

VERBAL INTERACTION BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE TEACHERS AND THEIR STUDENTS IN THE ENGLISH CLASSES

Azmi Septiana¹, Hamzah², and Zul Amri³

¹Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia, ✉ septianaazmi@gmail.com

²Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia

³Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia

Abstract

Verbal interaction involves using words and voice to exchange information between two or more people. In a classroom context, the interaction will result in comprehensible input and feedback from teacher to students and vice versa because both of them will exchange of ideas, thoughts, and feel during teaching and learning process. The study was qualitative that focused on the verbal interaction between male and female teachers and their students in the English classes at SMAN in Solok. The data collection method is video recording. The finding of this article shows that the male and the female teachers spent more time on content cross and the percentage showed that the female teachers ask more questions and criticize students than the male teachers. Meanwhile, the male teachers were more likely to give directions and lecture than the female teachers. Furthermore, there was no significant difference between the male and the female teachers in praising students.

Keywords: Verbal Interaction, Gender and Interaction

Introduction

In teaching and learning process, there is an interaction between teacher and students. This interaction is the important way to achieve students' level of acquisition in the classroom. Furthermore, the classroom interaction is influenced by the teacher's gender because male and female teachers are different in interacting with their students. According to Monsefi and Yaser (2015:1), gender is an affecting factor in the process of teacher-student interactions in the classroom. In other words, the gender of the teachers influences the quality and quantity of classroom interactions. These teachers will create their classroom interaction based on gender identities that will impact their interaction with the students. Based on preliminary observation, the researcher found that male English teachers tended to make jokes when interacting with students while female English teachers tended to ask more questions to the students. Besides based on a research conducted by Chavez (2000:32), male teachers communicate quickly and provide more opportunities for the student to have turns while female teachers ask more questions during classroom interaction. Based on the explanation, it is necessary to conduct a research about the verbal interaction between male and female teachers and their students because they have a different way of interacting with their students. Thus, the researcher is interested to conduct research about the verbal interaction between male and female teachers and their students in the English classes.

Furthermore, to analyze the classroom interaction, one of the guideline is by using Flanders' Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC). It is one of the important techniques to observe classroom interaction systematically. Flanders' Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC) has some strengths in analyzing classroom interaction in the teaching and learning process. Singh (2008:39) points out several advantages of using Flanders' Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC) to analyze teacher and students interaction in the classroom. First, the FIAC model is an effective tool to measure the social-emotional climate in the classroom. It means using Flanders' Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC) the teacher and the students can feel a different classroom interaction that created by each teacher. Second, FIAC model can be used to compare the behavior of teachers at different age levels and also different gender. Thus, by using FIAC, the teacher can evaluate their teaching style with other teachers because each teacher has a different characteristic in the teaching process. FIAC provides ten categories to classify classroom verbal interaction into three groups, namely, teacher talk, students talk, and silence or confusion. According to Flander (1970:34), the format of Flander Interaction Analysis Category (FIAC) has developed ten categories system: (1) accepting feeling; (2) praising or encouraging; (3) accepting ideas; (4) asking questions; (5) lecturing; (6) giving directions; (7) criticizing or justifying authority; (8) responding to the teacher; (9) initiating talk, and (10) silence or confusion.

There are some previous findings of gender differences influence the classroom interaction. First, the research conducted by Rasidi and Sahar (2012) with the title the effect of gender on the patterns of classroom interaction. The objective of the present study is to explore the effect of gender on the patterns of classroom interactions between teachers and students in Iranian EFL classrooms. The result showed that female teachers were more interactive, supportive and patient with their students than male teachers. Female teachers asked more referential questions, gave more compliments, and used fewer directive forms. Besides that Rashidi and Rad (2010) with the title analyzing patterns of classroom interaction in EFL classrooms in Iran. The result indicated that female teachers were more supportive than male teachers since they gave more positive feedback to the students. Meanwhile, the research conducted by Chavez (2000) with the title teacher and student gender and peer group gender composition in German foreign language classroom discourse. The finding reveals that male teachers used more directives than their female peers. Although female teachers used directives as well, most of the directives produced by them were in the form of requestives. Based on the findings, it can lead us to conclude that male and female teachers have classes with different interaction. That is the basic reason why the researcher want to know verbal interaction between male and female teachers and their students in the English classes.

