Yes, right.

* * * * 14 M₃. Why? Tell, why? What about first. First.

* * * * 15 M₁. No, second, please second one. That is better, is it not?

16 F₂. Yes, second.

* * * 17 M₁. Okay. second. Reason, reason; because we have to tell reason.

* * 18 M₂. Because that is bad; very bad. They bring health, economy and many many problems

* * 19 *M₁. Yes. they damage health, we finish money, no work and many many problems. Let me write down.

* * 20 M₃. Yes, later you will tell. Yes, write down.

Group 2

A B C D

* * 21 *F₂. People who drink quarrel, become sick, suffer headache, vomit. many problems. Chewing chat is bad also why because you need money for buying you sit, no work.

* * 22 F₁. All are good ideas very, very good.

* * * 23 F₃. Wait. please, you also. She has not finished.

* * * 24 F₆. Yes, she has not.

* * * 25 F₁. Enough, enough

* * * * 26 F₅. Continue, finish

* * 27 *F₂. Smoking bring many many problem. For example. em.... em.

You finish money, concerning health, lung problems, cough, not good smell, all these are bad. Is it not, Kadija?

* 28 F₄. Yes. All are bad habit, you say true.

* * * 29 *F₂. Can we add another? Who can add?

* 30 F₁. Here. look; drinking, chewing chat, smoking, make you out cast. People don't like

* * * 31 *F₂. Yes. that is true. But we have not said? New idea that not said before.

Group 3.

A B C D

- * * * 32 M₁. What about the problem of cancer?
- * 33 M₃. O! Ya. Smoking also brings cancer.
- 34 M₁. Lung cancer.
- * * * 35 *M₃. True. Right you are. Because there are different kind of cancer.
Yes. Good. Do you have some to add?
- * 36 F₂. Em, yes. Bad smell when you breathe. It is difficult to sit in front
of people because of that.
- * * 37 *M₃. Very good. Good idea again. That is why ladies have to
Participate.
- * 38 M₂. Because of gender issue. Haha, is it not?
- 39 F₃. Yes
- * * 40 *M₃. Good many many points or ideas. Do we have time to
continue?
- * * 41 M₁. I think we have no time. Tell us what you have write down.
- * * 42 M₂. Yes, summary. Key key points because we are going to
Report; right?
- 43 F₁. Yes, yes.
- * 45 *M₃. The points are the following;
Smoking brings many problem such as economical problem by
finishing money, health problem on lung, cough, cancer also bad
smell. Drinking brings many problems such as economical because
you pay much money to buy alcohol, quarrel with other people, kill
or die. you may also get sick headache and all body pain are
common. Chewing chat also have...
- * * * * 46 T. Well, time is, O! Twenty minutes elapsed. You now stop discussion
among groups and report. You tell us which tasks you have chosen
and why. [Reporting went on mainly by group leaders]. Good, now

the majority have chosen the second task which reads “People in our Country Traditionally Drink Alcohol, Chew Chat and Smoke Cigarette...”. You now once again discuss the task in your group. Dot down the important points. You are going to write an essay based on the points you dot down while the discussion is on.

Group 4

- | A | B | C | D | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| * | * | * | | 47 *F ₃ . Yes, that is good. It is an interesting topic, yes?
XL. Yes. |
| | * | | * | 48 F ₂ . We can say many things about this. |
| * | * | * | | 49 *F ₃ . Right. Let us start from the question. It says' if yes why? How? Why should we banid [to mean band]? How can we banid? are the the first questions. Banid means to stop, the teacher said. Okay? How can we stop people who have the habit of drinking, chewing and s-moking? Yes,[indicating F2] |
| | | | * | 50 F ₂ . Em, by teaching people. |
| | * | | * | 51 *F ₃ . Yes, good point. Another point? |
| * | * | | * | 52 F ₁ . But it is habit. It is difficult or it is, impossible to, to stop habit. You can teach, but it is difficult they do not stop smoking, chewing and alcohol. They cannot work, they are not active when they are not getting that. |
| | * | * | * | 53 F ₃ . Okay, Okay. Yes to stop habit is very very difficult, it means. Fine. Yes please? |
| | | | * | 54 F ₂ . That is difficult. But it is important for young people so that they will not start or begin. Before develop the habit, it is important to teach. |
| * | * | | * | 55 F ₄ . So, that is not stopping. |
| * | * | | * | 56 F ₆ . Some people can stop. Some people who have the habit can stop. I know. |

- * * * 57 *F₃. Yes. It means teaching can help. Another?
- * 58 F₅. The government has to prevent them.
- * * 69 *F₃ . How?
- * * 70 F₅. He can. Why not?
- * 71 *F₃. I mean, the method or the way.
- * 72 F₁. The government can do that by punishing those who produce
cigarette those who smoke.
- * * * 73 *F₃. Are you saying that?[Pointing to F₅]
- 74 F₅. Yes.

Group 5.

