

Gender and Classroom Interaction: Examining A Female and A Male Teacher's Moves Directed Towards Female and Male Students in Two EFL Classrooms in Turkey

Ebru Bađ, Leyla Martı, and Yasemin Bayyurt

Abstract

This article¹ examines a female teacher's and a male teacher's interactions with female and male students in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms. Lessons in two EFL classrooms in the preparatory school of a state university in Turkey, one classroom with a female teacher and the other with a male teacher, were observed and video-taped for two months. The lessons were transcribed and analysed using an adaptation of Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975, 1992) Classroom Discourse Analysis Model. The findings of the study showed that in general there was not an equal distribution between teachers' moves, both academic and non-academic, directed to female and male students in either classroom. The results of the study are discussed in reference to relevant literature on gender and classroom interaction and the authors draw attention to pedagogical implications.

Keywords: Gender and Classroom Interaction, Teacher-Student Interaction, In/Equality in the Classroom, EFL Classrooms in Turkey.

Introduction

The second wave feminist movement, which flourished in the late 1960s and early 1970s, influenced research studies of gender and education (Sunderland 1998) as well as research in various other areas and disciplines. A wide-ranging body of research examines the issue of gender at different grade levels, including kindergarten (Chen and Rao 2011) elementary (French and French 1984; Reay 2001; Sadker, Sadker, and Klein 1991), secondary (Sadker, Sadker, and Klein 1991; She 2000), and university level classrooms (Brady and Eisler 1999; Dancy 2011; Kim and Sax 2009; Lynch and Nowosenetz 2009; Sax and Harper 2007). Researchers have examined the role of gender from various perspectives, such as differences in the performance of girls and boys in various subjects (Brandell and Staberg 2008; Dayıođlu and Tırut-Ařık 2007; Salisbury, Rees, and Gorard 1999; Swiatek, Lupkowski-Shoplík and O'Donoghue 2000;

Ebru Bađ, PhD Candidate, University of Toronto, Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education, Canada, ebru.bag@mail.utoronto.ca

Leyla Martı, Assoc. Prof. Dr., Bođaziçi University, Faculty of Education, Department of Foreign Language Education, Istanbul, martı@boun.edu.tr

Yasemin Bayyurt, Prof. Dr., Bođaziçi University, Faculty of Education, Department of Foreign Language Education, Istanbul, bayyurty@boun.edu.tr

¹ This article is based on the first author's MA thesis research, which was funded by Bođaziçi University Scientific Projects Commission (Project No: 08D601).

Teixeira, Villani, and Nascimento 2008), their perceptions of classroom activities and academic achievement (Bennett et al. 1993), and their classroom interactions (Chen and Rao 2011; Clarricoates 1983; Duffy, Warren, and Walsh 2001; Farooq 2000; French and French 1984; Good, Sikes, and Brophy 1973; Kelly 1988; Jones and Dindia 2004; Jones and Wheatley 1990; Koca 2009; She 2000; Stake and Katz 1982; Sunderland 1996).

This study set out to investigate gender in relation to teacher-student interaction in two EFL classrooms in Turkey. Motivation for the study was a considerable amount of previous research on gender and classroom interaction showing that male students receive more teacher attention than female students and that male students interact more with their teachers. For instance, Good, Sikes, and Brophy (1973) examined the effects of teacher gender and student gender on classroom interaction in 16 seventh and eighth level classrooms by using the Brophy-Good Dyadic Coding System. Having observed four female and four male mathematics teachers, and four female and four male social studies teachers, they found that female and male teachers' behaviours towards students differed in some significant ways, although there were also some similarities. The results of the study showed that high-achieving boys received the most favourable teacher treatment, while low-achieving boys had the least favourable interaction with their teachers. On the other hand, low-achieving girls also received low teacher treatment, but not lower than that received by low-achieving boys.

Teachers may believe that they treat girls and boys equally, but classroom observations suggest that this is not often the case (Spender, 1982; Younger and Warrington 1996; Younger, Warrington, and Williams 1999). For instance, in her widely cited study, Spender (1982) examined her own teaching to learn if there was any difference in the way she interacted with female and male students. She reported:

Sometimes I have ... thought I have gone too far and have spent more time with the girls than the boys. But the tapes have proved otherwise. Out of ten taped lessons ... the maximum time I spent interacting with girls was 42 per cent and on average 38 per cent, and the minimum time with boys 58 per cent. ... It is nothing short of a substantial shock to appreciate the discrepancy between what I thought I was doing and what I actually was doing (p. 56).

Similarly, two meta-analytic reviews conducted by Kelly (1988) and Jones and Dindia (2004) indicated that teachers interact more with male students than with female students.

Stake and Katz's study (1982), in which eleven female and ten male elementary school teachers were observed, showed that males received more reprimands than females, and both female and male teachers described them as misbehaving more than girls. Researchers explain this result by suggesting that boys cause more discipline problems than girls do. Merrett and Wheldall (1992) also found that boys received more responses from teachers, both praise and reprimand, than girls received. These results were further supported by Younger and Warrington (1996), who made interviews with students, teachers, and parents to explore differential achievement of girls and boys at a

school. Students in their study perceived that boys received more criticism than girls in the classroom.

More recently, Aukrust (2008) examined the participation of girls and boys in teacher-led classroom conversations at first, third, sixth and ninth grade levels. In accord with the previous studies, she found that the boys participated more than the girls at all grade levels in both in female and in male teachers' classrooms. She also found that the boys interrupted the teacher more than the girls.

