GENDER IN THE EFL CLASSROOM: Differences in the teacher's reactions to boys' and girls' responses

Master's thesis

Anni Männynsalo

University of Jyväskylä
Department of Languages
English

November 2008

HUMANISTINEN TIEDEKUNTA
KIELTEN LAITOS

Anni Männynsalo
Gender in the EFL classroom: differences in the teacher's reactions to boys' and girls' responses

Pro Gradu -tutkielma
Englannin kieli
Marraskuu 2008 89 sivua + 1 liite

Tämän tutkimuksen tarkoituksena oli selvittää oppilaan sukupuolen vaikutusta vuorovaikutukseen opettajan kanssa englannin kielen luokkahuoneessa. Aikaisemmat tutkimukset ovat osoittaneet, että opettaja yleisesti antaa enemmän sekä positiivista että negatiivista huomiota pojille kuin tytöille. Tutkimuksessa tarkastellaan vuorovaikutusta opettajan ja hänen oppilaidensa välillä käyttäen apuna IRF- mallia (initiation-response-feedback), joka on yksi tyypillisimmistä rakenteista luokkahuonevuorovaikutuksessa sekä SETT viitekehystä, joka tuo uusimpiin tutkimuksiin pohjautuvaa näkökulmaa tutkimustuloksiin. Tarkemmin sanottuna työssä tutkittiin opettajan antamaa palautetta oppilaiden vastauksiin, jotta saataisiin selville onko palautteessa eroja opettajan tytöille ja pojille antaman palautteen välillä.

Tutkimuksen aineistona käytettiin Jyväskylän yliopiston kielten laitoksen neljää valmiiksi nauhoitettua ja litteroitua 45 minuutin englannin oppituntia. Luokassa oli kuusi 16–17-vuotiaasta tyttöä, kahdeksasta poikaa ja heidän naispuolinen opettajansa. Kyseinen tutkimus on lähestymistavaltaan laadullinen ja sen tarkoituksena on tarkastella tiettyjä aineistosta nousevia vuorovaikutusjaksoja, jotka mahdollisimman kattavasti tuovat esille eroja opettajan reagoinnissa oppilaiden vastauksiin.

Tutkimuksen tulokset osoittavat huomattavia eroja opettajan palautteessa ja käyttäytymisessä tyttöjen ja poikien välillä. Vuorovaikutusjaksot opettajan ja miespuolisten oppilaiden välillä olivat pidempiä ja haastavampia kuin tytöillä sekä etenkin palautteen luonne oli poikien kohdalla keskustelullisempaa ja laadukkaampaa. Toisaalta opettaja kohteli poikia huomattavasti suoremmin ja tyttöjä helläkätisemmin.

Yleisesti ottaen luokkahuonevuorovaikutusta ja sukupuolieroja on tutkittu melko paljon erikseen, mutta yhteisesti näiden aiheiden lisätutkimusta tarvitaan, jotta opettajat olisivat paremmin valmistautuneita ottamaan huomioon oppilaidensa tarpeet sekä vallitsevien stereotypioiden vaikutukset oppilaiden menestymiseen ja itsetuntoon kielten oppijoina.

Asiasanat: Classroom interaction, classroom discourse, discourse analysis (DA), conversation analysis (CA), IRF pattern, SETT framework

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction 4
2. Gender in language teaching 7
   2.1. Defining gender 7
   2.2. Gender in the EFL classroom 9
   2.3. Differential teacher-treatment 11
   2.4. Previous studies 16
3. Classroom discourse: exploring the IRF pattern 21
   3.1. Discourse analysis approach 21
   3.2. Conversation analysis and institutional talk 26
   3.3. Pedagogical features of language learning 31
   3.4. Corrective feedback and the treatment of error in the language classroom 34
   3.5. Previous studies 39
4. Methodological framework 43
   4.1. Implications and research questions for the study 43
   4.2. Data 45
   4.3. Methods of analysis 46
5. Findings 51
   5.1. Similarities in the teacher's feedback to boys' and girls' responses 51
   5.2. Differences in the teacher's feedback to boys' and girls' responses 63
      5.2.1. The teacher's attitude towards the boys' responses 63
      5.2.2. The teacher's attitude towards the girls' responses 69
      5.2.3. Male dominance in the EFL classroom 76
6. Discussion and conclusion 81

BIBLIOGRAPHY
APPENDIX

1. Introduction

Interaction between the teacher and a student is and has always been an interesting and a fruitful subject of study (See e.g. Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, Mehan 1979, Drew and Heritage 1992, Nassaji and Wells 2000, Cazden 2001, Seedhouse 2004, Walsh 2006, Lee 2007, Constantinou 2008) because communication in the classroom always differs from communication in a normal social setting. Moreover, when interaction is considered from the point of view of gender in the EFL classroom (e.g. Sunderland 1992, 1994, 1998, 2000, 2001, 2006, Swann 1992, Lindroos 1995, Goddard and Patterson 2000), it can be extremely fascinating and useful. Teachers' favouritism, inequality and gender bias towards their pupils are usually considered to be taboo in the world of education and it is important that this area of study gets the attention it deserves. As Constatinou (2008: 28) points out, in the last few years, the attention that has been paid to gender bias has been too little. She continues to say that one reason for this might be that most educators feel that inequality in the classroom is a thing of the past, and that some consider that it only exists for females. "Re-addressing the gender issue and seeking ways to better understand the phenomenon is a crucial step toward educational equity" (Constantinou 2008: 28).