A B C D

- * * * * 75 M₁. For example, can you study without
chewing chat if you have the habit? Very difficult or it is not
possible. How do you think so?
- * * * 76 M₃. It is difficult, but if you don't get, what can you do?
- 77 L.L. Hah [laughter]
- * * 78 M₁. If I don't get, I cannot study. That is what I say!
- * * * * 79 *M₂. Okay. That is difficult, but gradually I think it is possible to
reduce the habit. What about drinking the alcohol? [He looked at
80 F₂].
- * 81 F₂. It is possible to, to reduce and reduce and gradually stop.
- * * * 82 *M₂. Okay, [Looking at F₁].
- 83 F₁.The same
- * * * * 84 T. You now have to change roles. Each group has to choose
another group leader. Okay? Choose volunteer ones and go on
your discussion.
- * * 85 M₁. We are going to choose another group leader?
- * * 86 M₂. Yes, I am changed. Choose another one.
- * * 87 M₁. Let him be,[pointing to M₃].
- * * * 88 M₃. No. now from girls.

- * * * 89 F3. No, no. He is right, [looking at M1].
- * * 90 F1. Yes, he, he.
- * * * 91 M2. Okay, please, don't waste our time. Let him be and we
continue.
- 92 LL. Yes, yes.
- * * * 93 M2. Continue from what we said. We said we can gradually stop
chewing and drinking.
- * * 94 *M3. So, we are left with smoking cigarette?
- * * * 95 M1. Yes, I say it is also difficult to stop.
- 96 XL. Haha [laughter]
- * * * 97 M2. Still there [laughing]
- * * * 98 M₁. Yes, smoking and chewing are equal. The habit is very
difficult or em ...very serious to stop. Many people cannot
stop smoking because of they cannot be active without that. It
is because their stomach does not digesting food without that.
So, I say it is very difficult for them to leave cigarette.
- * * * * 99 M₃. But if we educate the people about the harmfulness of these,
you don't think they can reduce or minimize?
- * * * 100 F3. Yes, [nodding agreement]
- 101 LL. Yes, that is it.

Group 6

- A B C D
- * 102 F₁. I think the points have already mentioned. The consequences
are economic, health and social consequence.
- * * 103 F₅. Ya, no new. WE said all.
- * * 104 *F₂. Yes, the points are raised. But to go according to the order of
the questions. I mean to put the points in order.
- * * 105 F₃. Yes [The previous group leader]. Also we can go to the detail.

- * * 106 F₁. 'Detail?
 107 F₃. Yes details. When we say economic problems, it include
 private economy, country economy and the like; yes?
 108 LL. Yes, yes
- * * 109 F₅. Yes. it is clear For example, the man smoking, drinking and
 chewing has to pay money from his pocket. He is finishing his
 salary. His children are becoming poor, they don't go to school.
 They will become beggar when they grow. Look how it makes
 poor.
 110 F₄. Yes. yes. True.
- * 111 F₃. There are many many others.
- * * 112 F₂. To make it suitable for our writing of the essay, let us put these
 points in step by step.. em order by order. When we say
 economic problem or consequence, this include; it makes
 individuals poor at private level, it makes country poor at
 country level. Also chewing chat, drinking and smoking create
 problems health wise.
 113 LL. Yes, health, health wise.
- * * 114 F₆. Yes. They create lung problem, headache, cancer, all in all
 health problem. Em, also social problem, people don't like
 you, because you quarrel, in salt and damage property. Is it
 not? [looking at F₂]
 115 F₂. All these points are important.
- * * * * 116 T. Alright; time is up. Please, once please. Don't forget that we
 shall meet on the day after tomorrow right at this period
- * 117 F₂. O! Time has gone. Let us leave. it is enough, ya.
 118 LL. Okay, okay....

B. Discussion Transcripts of Lesson Two

Note that the transcript is in the order of the recording. The recording of the first lesson started with mixed-sex group and interchangeably went on to single-sex group, then to mixed-sex group and so on until each group was recorded once. The numbering of the groups was given during the first recording beginning with the mixed-sex group and interchangeably going on to the last sixth group. The same numbering was used while recording the second lesson. Recording the second lesson started with the single-sex group discussion and interchangeably went on to the last group until each group was recorded once. That is why the numbering in this transcript starts from 2, moves back to 1, then to 3 and so on.

Group 2

A B C D

- * * * * 119 T. Wright you will get in to your previous group; I mean the groups you formed the day before. Be in your previous seats. Your topic of discussion, today, is the one you chose last time. I hope you remember the topic. Choose group leaders as usual, the willing ones. Dot down important points while the discussion goes on so that you will use them to write your essays. By the way, one of your group member is missing. What is wrong with her?
- * 120 F₂. Absent
- * * 121 T. Why? Do you know the reason?
- * 122 F₂. No, I don't know
- * * * * 123 T. Another is also missing from the other group. They should not
124 have missed this class. Okay, let you go on your discussion any ways.
- 125 F₆. The topic was what? Who wrote yesterday?