In Turkey, a number of studies of gender in the classroom have been published (e.g., Bayyurt 1999; Dayioğlu and Türüt-Aşık 2007; Erden 2009; Gök, Özdoğru, and Erdoğan 2002; Gömleksiz 2012; Gümüšoğlu 1996; Koca 2009). However, as far as we know, there are no studies conducted specifically to examine gender and teacher-student interaction. For this reason, we made gender and classroom interaction, particularly teacher-student interactions in EFL classrooms, the main focus of the present study, which analyses the amount of attention teachers give to female and male students.

Gender and classroom interaction in second/foreign language classrooms

The influence of gender has been studied in foreign/second language learning and teaching, from various perspectives, including gender and learning styles and strategies (Oxford 1994; Green and Oxford 1995), gender and attitudes towards foreign/second language learning (Bacon and Finnemann 1992; Carr and Pauwels 2006; Guimond and Roussel 2001), gender and foreign/second language assessment (O'Loughlin 2002; O'Sullivan 2000); gender and foreign/second language materials (Bağ 2012; Bağ and Bayyurt 2008; Jones, Kitemu, and Sunderland 1997; Porreca 1984; Poulou 1997; Sunderland et al. 2002), gender and foreign/second language classroom interaction (Bayyurt 1999; Bayyurt and Litosseliti 2006; Farooq 2000; Gass and Varonis 1986; Sunderland 1996; Yepez 1994).

Analyzing classroom interaction in foreign/second language classrooms is significant as the language is both the target and means of communication. As noted by Sunderland (1996) "The assumption that much of what is gendered that occurs in a given non-foreign-language class may well occur too in a foreign language class" (p. 41). As one of the first studies on gender and classroom interaction in a foreign language setting, Alcón's study examined turn taking in teacher-initiated discussions and in same- and cross-gender discussions at a secondary level EFL classroom. Her findings indicated that both the female and the male teachers took more turns than the students, and that the boys took more turns than the girls. Also, Alcón discovered significant differences in the students' same-gender and cross-gender conversations. The boys interrupted more often than the girls during cross-sex conversations, whereas the girls provided a more supportive environment for the boys in which to produce language. However, the girls interrupted more and produced more language during same-gender conversations. To explain the discrepancy, Alcón referred to the stereotype of women in society, where they are expected to be polite and supportive when talking to men.

The results of Yepez's study of four ESL teachers (2 female, 2 male), also published in 1994, were inconsistent with the results of earlier studies in the literature. Yepez (1994) reported that three of the four teachers studied showed remarkable

equality in their interactions with female and male students. Sunderland (1996) observed a 7th grade German as a Foreign Language classroom in Britain to examine teacher-to-student and student-to-teacher talk. She noted how the teacher interacted with the students and looked for any difference in the way that boys and girls talked to the teacher. In addition, she interviewed the teacher and the students. Her study showed that most of the time there was no statistically significant indication of ‘differential teacher treatment’. The teacher gave the boys more attention in terms of ‘number of solicit² words’ and ‘proportion of non-academic solicits’. However, the girls were asked more ‘academic solicits’, to which the teacher expected them to respond in German, the target language, and they were asked more questions requiring an answer of more than one word. Her analysis of student-to-teacher talk revealed that the ‘average girl’ produced more solicits, more academic solicits, more non-academic solicits, more solicit-words, shorter solicits, and more ‘unsolicited solicits’ than the ‘average boy’ (p. 198). Sunderland’s findings suggest that teachers and researchers should interpret ‘the more is better’ approach with caution. It is important to analyse a teacher’s attention and classroom interaction not only quantitatively but also qualitatively, by distinguishing between different types of interaction, such as academic or non-academic interaction and negative or positive interaction.

Another study conducted by Farooq (2000), using an adapted version of Sinclair and Coulthard’s (1992) model, analysed a male teacher’s attention in a Japanese EFL high school classroom. Based on the overall findings of the study, Farooq reported that the teacher paid more attention to boys than to girls. He argued that the differential treatment of girls and boys resulted from the perception that girls were the more academic, able, and well-behaved learners, while boys needed more attention because of their more immature and disruptive nature.

In Turkey there are some studies of gender and foreign language instruction such as gender and communication strategies (Sunkar-Koçoğlu 1997), gender and language learning strategies of adults (Tercanlıoğlu 2004), gender and EFL teachers’ beliefs about foreign language learning (Tercanlıoğlu 2005), and gender representation in EFL textbooks (Bağ 2012; Bağ and Bayyurt 2008; Diktaş 2010; Sivashgil 2006). However the only known study of gender and EFL classroom interaction was conducted by Bayyurt (1999). She analysed the teacher’s management of female and male students’ turn-taking strategies and interruptions during classroom discussions. The results of her study showed that the teacher gave more opportunities to take turns to boys than to girls. In addition, the boys took longer turns than the girls. The classroom teacher did not stop boys from interrupting the girls in conversation. In this respect, Bayyurt’s results were consistent with the results of earlier studies conducted elsewhere (see: Kelly 1988; Spender 1988; Swann 1992; Swann and Graddol 1988). We carried out this current study in order to gain more insights about gender and teacher-student interaction in foreign language classrooms in Turkish context. The details of the study are provided in the following sections.

² The term ‘solicit’ was defined by Sunderland as ‘a teacher-student (but not teacher-whole class) or student-teacher utterance which requires and/or results in a verbal response or which results in or requires a behavioural one from the student or teacher respectively very soon after the uttering of the solicit’ (p. 143).

The Study

The present study, based on video-recorded and transcribed data, examines the attention given to students by two EFL teachers, one female and one male, in their respective classrooms. The study was conducted at the intermediate EFL level in the English preparatory program of a university in Turkey. It was guided by the following research questions³:

1. Are there any similarities and/or differences in the level of a female and a male teacher's student selection in terms of moves directed to class vs. directed to female and male students in the EFL classroom?
2. Are there any similarities and/or differences in the number of the female and the male teacher's academic (A) and non-academic (NA) initiating moves directed to female students and male students in the EFL classroom?
3. Are there any similarities and/or differences in the amount of feedback provided by the female and the male teachers to female and male students in the EFL classroom?