Gender is a concept that is more than only the biological differences a male and a female possess. The difference a boy and a girl have in the classroom is not only a result of difference in chromosomes, but also of the personalities they have, as well as the context and the atmosphere they are in at a certain time. In addition to these social differences, the teacher plays an important role in guiding the pupils in certain directions and building certain stereotypes that can be hard to overcome. Teachers constantly evaluate and react to pupils' utterances and errors when interacting together in the classroom. Especially the reaction a teacher has when a pupil produces a response that is not what the teacher expected the correct answer to be can be very influential to the pupil's development and motivation as a language

learner. As can be seen in the present study, the differences in the teacher's feedback can be substantial according to the gender of the pupil.

According to Sunderland (1992: 81), the word "gender", in the foreign language teacher, usually evokes only complaints about the use of *he* and sexism in textbooks. She suggests that there are other levels where gender operates and they include "language itself; and classroom processes, including learning processes, teacher-learner interaction, and learner-learner interaction". The present study will be concentrating on interaction between the teacher and learner, as opposed to studying interaction between male and female pupils or male and female teachers.

When studying and analysing classroom discourse, especially the teacher's reactions to pupils' responses, different approaches to discourse analysis have to be examined quite carefully. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) have been pioneers in discovering the secret of classroom discourse through a three part sequence that often occurs in classroom interaction. This sequence is called IRF (Interaction-Response-Feedback/Follow-up) and in addition to Sinclair and Coulthard, it has been studied, used and also criticized by many contemporary researches (e.g. Nassaji and Wells 2000, Seedhouse 2001, Walsh 2006, Lee 2007). Considering the vast use of the IRF pattern in studying classroom interaction, it gives a well-deserved starting point to analysing the present study. Nevertheless, for a closer examination of the phenomenon, the IRF pattern alone is not enough in order to get to the root of classroom discourse. Other approaches and methodologies such as conversation analysis (CA) and one of its more contemporary frameworks (SETT) (Walsh 2006) for analysing classroom discourse are needed. SETT provides a more pedagogical approach to classroom interaction and that is why the present study relies on that as well. The present study will also consider the treatment of error as well as the institutionality of classroom talk

to see if they can explain some of the reasons for gender inequity in the teacher's behaviour.

The more I studied this area of interaction, the more I realised that gender bias is relatively well studied as such, but when information is gathered for such specific purposes as the present study, surprisingly few studies exist. In many studies the emphasis is on gender in language use or gender in texts and less research is actually done on the interaction between teacher and student in a learning context. The present study also combines classroom discourse, as mentioned above, to studying differential teacher treatment in the EFL classroom and from this point of view there are not any previous studies to be found; to study whether there are any differences in the teacher's feedback in the IRF sequence to pupils' responses when the pupil is a boy or a girl. The purpose of this study is also to fill a gap in the research of gender in the language classroom as it has been neglected far too long. Although it is not the aim of this small-scale study, hopefully it will bring forward new insights into how to make teachers more aware of their own practises in maintaining stereotypes and gender bias in the classroom. These are often very hard to recognize without closer interactional analysis.

2. Gender in language teaching

The present study focuses on the differences between girls and boys in two respects; first it examines how the teacher's reaction to the pupils' responses differs according to the gender of the student and second, how the quality of feedback differs whether the student is a boy or a girl. In order to take these factors into consideration, we need to define gender as well as look at some previous studies on differential teacher treatment and gender bias in the classroom.

2.1. Defining gender

When trying to define the word *gender*, Goddard and Patterson (2000: 1) make a clear distinction between gender and *sex* so that the latter is about "socially expected characteristics rather than biology" and that gender has to do with behaviour, for example, masculine and feminine characteristics that people posses whether being biologically a boy or a girl. According to Goddard and Patterson (2000: 27), gender is a daily, continuous part of our social behaviour, something we do rather than being a "fixed and unalterable dimension that is imposed on us from on high." This can also be said about classroom behaviour, which is ever changing and altered by the participants in that context. Graddol and Swann (1989: 8) agree with this kind of definition as they also see gender as a social rather than a biological phenomenon in the sense that people learn the attitudes and behaviour appropriate to their sex, rather than are born with them.

According to Graddol and Swann (1989: 3), sexual inequality is an appealing and popular area of study in the academic community, but also within the wider public. Their definition of gender is similar to Goddard and Patterson's:

> Whether one is male or female is not just a biological fact, it assigns one to membership of one of two social groups. A great many consequences – social, economic and political – flow from this membership. Women and men, girls and boys, are treated in systematically different ways (by both men and women); they have different experiences at school, at work and at home; they do different things and different things are expected of them. In other words, women and men have different life experiences to an extend that cannot be satisfactorily explained by simple biological differences between the sexes.
>
> Graddol and Swann (1989: 8)

Even though it is a fact that women and men are treated differently in many aspects of life, my aim is to find out how the differences occur and in what situations in the classroom.