As a result, the objective of the paper is to find out the types of verbal interaction occurred during the teaching and learning process. The question is: “What are the types of verbal interaction that occur during teaching and learning process at SMAN in Solok?”

Method

This research was conducted at SMAN in Solok where there were five schools: SMAN 1 Solok, SMAN 2 Solok, SMAN 3 Solok, SMKN 1 Solok, and SMAN 1 Gunung Talang. The instrument was video recording. Video recording was aimed to record the verbal interaction between male and female English teachers and their students during classroom interaction. Because the data was male and female English teachers’ utterance and students’ utterance, the researcher asked permission from the teachers and did video recording to collect the data. The data was collected by recording three times of the teaching and learning process at the same class. There were some stages of analyzing the data including organizing the data and coding process. It means the researcher transcribed the teacher’s talk and the students’ talk into the written form. Then, the researcher organized the data and labeled the categories the teacher’s talk and the students’ talk. There are some limitation of the methodology used. First, the camera cannot catch all the students’ move one by one. Second, the camera cannot record slow sounds from a long distance.

Results and Discussion

To determine the verbal interaction between male and female teachers and their students in the English classes, the researcher concluded the interaction based on the teachers’ gender. It can be seen in table 1:

Table 1. The Summary Result of Verbal Interaction of Female and Male Teachers

No	Types of Verbal Interaction	Female		Male	
		F	%	F	%
1	Accepts Feelings	0	0%	0	0%
2	Praise/Encouragement	35	2%	9	1%
3	Accepts Ideas	0	0%	0	0%
4	Asks Questions	636	33%	347	30%
5	Lecturing	220	11%	221	19%
6	Giving Direction	262	14%	192	16%
7	Criticizing/Justifying Authority	102	5%	18	2%
8	Students Response	636	33%	376	32%
9	Students Initiation	28	1%	5	0%
Total		1919	100%	1168	100%

Table 1 shows that the percentage of female teacher’s talk in the classroom interaction was 65%. It was spent in the following ways: accepts feelings (0%), praise/encouragement (2%), accepts ideas (0%), asks questions (33%), lecturing (11%), giving direction (14%), and criticizing/justifying authority (5%). Furthermore, the percentage of the students’ talk was 34% and was spent in the following ways: students response (33%), students initiation (1%). Besides it also showed that the percentage of male teacher’s talk in the

classroom interaction was 68%. It was spent in the following ways: accepts feelings (0%), praise/encouragement (1%), accepts ideas (0%), asks questions (30%), lecturing (19%), giving direction (16%), and criticizing/justifying authority (2%). Furthermore, the percentage of the students' talk was 32% and was spent in the following ways: students response (32%), students initiation (0%). Furthermore, the researcher analyzed the characteristic of the interaction of teachers, as follow:

Table 2: The Characteristic of the Interaction of Female and Male Teachers

No	Types of Verbal Interaction	Female		Male	
		F	%	F	%
1	Teacher Support	35	2%	9	1%
2	Content Cross	856	45%	568	49%
3	Teacher Control	364	19%	210	18%
4	Students Participations	664	35%	381	33%
	Total	1919	100%	1168	100%

The table described that content cross dominated the teaching and learning process. The content cross was gotten by adding the percentage category 4 and 5. The percentage illustrated that the female teachers spent 45% of the interaction in the content cross while male teachers spent 49% of the interaction. The second dominant interaction was students' participation. It means the students participated to answer the teacher's questions and take the initiative to talk during the interaction. The table showed that students' participation was 35% of the interaction and 33% of the interaction (by adding the percentage of category 8 and 9). Teacher control was the third dominant of the classroom interaction. It was gotten by adding the percentage of category 6 and 7. The female teachers spent 19% of the interaction to control the students while male teachers spent 18% of the interaction. In supporting the students, both male and female teachers did not take much time of the interaction (by adding the percentage of category 1,2 and 3).