Setting of the study

The study was conducted in the foreign language program of a state university in Istanbul, Turkey. At this university, English is the medium of instruction. The students have to pass an English proficiency examination before beginning their studies in their various departments. Students who cannot pass the proficiency examination initially must take courses in the English preparatory program until they achieve the prerequisite proficiency level.

Two classes in the preparatory school were chosen for the study. While choosing the teachers and the classes, certain factors were considered, such as the number of the students in each class, their proficiency level, and the teaching experience of the teachers. One class was taught by a female teacher and one by a male teacher. Both teachers were teaching the core course of reading and writing, integrating grammar and vocabulary as necessary. They met their classes three days a week.

Participants

Teacher 1 (Female)

Teacher 1 was the female teacher of Class 1. She is Turkish and was 45 years old at the time of the study. She had had 11 years of teaching experience in total.

³ The fourth research question of the study focused on the perceptions of teachers and students about gender and teacher-student interaction in the EFL classroom; however due to space limitation, within the scope of this paper the results of this research question will not be presented and discussed. Some of the interview questions and participants' responses will be mentioned only briefly where necessary.

Teacher 2 (Male)

Teacher 2 was the male teacher of Class 2. He is Turkish and was 46 years old at the time of the study. He had been teaching English for 15 years.

Students in Class 1 (Female Teacher)

There were 28 students taught by the female teacher in Class 1, 16 female and 12 male. Their English proficiency according to the test administered by the university was at the intermediate level. All but two of the students were Turkish, both male, one from Afghanistan and one from Azerbaijan. The mean age for the female students was 18.87, and the mean for the male students was 18.75.

Students in class 2 (Male Teacher)

There were 26 students taught by the male teacher in Class 2, 14 female and 12 male. Their English was at the intermediate level. All of the students were Turkish. The mean age for female students was 19.23, and the mean age for the male students was 17.14.

Data collection and data analysis

Data collection process started after getting the ethics approval from the ethics committee of the university where the researchers were affiliated to and getting the consents of the students, teachers, and the school administration. Data were collected through 1) observation of classroom interaction, 2) video-taping of classroom interaction, 3) a demographic information form, and 4) interviews with the teachers and some of the students. Thirteen class hours⁴ in each teacher's classroom (26 hours in total) were videotaped over a period of two months, in the second term of the academic year 2007/2008. A point about classroom observation and recording should be mentioned. In the course of informal conversations during class breaks students reported that their lessons were observed quite often and that they were quite used to the presence of an observer. They said that their behaviour and the atmosphere of the classroom while a researcher was present were no different from lessons in which no observer was present. Program administrators confirmed that new teacher trainees often observed lessons while learning about the program.

All video-taped lessons were transcribed and eight were chosen for analysis according to the following criteria: a) lessons in which the students were reading or writing throughout the whole class hour were not chosen because there was not much interaction; b) lessons in which the number of female and male students was similar were preferred; c) lessons from the beginning, middle, and end of the semester were preferred.

The data were transcribed by one of the researchers. After choosing the lessons that would be analyzed according to the criteria mentioned above and after decided on

⁴ They had three blocks of lessons in a day, which last 90 minutes, 75 minutes and 60 minutes, respectively.

Sinclair and Coulthard's Classroom Discourse Analysis (IRF- Initiation, Response, Follow-up) model to analyze the data, transcriptions were checked by one of the researchers. In addition, while checking the transcriptions, exchanges which were composing transactions were determined. Then, the moves composing the exchanges were divided into slots—I (initiation), R (response) and F (follow-up/feedback) —as in the following example:

Line of moves (e.s)	Act	Move type
T (I): Small items of information are?	el	Eliciting
F (R): Details	rep-i	Informing
T (F): Details. Good	acc	Acknowledging

While the data collection process was going on, students were asked to fill in the demographic information forms (Appendix 1). At the end of the data collection period, the teachers and some of the students were interviewed in order to find out the perceptions of the participants on gender and classroom interaction. However, as mentioned above, within the scope of this paper, only the findings of the classroom interaction data are presented and discussed.

Results and discussion

The study examined the attention given to students by two, one female and one male, EFL teachers at an English Preparatory School of a university. Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975, 1992) Classroom Discourse Analysis Model was used to analyse teachers' moves in general (both initiating and follow-up moves), the distribution of A and NA initiating moves, and follow-up moves (feedback) directed to female and male students (Coulthard and Brazil, 1992; Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975, 1992).

Initial analysis of the eight video-taped lessons involved the differentiation of the teachers' initial or follow-up (feedback) moves directed towards the class versus moves directed to individual students, i.e. females and males. Even though the main aim was to look at the selection of the teacher in terms of gender, a classification of the moves directed to the class versus females or males provides a general picture of classroom participation, as seen in Table 1.

Table 1. Initiating and follow-up moves directed to class vs. directed to female or male student

	Female Teacher	%	Male Teacher	%
Initiating Moves				
Directed to class	371	62.77	414	81.66
Directed to a specific female or male S	220	37.23	93	18.34
Total	591	100	507	100
Follow-up Moves				
Directed to class	138	41.69	125	27.11
Directed to a specific female or male S	193	58.31	336	72.89
Total	331	100	461	100

Both the female and male teacher addressed the class as a whole more often when they provided initiating moves: 62.77 % of initiating moves were directed to the class by the female teacher and 81.66 % of initiating moves were directed to the class by the male teacher. Clearly, the male teacher prefers to address the class as a whole, and the female teacher shows the same tendency.