Swann (1992: 8) agrees with Goddard and Patterson (2000) with the fact that it can be dangerous to explain the differences between boys and girls only in biological terms as these terms only underline people's acceptance of inequalities and differences between boys and girls. In addition, explaining gender differences only in social terms can lead to a view that "external forces are so powerful that there is little possibility of change" (Swann 1992:11). When going deeper into gender definitions and characteristics, Morgan (as quoted in Goddard and Patterson 2000: 32) points out that "males are seen as logical, rational, aggressive, exploitative, strategic, independent and competitive", as females, on the other hand, are thought to be "intuitive, emotional, submissive, empathic, spontaneous, nurturing and co-operative." Morgan summarizes these by implying that man is "a leader and decision-maker" and woman is "a loyal supporter and follower" (p. 32). Graddol and Swann (1989: 13-40) point out that men are stereotypically portrayed as loud voiced and deeper pitched, whereas women softly spoken and higher and lighter pitched. Graddol and Swann (1989: 13-40) studied the voice differences of men and women quite extensively and concluded that some apparently natural characteristics of men's and women's voices cannot be explained as only being anatomical differences between sexes because those aspects are acquired when people learn cultural norms of masculine and feminine behaviour. Perhaps this is one of the reasons why boys get

more attention in the classroom as well because they have acquired a masculine behaviour.

According to Kramer (as quoted in Graddol and Swann 1989: 70), a survey on people's attitudes towards female and male speech conducted by Cheris Kramarae showed that *gossip* and *talk a lot* were very often characterized as female speech. This is inconsistent with the fact that while girls are often stereotyped as the "overtalkative" sex, it is still boys who dominate classroom talk. Moreover, Graddol and Swann (1989: 71) point out that the majority of classroom interaction studies show that boys talk more than girls. In order to explain this inconsistency as to why girls and women are seen and stereotyped as talkative, Spender (as quoted in Graddol and Swann 1989: 73) argued that "a double standard is in operation in attitudes to talk." Spender claims that a female who is portrayed as being talkative is often one who talks as much as a man and when "females are seen to talk about HALF AS MUCH AS MALES, they are judged as dominating talk" (p. 73).

In this section some general aspects of gender differences between males and females have been discussed as background information and for the purpose of pointing out that defining gender is not as straightforward as it may sound. Next, the gender issues are considered in a specific context; the foreign language classroom. After this, in section 2.3, the teacher's behaviour in terms of the gender of the pupil is discussed in more detail.

2.2 Gender in the EFL classroom

In the present study, it is important to separate the study of gender from any feministic perspectives or opinions and only focus on its value inside the classroom. There have been many studies concerning interaction that takes place in the foreign language classroom. According to Graddol and Swann (1989: 2-3), in addition to linguistics, there are many authors studying language and gender, for example in the area of women's studies and

sociology. However, studies on gender related to the interaction between a student and a teacher in the language classroom are relatively few.

According to Swann (1992: 3), gender differences are reinforced every day in schools and classrooms. She continues to say that schools cannot be held responsible for producing gender inequalities but they will contribute to them. Delamont (as quoted in Swann 1992:3) argues that gender bias is harmful and it can limit both girls' and boys' subject choices, their personal and social lives and even their career opportunities. Delamont continues to claim that when schools could be alleviating the negative aspects of gender roles, they often reinforce issues such as sex segregations, stereotypes and discriminations which bring forward sex roles with negative connotations in the outside world. Swann (1992: 11) points out that it is important to understand that diversity and contradictions exist in classrooms and they "can be exploited by those who wish to promote change" in order for boys and girls to have more learning opportunities.

According to Sunderland (1998: 49) as well, there has not been much research done on gendered discourse in the language classroom and that even though gender has been quite widely investigated in foreign language education, there are still very few studies of gender and interaction in the FL classroom. The focus of her study was on girls' and boys' talk to the teacher in the foreign language classroom. Even though this is not what the present study will be focusing on *per se*, Sunderland's study (discussed in more detail in section 2.4.) does have some interesting insights concerning gender specifically in the EFL classroom. She believes that there are reasons to why curricular subjects make a difference to the gendered nature of classroom discourse. This means that different characteristics can make a foreign language classroom different from other subjects in terms of gendered talk as, for example, there are at least two languages in use in the language classroom, there is usually much more talking and the teacher may try to talk

less than the students to facilitate more speaking opportunities to the students (Sunderland 1998: 52-53). She claims that these characteristics are the reason why the answer to a "non-subject-specific" research question such as "does the teacher pay more attention to girls or to boys?" is probably different when asked of language classrooms.

2.3. Differential teacher-treatment

According to Sunderland (2000: 159), there seems to exist an ongoing pattern of male dominance in classroom interaction, where in a classroom situation boys are given more negative and positive attention than girls. She makes a distinction between the quality and quantity of attention given to male students, as "*kind* of attention is likely [...] to be what counts" (p.161). In other words, Sunderland (1994: 137) claims that gender affects the proceedings in a classroom, for example, in how much and what kind of attention the teacher gives to boys and girls in the classroom. She goes on saying that the studies done on teacher attention have shown that teachers give more attention to boys than girls, although this kind behaviour is not necessarily favouring students, "but responding to them actively" (Sunderland 1994: 137). Meyer and Thompson (as quoted in Sunderland 1994: 138) found in their study that boys actually got the blame more often than girls. In addition, she claims that boys have a tendency to talk more to the teacher than the girls. Sunderland (1994: 148) also shows how "variously, boys get more blame, approval, disapproval and instructions than girls, and that girls who call out are reprimanded more than boys who call out." Webster (as quoted in Sunderland 1998: 53) also found that teenaged boys received more teacher solicits and that the difference was mostly due to the fact that boys received more disciplinary solicits than girls.