Group 3

A B C D

- * 174 M3. A lot of methods, many many are told by media, or on media.
By being one to one, or only one girl friend, by using
condom, by abstaining all are told on media.
- * * * 175 *M1. The problem is not don't knowing or lack of education on
AIDs. You know, em all people men, women, children all
know how HIV AIDS can be profected. But, you see, em
they don't or we don't use or implement by practice.
Practically, we don't use or implement.
- * 176 F3. Yes correct
- * 177 F2. He is right
- * * 178 M2. So. what can we do? It is the problem
- * * 179 F2. We have to implement or bring in to practicall.
- * * * 180 M3. The problem is when drinking alcohol. They drink alcohol,
they don't know themselves during night, they can go to bar
ladies.
- * * 181 M2. Beautiful girls also..
- 182 LL. Haha [laughter]
- * * 183 *M1. Ush. Please. Solution, solution.
- * * 184 M3. As our psychology teacher says, behavioral change is
important. We have to stop making mistakes drinking alcohol.
seeing beautiful girls.
- 185 XI. Haha.
- * * 186 M3. yes what we learn, we have to bring into practical or
practicing.

Group 6

A B C D

- * 187 *F3. The solution is educating, further educating people about AIDS.
- * * 188 F2. Churches, mosques, and other religion people also have to participate very much.
- * * 189 *F3. Yes. when I say education, it include all what you are saying.
- * * * 190 F1. Always educating, educating. But doctors have died by AIDS. This is told many times. Doctors, teachers, other intellectuals.
- * 191 F5. You are right. There are many educated people who are dying by HIV AIDS.
- * * * * 192 F4. And what do you think is the solution?
- * * 193 F1. Educating is not a solution, that is what I am say.
- * * * 194 F5. AIDS has no solution except God.
- * * * 195 *F3. In addition to God, we have to think of other solution. We have to implement what we learn. Some people can make mistake. human being is not perfect. But we should not see only those who make mistake.
- * * * 196 F2. And when I say church and mosque fathers have to teach, I am saying they have to teach people to accept God. God can keep us.
- * * 197 *F3. Ya. you are right. Shall we say no solution? Some people can make mistake, human being is no perfect.
- * 198 F6. Yes. that is good idea.

Group 5

A B C D

- * * * * 199 T. Don't forget to dot down the important points so that you will include them into your essay.

- * * 200 *M1. All right. Let us come to summarizing dotting down the important points.
- * * 201 M3. Start from why we say AIDS is worrying
- * * 202 M1. Yes. you are right. It will be convenient when we write the essay.
- * * 203 F2. Shall we write the essay?
- * * 204 *M1. Forget that. But, who is interested can do.
- * * 205 F2. Yes, okay. AIDS is killing many many people. It is killing educated, young and old, man and women, all.
- 206 XL. Yes.
- * * 207 *M1. Good. Old people are without help because the ones who have energy are killed by AIDS. Em, em
- * * 208 M3. Children are not going to school because no mother no father. No one to help them. Some school are closed because of teachers killed by HIV ya.
- 209 F1. Yes.
- 210 F3. Many problems. You are right.
- * * 211 M1. Good. We can also include all the economical and social problem we said before.
- * * 212 M2. Yes. Because educated and energetic people are killed by AIDS, who bring economic growth? It is problem.

II. Interview Questions

Interview

The aim of these interview is to supplement a gender research currently being conducted. Since the success of the research depends on the truthfulness of your responses, you are kindly requested to respond the questions honestly

For Girls

1. If you were given the freedom to join the discussion group of your choice, would you prefer A) a girls only group B) a boys only group C) a mixed group of boys and girls

Why? _____

2. In many cases in English classes, girls and boys sit with members of the same-sex and do not often mix. What do you think is the reason? _____

-
3. From your observation of group discussion in English classes who do you think participate more, girls or boys? A, Boys B. Girls

4. Do you see any advantages or disadvantages of working with boys in group activities? If yes, what are these

-
5. Do you believe that boys are generally better than girls as students and as discussion partners? _____

6. Do you think your individual participation increases:

A) in only girls group B) in mixed groups of boys and girls. Why? _____

II. Interview Questions

Interview

The aim of these interview is to supplement a gender research currently being conducted. Since the success of the research depends on the truthfulness of your responses, you are kindly requested to respond the questions honestly

For Boys

7. If you were given the freedom to join the discussion group of your choice, would you prefer A) a girls only group B) a boys only group C) a mixed group of boys and girls
Why? _____

8. In many cases in English classes, girls and boys sit with members of the same-sex and do not often mix. What do you think is the reason? _____

9. From your observation of group discussion in English classes, who do you think participate more, girls or boys? A, Boys B, Girls
10. Do you see any advantages or disadvantages of working with girls in group activities?
If yes, what are these?

11. Do you believe that boys are generally better than girls as students and as discussion partners? _____
12. Do you think your individual participation increases:
A) in only girls group B) in mixed groups of boys and girls. Why? _____

January 2007

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, declare that this is my work and that all sources of material used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name: **Abera Kasaye**

Signature: _____

Date: Feb. 2007

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

PARTICIPATION OF FEMALE STUDENTS IN
MIXED AND SINGLE-SEX GROUP DISCUSSIONS IN
EFL CLASSES AT ADAMA TEACHERS TRAINING
COLLEGE

BY
ABERA KASAYE

INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGE STUDIES

APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS

Advisor

Signature

Examiner

Signature

Examiner

Signature