The pattern of follow-up moves is different, however; both teachers address individual students more often than they address the class as a whole. The male teacher's preference for directing his follow-up moves to specific students (72.11 %) is somewhat stronger than the female teacher's (58.30 %). It seemed to the researchers that the female teacher had a tendency to direct her initiating moves, which were mostly composed of 'questions', to the whole class if she thought that the question was easy⁵ enough and she did not want to spend too much time on it. Thus, she did not provide feedback to those questions. Thus, her follow-up moves that were provided to the whole class (41.69 %) were less than the ones provided to individual students (58.31 %). The male teacher also asked most of his questions to the whole class, but without regarding the easiness or difficulty of the questions, and he tried to provide feedback to most of

⁵ During the interviews with the teacher, she stated that she knew how easy or difficult a question was for students based on their curriculum and amount of language knowledge students had gained. The teachers had a sense of which questions could be easy or difficult for the students. In our observation, the 'easy' questions were mostly the ones that required descriptive answers or that had structures (vocabulary & grammar) students were already familiar with while the 'difficult' questions required students to synthesize the information and make interpretation.

them. The researchers noted that the male teacher's initiating moves drew more responses from individual students than from the class. Thus the greater amount of this teacher's feedback went to individual students (72.89 %). The next section will discuss the individual students addressed by both teachers.

The female teacher's classroom

Female teacher's initiating moves

The general distribution of the teacher's initiating moves directed to a female or a male student includes both A and NA moves. Since the exact ratio of males to females changed from lesson to lesson, the number of initiating moves per head of female and male students was calculated. As seen in Table 2, the females were recipients of 118 initiating moves and the males were recipients of 102 (total of 220 initiating moves) throughout the recorded four lessons.

Table 2. The female teacher's initiating moves directed to female and male students

Lessons	Ss' percentages		No. of teacher's initiating moves (N of F/M S)		Mean for the "average" female/male student		Percentages	
	F Ss	M Ss	Female Ss	Male Ss	Female Ss	Male Ss	Female Ss	Male Ss
Lesson 1	54%	46%	17(13) ⁶	16(11)	1.30	1.45	52%	48%
Lesson 2	56%	44%	43(14)	45(11)	3.07	4.09	49%	51%
Lesson 3	57%	43%	30(16)	28(12)	1.87	2.33	52%	48%
Lesson 4	58%	42%	28(15)	13(11)	1.86	1.18	68%	32%
Total			118	102	2.02	2.26		

The mean of initiating moves directed to male students was 2.26, compared to 2.02 for females. This finding is consistent with the results of previous research conducted in foreign language classrooms (Farooq 2000; Sunderland 1996) and in other subject classrooms (Duffy, Warren, and Walsh 2001; Good, Sikes, and Brophy 1973; Stake and Katz 1982; Swann and Graddol 1988). Although the female teacher stated during her interview that she took care to give equal attention to female and male students, in actuality she directed more initiating moves to male students. Analysis of the students'

⁶The numbers in parentheses refer to the number of female and male students in those lessons.

responding moves is more revealing. In both classrooms, when the teachers directed their initiating moves to the class, female students responded to the teacher's initiating moves more often than male students (except in one lesson). In Class 1, the female teacher's classroom, since the teacher directed more initiating moves to male students, female students might have tried to compensate by responding to the teacher's initiating moves to the class more often than male students. On the other hand, when female students responded to the teacher's initiating moves directed to the class more often than the male students responded, the teacher might have tried to compensate by directing more initiating moves to the male students.

As mentioned before, the academic (A) and non-academic (NA) distinction can reveal more about the nature of classroom interaction. Table 3 shows the distribution of A initiating moves and Table 4 the distribution of NA initiating moves.

Table 3. The female teacher's A initiating moves directed to a female or a male student

Lessons	N of teacher's A initiating moves (N of female/male S)		Mean for female/male S	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
Lesson 1	15(13)	14(11)	1.15	1.27
Lesson 2	39(14)	44(11)	2.78	4
Lesson 3	28(16)	27(12)	1.75	2.25
Lesson 4	27(15)	11(11)	1.8	1
Total	109	96	1.87	2.13

As seen in Table 3, female students in Class 1 received an average of 1.87 A initiating moves, while the male students received an average of 2.13 moves. In the first, second, and third lessons, most A initiating moves were directed to male students, and in the fourth lesson most were directed to female students. The initiating moves in general (both A and NA moves) and the A initiating moves are directed more often to male students. On the other hand, the teacher's NA initiating moves had a more balanced distribution among female and male students, as can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4. The female teacher's NA initiating moves directed to a female or a male student

Lessons	N of teacher's NA initiating moves (N of female/male S)		Mean for female/male S	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
Lesson 1	2(13)	2(11)	0.15	0.18
Lesson 2	4(14)	1(11)	0.28	0.09
Lesson 3	2(16)	1(12)	0.12	0.08
Lesson 4	1(15)	2(11)	0.06	0.18
Total	9	6	0.15	0.13

As seen in Table 4, in two of the lessons, the teacher directed more NA moves to female students, and in the other two lessons she directed more NA moves to male students. The overall mean of NA initiating moves directed to females (0.15) is slightly higher than the mean of those directed to males (0.13). Students' age and grade level may be the reasons for this: Student in K-12 education may have more disciplinary problems, and teachers may direct more NA moves (including reprimands and criticisms) to them. However, we should note that the raw scores are very small and there is not much difference between the raw scores of two groups.