Sunderland (1994: 148) points out how little different teacher-treatment and gender differences have been studied in the language classroom. She continues to say that it is unclear if there are "any patterns of differential

teacher treatment-by-gender [...] specific to EFL". However, Sunderland continues to say that research that has been done in non-EFL classes have found there to be some differences in both how much and what kind of attention teachers gives to his/her pupils, for example in maths, boys have been found to receive more *wait time* from the teachers, and girls have been asked more *product questions*, such as "What's the answer to number 6?", and boys more *process questions*, such as "Why is the answer to number 6 thirty-three metres?" (p. 148).

What is interesting about teachers paying more attention to male pupils is that even though teachers think they are distributing their attention equally or even consciously trying to give more attention to girls, studies show that this is usually not the case. According to Spender (as quoted in Sunderland 1992: 88), after studying numerous transcripts, those teachers who thought they had spent more time with the girls, had in fact spent the minimum of 58 per cent with the boys and a teacher who had spent 34 per cent of her time with the girls had reported that "the boys […] were complaining about me talking to the girls all the time". One problem that can rise from this is that male dominance can become natural in the EFL classroom (Sunderland 1992: 88). Sunderland (1992: 89) suggests that in addition to boys getting more speaking practise and feedback, the teacher can also treat girls and boys differently by "varying the level of difficulty of questions by gender, and employing double standards". When group work is concerned, however, Cook-Gumperz et al. (2001: 110) noticed in their study that girls in a mixed sex group played a larger organizational part and that when "verbal sparring" occurred, it was most likely to happen between girls as a way to compete over control of the group's activities. These findings show an opposite view to the more commonly discovered pattern of gender separation, where in situations such as open conversation, boys have been the dominating force (Swann as quoted in Cook-Gumperz 2001: 110).

According to Swann (1992: 47), it is important for the teacher to be aware of gender differences in language, for example in language use, as they will be challenged (or maintained) in the classroom. In addition, the teacher should decide how to respond to the language of boys and girls and take gender differences into account in teaching and learning. Sunderland (1994: 5-6) has, in a quite similar way, suggested that gender is something that can be reproduced in the classroom, as the language classroom plays an important role in reproducing gender. In addition, Swann (1992: 51-52) points out that many studies have discovered different ways that gender bias is maintained in the classroom, for example boys are more outspoken even though there are pupils who are quiet in both sexes, boys tend to be more confident and stand out more than girls, they sit separately and choose "gender- typed" written topics, "boys are often openly disparaging towards girls". In addition, the teachers make distinctions between the different sexes for disciplinary and administrative reasons or in order to motivate students, teachers accept certain behaviour from boys but not from girls. Swann (1992: 69) also points out that "if gender- typed talk is regarded as normal, it is likely that it will be supported by all participants in an interaction".

Swann (1992: 68) also claims that although many studies suggest that, in a classroom, boys are the ones who dominate mixed-sex talk and girls who give away power, it is usually the teacher who, often unconsciously, supports discrimination based on gender. Even though much evidence shows that boys "take up more verbal space than girls" (p. 68-69), it is not as straightforward as it sounds; the context in which the pupils are at a given point, for example how the classroom is organized, what kind of activities take place or what kind of attitudes the teacher has, affects the actual situation as well. In addition, Graddol and Swann (1989: 73) point out that it is important to realize that the amount of talk also depends on different factors, for example personality, emotional state, social identity, the roles speakers play and the conversational goals they have.

Sunderland (1998: 51) makes an interesting point that many studies position girls as “victims” and that the boys’ dominant behaviour is “detrimental to girls’ academic progress and development of self-esteem”. She also continues to claim that when gender bias is considered from the point of view of student–teacher discourse in other classrooms than the language classroom, studies have not found any evidence of male dominance and that, in fact, in some classes it was the girls who initiated more interactions with the teacher than boys did.

How the teacher responds to the pupils is also mentioned by Swann (1992: 69), but what is emphasised is the relationship between the girls and boys, and the effects of gendered texts and talk around the texts. She suggests that teachers themselves should monitor all the aspects (activities, behaviour, texts etc.) of classroom interaction, as well as use the strategies available in order to create equal opportunities to all pupils (p. 163-236). However, too much intervening could harm the teaching process, as it could lead to ignorance towards other aspects of education.

Lindroos (1995) presents an interesting viewpoint in her study on gender and language classroom research as she explains the complexity of the field. She claims that gender is defined in a given context and therefore cannot be analysed by using stereotypes or discarding other features, such as discourse, that are necessary in forming the situation. The context, on the other hand, is usually the same in these kinds of studies, as the classroom seems to be the natural choice. The main focus of Lindroos’ (1995) study was to examine interruptions that took place in the classroom. The dominance of male pupils was studied by measuring the number and quality of interruptions that occurred during class. The study of interruptions has been “highlighted especially when analysing language and gender” (West and Zimmerman,

1983, as quoted by Lindroos 1995). Perhaps it is related to power that the male pupils have and which the female teacher then supports.