Based on the result, it can be discussed that the male and the female English teachers spent more time on the content cross. It means most of the teaching and learning time was devoted to asking questions and lecturing. The result showed that the female teachers used 33% of the interaction to ask questions while the male teachers used 30% of the interaction. It means the female teachers asked more questions than the male teachers. Furthermore, the female teachers used 11% of the interaction to lecture while the male teachers used 19% of the interaction. It means the male teachers spent more time lecturing than the female teachers. This finding was in line with Chavez (2000). He stated that female teachers asked many questions to their students than male teachers. In teacher control, the female teachers used 14% of the interaction to give directions while the male teachers used 16% of the interaction. This finding was in line with Rasidi and Sahar (2012). They stated that female teachers used fewer directive forms than male teachers. Besides the female teachers used 5% of the interaction to criticize students while the male teachers used 2% of the interaction. This finding was in a line with Hopf and Hatzichristou (1999). They stated that female teachers were found to be more sensitive and give more warning to students about behavioral problems than male teachers. Furthermore, teacher support had a little proportion in the classroom interaction. it described that female teachers and male teachers did not take the time to accept students' feeling and students' ideas. In praising the students, the female teachers only used 2% of the interaction while the male teachers used 1% of the interaction. It means the percentage was almost similar. This finding was not in a line with Thorne (1979) and Sadker and Sadker (1992), they stated that female teachers gave more compliments to their students.

There were some implications that can be drawn as follow: the teaching and learning process was dominated by the teacher's talk. This condition implied the students were passive during teaching and learning process. The gender of the teachers influenced the way teacher to teach. This condition implied the way teachers interact with the students. Based on the results and discussion, it is suggested for further research to study students' interactions with other students in the classroom and add the number of schools to get more represent data

Conclusions

Based on the results and discussion, some conclusions can be drawn as follows: The male and female teachers spent more time on the content cross. It means most of the teaching and learning process was devoted to asking questions and lecturing. Besides that the percentage depicts the female teachers ask more questions and criticize students than the male teachers. Meanwhile, the male teachers were more likely to give directions and lecture than the female teachers. Furthermore, there was no significant difference between the male and the female teachers in praising students. This paper is important because it gives beneficial information about verbal interaction in the classroom and can be a reference for all teachers in creating good interaction in the classroom.

Acknowledgments

I would like to dedicate my sincere gratitude and appreciation to those who have given contribution in finishing this paper. My deepest gratitude goes to: Dr. Hamzah, M.A, M.M and Dr. Zul Amri, M.Ed who have given their contribution and suggestions for the improvement of this paper. Then, to my beloved parents who have supported me from the beginning until the end.

References

- Chavez, M. (2000). Teacher and Student Gender and Peer Group Gender Composition in German: Foreign Language Classroom Discourse: An exploratory study. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, 1019-1058.
- Hopf, D., & Hatzichristou, C. (1999). Teacher Gender-Related Influences in Greek Schools. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 69, 1-18.
- Flanders, N. (1970). *Analysing Teaching Behaviour*. Addison-Wesley: Mass.
- Monsefi, M., & Yaser, H. (2015). Male and Female EFL Teachers' Politeness Strategies in Oral Discourse and Their Effects on the Learning Process and Teacher-Student Interaction. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*. 3(2): 1-13.
- Rashidi, N., & Rafiee, R. M. (2010). Analyzing Patterns of Classroom Interaction in EFL Classrooms in Iran. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*. 7(3): 93-120.
- Rashidi, N., & Sahar, N. (2012). The Effect of Gender on the Patterns of Classroom Interaction. *Journal of Education*. 2(3): 30-36
- Sadker, M. and Sadker, D. (1992). *Teaching for Diversity: New Directions for Teaching and Learning*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Singh, Y. K. (2008). *Educational Technology: Teaching and learning*. New Delhi: APH Publishing Corporation.
- Thorne, B. (1979). *Claiming Verbal Space: Women Speech and Language for College Classrooms*. Paper Presented at the Research Conference on Educational Environments and Undergraduate Women. Wellesley College. Wellesley: MA.