Teacher's follow-up moves (feedback)

The significance of feedback, in language classrooms (Cullen 2002; Hewings 1992; Lyster and Mori 2006; Mackey 2006) and non-language classrooms (Burnett 2002; Chin 2006; Hattie and Timperley 2007), has been pointed out by many researchers. The students who participated in the current study also expressed the belief that the teacher's feedback and supportive responses are crucial for them since they are affected positively and their motivation increases when they get feedback and supportive responses. In this section, the findings regarding the female teacher's feedback will be presented. Table 5 shows the distribution of female teacher's follow-up moves directed to female and male students.

Table 5. The female teacher's follow-up moves directed to female and male students

Lessons	N of teacher's follow-up moves (N of female/male S)		Mean for female/male S	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
Lesson 1	15(13)	18(11)	1.15	1.63
Lesson 2	32(14)	40(11)	2.28	3.63
Lesson 3	27(16)	18(12)	1.68	1.5
Lesson 4	32(15)	11(11)	2.13	1
Total	106	87	1.81	1.94

As seen in Table 5, female students received an average of 1.81 follow-up moves and male students an average of 1.94 follow-up moves. In the first two lessons, the teacher directed more follow-up moves to males than to females, but in the last two lessons, she directed more follow-up moves to females than to males. Overall, the male students received slightly more feedback than female students, reflecting the female's teacher's tendency to balance her moves or only slightly favour the males.

The male teacher's classroom

Teacher's initiating moves

The general distribution of the male teacher's A and NA initiating moves show a tendency to direct more initiating moves to female students, a mean of 1.39 moves, than to male students, a mean of 1.06. In three out of four lessons, more initiating moves were directed to females than to males.

Table 6. The male teacher's initiating moves directed to female and male students

Lessons	Ss' percentages		No. of teacher's initiating moves (N of F/M S)		Mean for the "average" female/male student		Percentages	
	F Ss	M Ss	Female Ss	Male Ss	Female Ss	Male Ss	Female Ss	Male Ss
Lesson 1	64%	36%	10 (14)	2 (8)	0.71	0.25	83%	17%
Lesson 2	59%	41%	14 (13)	11 (9)	1.07	1.22	56%	44%
Lesson 3	60%	40%	27 (9)	15 (6)	3	2.5	64%	36%
Lesson 4	58%	42%	11 (14)	3 (10)	0.78	0.3	79%	21%
Total			62	31	1.39	1.06		

It must be said, however, that the male teacher initiated fewer moves than the female teacher. He directed 62 moves to females, 31 to males, for a total of 93 moves, whereas she directed 118 moves to females, 102 to males, for a total of 220 moves. A detailed summary of A and NA moves can be seen in Tables 7 and 8.

Table 7. The male teacher's A initiating moves directed to a female or a male student

Lessons	N of teacher's A initiating moves (N of female/male S)		Mean for female/male S	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
Lesson 1	9(14)	2(8)	0.64	0.25
Lesson 2	13(13)	6(9)	1	0.66
Lesson 3	26(9)	11(6)	2.88	1.83
Lesson 4	11(14)	3(10)	0.78	0.3
Total	59	22	1.32	0.76

The male teacher's tendency to direct more initiating moves to females than to males can be seen in Table 7, showing a summary of his academic (A) initiating moves. In all four lessons, the male teacher directed more A initiating moves to females (mean of 1.32) than to males (mean of 0.76). This result is not consistent with the results found in previous research (Farooq 2000). The reason why he selected more females than males to receive his initiating moves can be inferred from an interview in which he stated, 'I paid attention to asking questions to the students whom I thought were ready to answer'. It is likely that among the students he thought were ready to answer his questions there were more females than males. Similarly, Farooq (2000) found that although the teachers studied paid more attention to boys in their classes, they thought that girls were more academic and better-behaved.

Table 8. The male teacher's NA initiating moves directed to a female or a male student

Lessons	N of teacher's NA initiating moves (N of female/male S)		Mean for female/male S	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
Lesson 1	1(14)	-	0.07	-
Lesson 2	1(13)	5(9)	0.07	0.55
Lesson 3	1(9)	4(6)	0.11	0.66
Lesson 4	-	-		
Total	3	9	0.08	0.60

As seen in Table 8, the male teacher initiated few NA moves in these lessons. The results show that when he did initiate NA moves, they were usually directed to male students. In lesson 2, out of 9 NAs, 5 were directed to male students, and all 5 were for disciplinary purposes. During the observations in Class 2, the researchers noticed that certain male students showed disruptive behaviour. These results are consistent with the results of previous research which showed that boys receive more criticism and reprimands than girls (Merrett and Wheldall 1992; Stake and Katz 1982; Younger and Warrington 1996).

Teacher's follow-up moves (feedback)

Table 9 shows the distribution of the male teacher's follow-up moves.

Table 9. The male teacher's follow-up moves provided to female and male students

Lessons	N of teacher's follow-up moves (N of female/male S)		Mean for female/male S	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
Lesson 1	72(14)	21(8)	5.14	2.62
Lesson 2	86(13)	46(9)	6.61	5.11
Lesson 3	37(9)	15(6)	4.11	2.5
Lesson 4	48(14)	11(10)	3.42	1.1
Total	243	93	4.82	2.83

As seen in Table 9, in all of the four lessons, more female students than male students received follow-up moves. The overall mean for follow-up moves directed to females, at 4.82, is relatively high compared to the mean of 2.83 moves directed to males.

Comparing the number of female and male teacher's follow-up moves, one can surmise that the female teacher treated female and male students equally when providing feedback, a finding consistent with Sunderland's (1996) conclusion that the teacher in her study gave equal amounts of feedback to girls and boys. The male teacher in this study, in contrast, directed more follow-up moves to female students than to male students in all of the four lessons, a finding that is not consistent with previous research results (Farooq 2000; Sunderland 1996). In this case, the amount of feedback given to female students reflects the greater number of female responses to the male teacher's initiating moves. It should also be noted that, within the scope of this study, students' initiating moves were not examined. However, in both classes, teachers' follow-up moves included the ones provided to the students' responding moves as well as the ones provided to students' initiating moves. Therefore, the number of the students' initiating moves might have affected the number of the teachers' follow-up moves.