As already established, according to Graddol and Swann (1989: 71), there is evidence of teachers paying more attention to boys and giving them more disapproval, praise and encouragement. In addition, it can be the teacher who rewards the same behaviour in boys that they discourage in girls. For example, Sadker and Sadker (as quoted in Graddol and Swann 1989: 72) found that boys were several times more likely to call out answers, which was accepted by the teacher more often than girls, when they called out. Likewise, Brooks (as quoted in Sunderland 1998: 50) "found a tendency for male college students to *interrupt* more than female college students in some contexts". In addition, Kelly (as quoted in Sunderland 1998: 50) concluded in a meta-analysis of 81 studies of gender and classroom interaction that just as likely as boys, girls volunteer answers in class, but it is the boys who are more likely to call out the answers. Graddol and Swann (1989: 72) claim that "boys' greater participation in classroom talk comes about because of an interaction between the teacher's behaviour and that of the pupils." In their study, they found teachers who encouraged boys by using very subtle cues, such as eye gaze and boys who were talkative seemed to be successful within very different teaching styles. In addition, as male pupils seem to be the dominant sex in verbal interaction, Cazden (2001: 86) suggests that because female pupils as a group can do even better than male pupils in "K-12 school grades", opportunities to become confident and fluent in speaking in public could, in fact, be the most important aspect of gender equity in classrooms or in other words, the teacher has to make a distinction between what the pupil knows and the situations in which he or she is "most apt to perform well". According to Constantinou (2008: 29), a research reported that "the overall ratio of teacher-student interaction favored males". MacDonald (as quoted in Constantinou 2008: 29) points out that teachers usually have more verbal and positive interactions with boys than with girls. In addition, teachers give

male students more corrective feedback than they do with female students (Daunbar& O'Sullivan as quoted in Constantinou 2008: 29).

The research done in the field of gender in the classroom shows many areas of interaction where differences in the teacher's behaviour, according to the gender of the pupil, can be found. Some studies claim that teacher's give more positive attention to boys than girls and some that they give more negative feedback to boys. Especially in the language classroom gender bias seems to play an important role as many stereotypes are maintained every day. The complex interaction between the teacher and his/her pupils in this specific context is now further examined by introducing a similar study in the field of gender in the language classroom as the present study is.

2.4. Previous studies

Previous studies that have combined classroom discourse, especially features of the IRF and SETT, with differential teacher treatment according to the gender of the pupil have not been found in the process of the present study. At the Department of Languages at the University of Jyväskylä there is a Pro Gradu thesis that has studied how "gender influences the choice of discourse strategies in a cross-gender conversation" (Brilli and Potka 1988: 2). However, this study does not consider gender differences in the classroom, but in a recorded conversation between men and women of two groups in a laboratory setting with no spontaneous conversation between the participants.

The most relevant study for the present study is that of Sunderland (1998). This study is closely related to the present study in the sense that it examined how a pupils' gender affects interaction with the teacher and it provides important findings in terms of gender bias as well as aspects of teacher-student interaction. More closely, its main objective was to study student-to-teacher discourse, but it also has many interesting findings on teacher-to-

student discourse, which are relevant to the present study. According to Sunderland (1998: 48), most of quantitative and qualitative studies of *gendered* classroom discourse have discovered findings of great concern in terms of the quantity and quality of attention the teacher gives to female students and the amount of talk girls produce. She continues to claim that in the language classroom findings can be different, because it is often considered by many teachers to be “a girls’ world”.

The focus of Sunderland’s (1998) study was the foreign language classroom and the talk of girls and boys to the teacher. For reasons of space, she only reported the ‘student-to-teacher’ discourse, but also briefly referred to the teacher-to-student discourse “in order to provide important context” (p. 49). In her study, she uses the term *student solicit*, which is “an utterance which requires and often results in a verbal response (or which results in *or* requires a behavioural one) from the teacher very soon after the uttering of the solicit” (p. 60). Sunderland wanted to see if gendered student-talk that has been known to happen in other subject classrooms, would happen in language classrooms in a different way. Specially, she wanted to see “to what extend the language classroom produces *specifically* gendered interaction events” (Sunderland 1998: 56).

The research was conducted in a year 7 German classroom, which was chosen because it had an Equal Opportunities Policy as their curriculum, which according to Sunderland (1998: 57), made the classroom a more interesting and relevant site to conduct research that is gender-related. As is the case in the present study, Sunderland wanted equal numbers of girls and boys “in order to obviate the possibility of what looked like a ‘gender effect’ in fact being a ‘majority group’ or minority group’ effect” (p. 58). The class consisted of a female teacher, 14 boys and 13 girls. The students were all from an English background (with two boys of Chinese descent) and they were 11 or 12 years old from a range of socioeconomic backgrounds. The

class had two German lessons every week and almost always the students would sit next to a person with the same sex. Sunderland observed, audio-recorded and transcribed the happenings of 12 lessons.

To ensure accuracy, Sunderland used SPSS to analyse quantitatively the findings, which took the form of figures for the 'average boy' and the 'average girl', percentages within gender groups, rank orders of frequencies and statistical significance of gender differences in frequencies. Before these findings were presented, Sunderland indicated the findings of teacher-student research in order to allow the student-teacher analysis "to be seen in context" (p. 62). These findings are even more relevant to the present study than the latter ones. According to Sunderland (1998: 62-63), the teacher gave more of her attention to the boys than the girls in terms of:

- number of times boys' names were mentioned
- number of solicit-words
- number of academic solicits
- number of non-academic routine solicits
- proportion of non-academic disciplinary solicits
- number of comments.

However, Sunderland found that the teacher asked the girls:

- a greater proportion of academic solicits which they were expected to respond to in German, and
- a greater proportion of questions which required an answer of more than one word than the boys.

What was interesting was that Sunderland (1998: 67) found a slightly larger proportion of the girls' responses to the teacher's *academic solicits* as treated as *broadly correct* rather than *broadly incorrect*. Boys, on the other hand, were more likely to have their academic solicits met with *non-academic* (including *disciplinary*) *responses* by the teacher. Boys were also more likely than girls to

have their non-academic responses met with disciplinary rather than *routine* responses. Sunderland's overall picture of teacher–student discourse was that the girls got less teacher attention than the boys, and the girls were seen by the teacher as the more academic gender group, and because of that the girls were more academically challenged by the teacher. Sunderland (1998: 70) points out that there were both qualitative and quantitative differences and similarities here. The girls' relative keenness to 'volunteer an answer' in German represented a gender difference. According to Sunderland (1998: 70), this seemed to be one factor in the girls' more frequent use of 'unsolicited solicits'.

In summary, as regards the production of solicits, Sunderland (1998: 69) found that the 'average girl' produced more solicits, more academic solicits *and* more non-academic solicits. The girls also produced *significantly* more solicit-words, a *significantly* greater proportion of 'unsolicited solicit', volunteered answers in German *significantly* more but produced shorter solicits than the 'average boy'. According to Sunderland (1998: 69), these findings as a whole are very interesting in the sense that even though the teacher directed more of her attention (by giving more solicits and solicit-words) to the male students, it was the female students who produced more solicits, more solicit-words and more unsolicited solicits to the teacher. She continues to point out that such findings, although not unknown, are quite unusual. These findings could be explained for the fact that this was a language classroom (where girls are usually expected to do better than boys), because the girls were more verbose than the boys, who usually *monopolize* the classroom interaction (Sunderland 1998: 69). Even though the girls seemed to be more active and confident, Sunderland (1998: 70) claims that this was, in fact, not the case. First of all, the girls' solicits were shorter and secondly, "the *proportion* of their academic solicits relative to their non-academic ones was similar to that of boys, and the boys asked about or checked the meaning of a German word or phrase proportionately more than

did the girls" (p. 70). Nonetheless, Sunderland (1998: 70) found that overall the girls' received more challenging questions, "in terms of expected length of response (a *significant* gender difference) and the fact that their answers were more often expected to be in German than the boys' (this difference was approaching significance)".

What is controversial about this study is that in one aspect the girls are portrayed as actually being more active than the boys and that boys do not have to "dominate the classroom in all respects, in that girls may make more contributions, of many different types" (s. 75), but then, on the other hand, as mentioned above, Sunderland (1998: 70) states that this is not the case, because the contributions, for example, were shorter than with the boys. I agree with Sunderland that 'boys dominating' is not as simple as it sounds, as it is usually girls who actually do better in languages than boys. But when attention given by the teacher is concerned, it is undoubtedly boys who dominate. Girls as a group, as opposed to boys, were in Sunderland's study doing quite well in many ways, for example, they created many learning opportunities for themselves by making more solicits to the teacher.

Now that the issues of gender overall and specifically in the language classroom has been presented and the most relevant previous study discussed in relation to the present study, it is time to focus on the interaction that takes place in the classroom. The aim of the next section is to discuss different approaches to examining classroom discourse that are relevant to the present study and to give perspective to the differential teacher treatment in terms of the gender of the pupil.

3. Classroom discourse: exploring the IRF pattern

The study of classroom discourse has many approaches and every researcher in this field has his or her arguments on what is the best way to analyze discourse in the classroom context. However, there does exist some consensus among the scholars; it all started with discourse analysis (DA) and the IRF pattern during the late 1960's. Over time, this approach to classroom discourse has undergone criticism and it has been modified and challenged to meet the needs of today's classroom interaction. In this section, it will be discussed how the IRF pattern has been examined in different approaches in order to show its relevance in analyzing classroom discourse. In addition, discourse analysis is viewed and compared with another significant and more recent approach to classroom discourse, conversation analysis (CA), which seems to offer better solutions to problems of analyzing sequences and turn taking in the classroom. The CA will be presented in sections 3.2. in relation to institutional talk. Even though the DA and CA are divided into different sections, there is going to be some overlap due to the fact that they are often discussed in comparison to one another. In section 3.3., pedagogical views in terms of language learning are discussed in relation to classroom discourse, especially how the teacher's goals affect the way he/she gives feedback to pupils. Before introducing some previous studies that are closely related to the present study, corrective feedback is discussed in section 3.4.