Conclusion

This study has examined the amount of attention a female and a male teacher paid to students in two EFL classrooms. More specifically, it examined how the teachers directed their academic and non-academic initiating moves and their follow-up moves (feedback) to female and male students. The findings of the study can be summarized as follows:

- Both teachers directed more initiating moves to the class as a whole than to any specific female or male student.
- Both teachers addressed specific students more than the class as a whole when they provided follow-up moves.

In Class 1, the female teacher's class

- The mean of the initiating moves (A&NA) directed to male students was higher than the mean of the initiating moves directed to female students
- The mean of the A initiating moves directed to male students was higher than the mean of the A initiating moves directed to female students
- There was a fairly well balanced distribution of attention when directing NA and follow-up moves to the students, only slightly favouring females with her NA initiating moves and males with her follow-up moves.

In Class 2, the male teacher's class

- The mean of the initiating moves (A&NA) directed to female students was higher than the mean of the initiating moves directed to male students
- The mean of the A initiating moves directed to female students was higher than the mean of the A initiating moves directed to male students
- The mean of the NA moves directed more to male students was higher than the mean of the NA moves directed to female students
- The mean of the follow-up moves provided to female students was higher than the mean of the follow-up moves provided to male students.

Taken as a whole, the findings show that there was not an equal distribution of teacher attention in either classroom. We acknowledge that classroom interaction is complex and multifaceted and examining teachers' initiating and feedback moves is one part of the classroom interaction. However, the results of the present study is significant in terms of its being the first study, to the best knowledge of the researchers, that examines the issue of gender and teacher-student interaction based on the video-taped classroom interaction data in an EFL context in Turkey. Thus, one of the most significant implications of this study is that teachers must analyse the nature of their classroom interaction through a process of self-observation and reflection as every student has the right to be treated equally and to have equal access to learning opportunities. Teachers must eschew stereotyped views about females and males that limit the potential of women and men at schools and in society. As suggested by some researchers (e.g. Erden, 2009; Jones, 1989; Kelly, 1988; Tatar and Emmanuel, 2001), it is important to enable both pre- and in-service teachers to develop critical self-awareness and to gain insights into the issue of gender inequality. Kelly (1988) reported that '... trained teachers are much more successful than un-trained teachers in reducing sex-bias in their classrooms' (p. 15). Therefore, the trainee teachers can be provided with compulsory courses or workshops on gender and equality during their teacher training programs. In order to gain a more comprehensive view on gender and classroom interaction further research can be carried out with different age groups and in different subject classes by focusing on student-teacher as well as student-student interactions.

References

- Alcón, E. (1994). The role of participation and gender in non-native speakers' classroom interaction. *Working Papers on Language, Gender and Sexism*, 4 (1), 51–68.
- Aukrust, V.G. (2008). Boys' and girls' conversational participation across four grade levels in Norwegian classrooms: Taking the floor or being given the floor? *Gender and Education*, 20 (3), 237–252.
- Bacon, S., & M. Finnemann. (1992). Sex differences in self-reported beliefs about foreign- language learning and authentic oral and written input. *Language Learning* 42 (4), 471– 495.
- Bağ, E. (2012). Gender representation in EFL textbooks in Turkey: A follow-up to the 2008 study. Paper presented at the 56th Annual Conference of the Comparative and International Education Society, April 22-27, 2012, San Juan, Puerto Rico.
- Bağ, E., & Bayyurt, B. (2008). Gender representation in foreign language textbooks in Turkey. Paper presented at the 5th International ELT Research Conference Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University (ÇOMÜ), May 23-25, 2008, Çanakkale, Turkey.
- Bayyurt, Y. (1999). Research report: The analysis of the interactional strategies of female and male university students in an EFL setting. Supported by The Commission of Boğaziçi University Scientific Research Projects, Project Number: 99HD601.
- Bayyurt, Y., & Litosseliti, L. (2006). Gender and language in education. In L. Litosseliti (ed.), *Gender and language: Theory and practice*, 73 –89. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Bennett, R.E., Gottesman, R.L., Rock, D.A., & Cerullo, F. (1993). Influence of behavior perceptions and gender on teachers' judgments of students' academic skill. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 85 (2), 347– 356.
- Brady, K.L., & Eisler, R.M. (1999). Sex and gender in the college classroom: A quantitative analysis of faculty-student interactions and perceptions. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91 (1), 127 –145.
- Brandell, G., & Staberg, E. (2008). Mathematics: A female, male or gender-neutral domain? A study of attitudes among students at secondary level. *Gender and Education* 20 (5), 495–509.
- Burnett, P.C. (2002). Teacher praise and feedback and students' perceptions of the classroom environment. *Educational Psychology*, 22 (1), 5–16.
- Carr, J., & Pauwels, A. (2006). *Boys and foreign language learning: Real boys don't do languages*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chen, E.S. L., & Rao, N. (2011). Gender socialization in Chinese kindergartens: Teachers' contributions. *Sex Roles* 64, 103–116.
- Chin, C. (2006). Classroom interaction in science: Teacher questioning and feedback to students' responses. *International Journal of Science Education* 28 (11), 1315 –1346.

- Clarricoates, K. (1983). Classroom interaction. In J. Whyld (ed.) *Sexism in the secondary curriculum*, 46–61. New York: Harper and Row.
- Coulthard, M., & Brazil, D. (1992). Exchange structure. In M. Coulthard (ed.), *Advances in spoken discourse analysis*, 50–78. London: Routledge.
- Cullen, R. (2002). Supportive teacher talk: The importance of the F-move. *ELT Journal* 56 (2), 117–127.
- Dancy, T.E. (2011). Colleges in the making of manhood and masculinity: Gendered perspectives on African American males. *Gender and education* 23 (4), 477–495.
- Dayioğlu, M., & Türüt-Aşık, S. (2007). Gender differences in academic performance in a large public university in Turkey. *Higher Education* 53 (2), 255–277.
- Diktaş, M. (2010). *A Comparative study of textbooks designed by Ministry of Education of Turkey and non-Turkish publishers*. MA thesis, Maltepe University, Istanbul.
- Duffy, J., Warren, K., & Walsh, M. (2001). Classroom interactions: Gender of teacher, gender of student, and classroom subject. *Sex Roles* 45 (9/10), 579–593.
- Erden, F.T. (2009). Course on gender equity in education: Does it affect gender role attitudes of pre-service teachers? *Teaching and Teacher Education* 25(3), 409–414
- Farooq, M.U. (2000). *Examining a male teacher's attention in a mixed-sex EFL Japanese high school classroom based on the Sinclair-Coulthard model*. Unpublished MA thesis, University of Birmingham.
- French, J., & French, P. (1984). Gender imbalance in the primary classroom: An interactional account. *Educational Research* 26 (2), 127–36.
- Gass, S., & Varonis, E. (1986). Sex differences in NNS/NNS interactions. In R. Day (ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition*, 327–351. New York: Newbury House.
- Good, T., Sikes, N., & Brophy, J. (1973). Effects of teacher sex and student sex on classroom interaction. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 65(1), 74–87.
- Gök, F., Özdoğru, A.A., & Erdoğan, N. (2002). Content analysis for gender bias in Turkish elementary school textbooks. From <http://www.albany.edu/eqre/papers/39EQRE.pdf>.
- Gömleksiz, M.N. (2012). Elementary school students' perceptions of the new science and technology curriculum by gender. *Educational Technology and Society* 15(1), 116–126.
- Green, J., & Oxford, R. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 proficiency, and gender. *TESOL Quarterly* 29(2), 261–297.
- Guimond, S. & Roussel, L. (2001). Bragging about one's school grades: Gender stereotyping and students' perception of their abilities in science, mathematics, and language. *Social Psychology of Education* 4, 275–293.
- Gümüšoğlu, F. (1996). *Ders kitaplarında cinsiyetçilik (1928-1995)* (Sexism in textbooks (1928- 1995)). İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H.. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research* 77(1), 81–112.
- Hewings, M. (1992). Intonation and feedback in the EFL classroom. In M. Coulthard (ed.), *Advances in spoken discourse analysis*, , 183–196. London: Routledge.

- Jones, M.A., Kitetu, C., & Sunderland, J. (1997). Discourse roles, gender and language textbook dialogues: Who learns what from John and Sally? *Gender and Education* 9(4), 469–490.
- Jones, S., & Dindia, K. (2004). A meta-analytic perspective on sex equity in the classroom. *Review of Educational Research* 74 (4), 443–471.
- Jones, M.G., & Wheatley, J. (1990). Gender differences in teacher-student interactions in science classrooms. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* 27(9), 861–874.
- Kelly, A. (1988). Gender differences in teacher-pupil interactions: A meta-analytic review. *Research in Education* 39, 1–23.
- Kim, Y.K., & Sax, L.J. (2009). Student–faculty interaction in research universities: Differences by student gender, race, social class, and first-generation status. *Research in Higher Education* 50(5), 437–459.
- Koca, C. (2009). Gender interaction in co-ed physical education: A study in Turkey. *Adolescence*, 44: 173. Proquest, 165–185.
- Litosseliti, L. (2006). *Gender and language: Theory and practice*. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Lynch, I., & Nowosenetz, T. (2009). An exploratory study of students' constructions of gender in science, engineering and technology. *Gender and Education* 21(5), 567–581
- Lyster, R., & Mori, H. (2006). Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 28(2), 269–300.
- Mackey, A. (2006). Feedback, noticing and second language development: An empirical study of L2 classroom interaction. *Applied Linguistics* 27 (3), 405–430.
- Merrett, F., & Wheldall, K. (1992). Teachers' use of praise and reprimands to boys and girls. *Educational Review* 44(1), 73–79.
- O'Loughlin, K. (2002). The impact of gender in oral proficiency testing. *Language Testing* 19(2), 169–192.
- O'Sullivan, B. (2000). Exploring gender and oral proficiency interview performance. *System* 28(3), 373–386.
- Oxford, R. (1994). 'La difference continue ...': Gender differences in second/foreign language learning styles and strategies. In J. Sunderland (ed.), *Exploring gender: Questions and implications for English language education*, 140–147. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.
- Porreca, K. (1984). Sexism in current ESL textbooks. *TESOL Quarterly*, 18(4), 705–724.
- Poulou, S. (1997). Sexism in the discourse roles of textbook dialogues. *Language Learning Journal* 15(1), 68–73.
- Reay, D. (2001). Spice girls, 'nice girls', 'girlies' and tomboys: Gender discourses, girls' cultures and femininities in the primary classroom. *Gender and Education* 13(2), 153–166.
- Sadker, M., Sadker, D., & Klein, S. (1991). The issue of gender in elementary and secondary education. *Review of Research in Education*, 17, 269–334.