3.1. Discourse analysis approach

According to Seedhouse (2004: 56), "any current attempt at analysis of L2 classroom interaction is very much built on the foundations of what has been achieved through DA approach". One of the most well-known L1 classroom interaction analyses under the DA approach is Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) model of a three-part sequence, which is generally known in Britain as teacher *initiation*, learner *response*, and teacher *follow-up* or *feedback* (IRF) and in America as *initiation*, *response* and *evaluation* (IRE) (Seedhouse 2004: 56).

Seedhouse (2004: 56-57) goes on saying that it is important to note that "a full-scale and explicit DA model of the organization of L2 classroom interaction" has not yet been published, although most of the studies on classroom interaction have been explicitly based on it. However, the basic IRF exchange structure is impossible to ignore in any classroom talk (Edwards and Mercer, as quoted in Sunderland 2001: 1) as "radical departures from the IRF have never been achieved" (Sunderland 2001: 6).

As mentioned above, Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) are pioneers in studying classroom discourse. Their main goal was to find out who controls discourse in the classroom, as well as to see how the roles of the speaker and listener pass from one person to another (1975: 1). According to Sinclair and Coulthard (1975: 21), typical interaction in the classroom consists of "an *initiation* by the teacher, followed by a *response* from the pupil, followed by *feedback* to the pupils response from the teacher." In other words, Sinclair and Coulthard (1975: 24-27) have modelled a system of analysis with different types of *ranking* of discourse, one of the most well known being *IRF- structure* which is based on *teaching exchange* with the elements of *initiation*, *response* and *feedback*. The structure is also classified as *opening*, *answering* and *follow-up* (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975:27). An example from the data of the present study, where the class is going through some grammar rules, illustrates this pattern:

1 T Ville (names changed) on yhtä komea kuin Tom Cruise (*Vili is as handsome as T.C.)*
2 (1.9)
3 T helppo (*easy)*
4 (3.6)
5 T sanokko Tiina (*would you say it Tiina*)
6 LF3 aa Ville is as <ha:ndshome [as]> Tom Cruise
7 T [as]
8 T <handsome (0.5) as (1.3) Tom> (0.8) Cruise
9 (2.7)
10 T <yhtä komea kuin> (*as handsome as*)

The first teacher utterance is a clear *initiation* from the teacher to the class to translate the sentence on line 1. On line 5 the teacher names a female pupil to translate the sentence when there are no volunteers. Line 6 is a *response* from the pupil. The teacher then accepts the pupil's response (*a follow-up*) by repeating what the pupil said (on line 8-10) and at the same time emphasizing the part of the utterance that is crucial to the grammatical rules they are learning.

In the present study, I will mostly focus on analysing the *follow- up* in relation to the answer a student produces, especially when the response is not correct and some kind of corrective feedback is required from the teacher. According to Sinclair and Coulthard (1975: 48), the function of *follow-up* is "to let the pupil know how well he/she has performed." They have also suggested that a *follow-up* is not only the teacher's acceptance or comment on the pupil's reply, but can also be an evaluation. According to Sinclair and Coulthard (1975: 49), evaluation always exists in discourse between the teacher and a pupil, although more often it is expressed in an indirect way.

Sinclair and Coulthard (1975: 54) also talk about *re-initiation,* which is a situation where the teacher gets a wrong answer from a pupil and has two ways of dealing with it: he/she can "work him round to the right answer or he can keep the question and move on to another child." This type of structure is always followed by some kind of feedback or follow-up. It is worth noticing that the structure of *IRF* does not always seem to follow the rules of *initiation*, *response* and *feedback*. Although many of the discourse units do fulfil the direct categories, it is suggested by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975: 50-56) that the structure can also be *I* or *IR*, for example when the teacher asks the pupils to do something without assuming and expecting a response. In the same way a pupil can respond to the teacher's request to do something without expecting any kind of feedback. This is important to realise when analysing the data of the present study.

Following the footsteps of Sinclair and Coulthard, Seedhouse (2004: 57) explains the basic idea of the DA approach and of the classroom coding schemes in the following way: "An interactant makes one move on one level at a time. The move the teacher makes can be specified and coded as a pedagogical move, for example, *initiates* or *replies*." According to Walsh (2006: 39), discourse analysis is a traditional, quantitative approach where codings, such as the IRF sequence, are used to record observations in the classroom. However, Seedhouse (2004: 55-56) claims that the DA approach has certain limitations when used in isolation and thus he argues that it should be integrated into the CA approach. Seedhouse (2004: 59-62) takes the conventional DA approach further and reanalyzes some IRF/IRE codings using the CA methodology. First of all, the traditional DA approach analyzes in a quick and complete way and often shows how two extracts of classroom interaction are very similar, but when reanalyzed by using the CA approach, it can be seen how the somewhat simple and predictable IRF/IRE cycle sequence is "in fact dynamic, fluid, and locally managed on a turn-by-turn basis to a considerable extent" (p. 62). What this tries to show us is that although the teacher is controlling most of the speech exchange, the IRF/IRE pattern should not be considered as predictable, as a teacher does not know what a student's response is going to be (Seedhouse 2004: 62). Moreover, it shows that the interaction in the classroom is not by all means completely closed with the IRF/IRE cycle pattern (Seedhouse 2004: 64).