- Salisbury, J., Rees, G., & Gorard, S. (1999). Accounting for the differential attainment of boys and girls at school. *School Leadership and Management* 19(4), 403–426.
- Sax, L.J., & Harper, C.E. (2007). Origins of the gender gap: Pre-college and college influences on differences between men and women. *Research in Higher Education* 48(6), 669–694.
- She, H. (2000). The interplay of a biology teacher's beliefs, teaching practices and gender-based student-teacher classroom interaction. *Educational Research* 42(1), 100–111.
- Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1992). Towards an analysis of discourse. In M. Coulthard (ed.), *Advances in spoken discourse analysis*, 1–34. London: Routledge.
- Sivaslıgil, P. (2006). *Gender ideology in 6th, 7th, and 8th grade course books published by the Turkish Ministry of National Education*. Unpublished MA thesis, Çukurova University, Adana, Turkey.
- Spender, D. (1982). *Invisible women: The schooling scandal*. London: Writers and Readers Publishing.
- Spender, D. (1998). *Man made language*. London: Pandora.
- Stake, J.E., & Katz, J.F. (1982). Teacher-pupil relationships in the elementary school classroom: Teacher-gender and pupil-gender differences. *American Educational Research Journal* 19(3), 465–471.
- Sunderland, J. (1994). Differential teacher treatment-by-gender in the EFL classroom: Using ex-participants' perspectives. In J. Sunderland (ed.), *Exploring gender: Questions and implications for English language education*, 148–153. London: Prentice Hall.
- Sunderland, J. (1996). *Gendered discourse in the foreign language classroom: Teacher-student and student-teacher talk, and the social construction of children's femininities and masculinities*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Lancaster, England.
- Sunderland J. (1998). Girls being quiet: A problem for foreign language classrooms? *Language Teaching Research* 2(1), 48–62.
- Sunderland, J. (2000). New understandings of gender and language classroom research: texts, teacher talk and student talk. *Language Teaching Research* 4(2), 149–173.
- Sunderland, J., Cowley, M., Abdul Rahim, F., Leontzakou, C., & Shattuck, J. (2002). From representation towards discursive practices: Gender in the foreign language textbook revisited. In L. Litosseliti and J. Sunderland (eds.), *Gender Identity and Discourse Analysis*, 233–255. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Sunkar-Koçoğlu, Z. (1997). *Sex-based differences in the conversational behaviours of Turkish EFL students: An analysis of communication strategies*. Unpublished MA thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul
- Swann, J. (1992). *Girls, boys and language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Swann, J., & Graddol, D. (1988). Gender inequalities in classroom talk. *English in Education* 22(1), 48–65.

- Swiatek, M.A., Lupkowski-Shoplik, A., & O'Donoghue, C. (2000). Gender differences in above-level explore scores of gifted third through sixth graders. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 92(4), 718–723.
- Teixeira, A.B.M., Villani, C.E., & Nascimento, S.S.D. (2008). Exploring modes of communication among pupils in Brazil: Gender issues in academic performance. *Gender and Education* 20(4), 387–398.
- Tercanlioglu, L. (2004). Exploring gender effect on adult foreign language learning strategies. *Issues in Educational Research* 14(2), 181–193. <http://www.iier.org.au/iier14/tercanlioglu.html>
- Tercanhoğlu, L. (2005). Pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs about foreign language learning and how they relate to gender. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology* 3(1), 154–162.
- Yepez, M.E. (1994). An observation of gender-specific teacher behaviour in the ESL classroom. *Sex Roles* 30(1/2), 121–133.
- Younger, M., & Warrington, M. (1996). Differential achievement of girls and boys at GCSE: Some observations from the perspective of one school, *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 17, 299–314.
- Younger, M., & Warrington, M., & Williams, J. (1999). The gender gap and classroom interactions: reality and rhetoric? *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 20(3), 325–341.

APPENDIX 1

Participant Demographic Information Form

- 1) Name-Surname:
.....
- 2) Gender:
.....
- 3) Age:
.....
- 4) Place of Birth:
.....
- 5) Department:
.....
- 6) E-mail:
.....
- 7) High School
.....
- 8) Your mother's educational background
PhD () MA () BA () High School () Secondary School () Primary School ()
- 9) Your mother's job
.....
- 10) Your father's educational background
PhD () MA () BA () High School () Secondary School () Primary School ()

11) Your father's job

12) How long have you been learning English?

13) Do you speak any foreign language(s) other than English?

Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Sınıf İi Etkileşim: Türkiye'deki YDİ Sınıfında Bir Kadın ve Bir Erkek Öğretmenin Kadın ve Erkek Öğrencilerle İletişiminin İncelenmesi

Özet

Bu alıřma, İngilizcenin Yabancı Dil Olarak (YDİ) öğretildięi sınıflarda, öğretmenlerin kadın ve erkek öğrenciler ile olan sınıf içi iletişimini incelemektedir. alıřma için, Türkiye'de bir devlet üniversitesinin Hazırlık Okulunda İngilizcenin Yabancı Dil Olarak öğretildięi bir kadın ve bir erkek öğretmenin sınıfı, iki ay boyunca gözlemlenmiş ve videoya kaydedilmiştir. Yazıya dökülen veriler, Sinclair and Coulthard'ın (1975, 1992). Sınıf içi Söylem Analiz Modelinin bu alıřmaya uyarlanmış şekli ile analiz edilmiştir. alıřma bulguları genel olarak, her iki sınıfta da kadın ve erkek öğrencilere yöneltilen hem akademik ve hem de akademik olmayan öğretmen tümcelerinde eşit bir dağılım olmadığını göstermiştir. Sonuçlar, sınıf içi iletişim ve toplumsal cinsiyet ile ilgili alanyazına atıfta bulunularak tartışılmakta ve pedagojik önerilerde bulunmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Sınıf İi İletişim; Öğretmen-Öğrenci İletişimi; Sınıf İi Eşitlik/Eşitsizlik; İngilizcenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretildięi Sınıflar; Türkiye