The discourse analysis approach has undergone plenty of criticism and one of the basic problems of this approach is that teachers are portrayed "as making one pedagogical action on one level at a time" as opposed to teachers actually having "multiple separate pedagogical concerns" and that the interaction in the classroom is, in fact, "operating simultaneously on multiple levels" (Seedhouse 2004: 64). Seedhouse (2004: 65) argues that one reason why the DA approach overly simplifies classroom interaction is because it

has to do so in order for the DA system to work. According to Walsh (2006: 39), the DA analysis is scientific and objective. Like Seedhouse (2004), he continues to point out why this coding system has underdone so much criticism, for example Chaudron (as quoted in Walsh 2006: 43) claims that researchers observing the classroom may not agree on how to record their observations. Seedhouse (as quoted in Walsh 2006: 43) also points out that "coding systems fail to take account of context and 'evaluate all varieties of L2 classroom interaction from a single perspective and according to a single criteria'." In the DA approach, Walsh (2006: 47) points out that some of these limitations, especially in the Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) method, are due to the fact that when the data was recorded in the 60's, primary school classrooms had more clear power and status relationships, whereas the contemporary language classrooms are considered to be more equal and learner-initiated. According to Sunderland (1998: 50), much of the interaction that takes place in the classroom is not composed of "unasked for or unresponded to turns", as the IRF sequences often illustrate. In addition, it sometimes is the case that a teacher *solicit*, for instance an academic question, results in a response from the student which may itself be a solicit where the teacher then responds (Sunderland 1998: 49). Furthermore, pupils can produce *comments* that are unsolicited by the teacher and that do not require a teacher response (p. 49). In a later study, Sunderland (2001: 6) claims that by many the IRF is seen as giving a student encouragement to respond only to give "an evaluatable answer". According to Stubbs (as quoted in Sunderland 2001: 6), this represents classroom knowledge as "essentially closed" instead of being "open-ended" and that every question has a correct answer. Sunderland continues to say that it is a paradigm that actually works because teachers usually know the answers to their questions beforehand, which the students expect them to do. However, if a student asks a question to which s/he knows the answer to, is often seen as showing off (Sunderland 2001: 6). This is why one of the functions of the IRF is to evaluate the knowledge of the students'(Young, as quoted in Sunderland 2001: 6).

To sum up, the DA approach attempts to analyse classroom data according to its structural and functional patterns and it always involves some kind of reduction or simplification (Walsh 2006: 48). In the present study, the IRF is used to show the basic pattern of the teacher-student discourse and with the help of recent research on CA, to show how one piece of discourse can have many levels to analyze with. Next, the CA approach is discussed in more detail from the perspective of institutional talk, such as classroom talk is often considered to be.

3.2. Conversation analysis and institutional talk

In this section, the nature of the CA approach to interaction is considered by focusing on its application to institutional talk (Drew and Heritage 1992: 16). According to Seedhouse (2004), it is the CA approach that is taking over the study of the language classroom. The CA approach is often linked to the study of institutional talk, which for example, studies the interaction between a doctor and a patient, or a teacher and a student. According to Walsh (2006: 51), institutional interaction, where the interaction takes place between a specialist and non-specialist, is analyzed through CA methodology. In an institutional setting, such as the L2 classroom, the purpose of CA methodology is to "account for the ways in which context is created for and by the participants in relation to the goal-oriented activity in which they are engaged" (Heritage as quoted in Walsh 2006: 51).

In a more detailed way, institutional interactions, according to Drew and Heritage (1992: 3-4), can happen face to face or, for example, by calling someone on the telephone. Moreover, this kind of interaction can take place in a certain physical setting, such as a hospital, courtroom, or school, but this does not mean that the interaction is restricted to such settings and therefore *the institutionality* of the interaction does not determine the setting, but rather, the interaction can be considered to be institutional "insofar as participants'

institutional or professional identities are somehow made relevant to the work activities in which they are engaged" (p. 3). According to Drew and Heritage (1992: 4), many studies of a variety of institutional contexts arise from a single research tradition, that of CA. They explain the reason for this as follows:

> It may perhaps seem surprising that a perspective which, as its very name suggests, is associated with the analysis of ordinary conversation between peers in everyday contexts should be applied to interactions which are evidently not "ordinary conversation" in quite this sense. Yet the data and research enterprises of CA have never been exclusively focused on ordinary conversation. On the contrary, CA research has been developed in relation to a wide range of data corpora. Indeed it is for this reason that the term "talk-in-interaction" (Schegloff) has come to be generally used, in preference to "conversation," to refer to the object of CA research.
>
> (Drew and Heritage 1992: 4)

According to Drew and Heritage (1992: 16-19), CA is a combination of contextual sensitivity of language use and talk "as a vehicle for social action". With this notion, they go on to present four features of the CA perspective that have an important relevance in analyzing talk in institutional settings. The first one is called *the activity focus of conversation analysis*, which separates the CA treatment of interaction and language use from others. Moreover, according to this feature, the focus of CA is on certain actions that happen in some context and on their social organization, as well as on "the alternative means by which these actions and the activities they compose can be realized" (p. 17). The second one is called *sequencial analysis: an interactional approach to the units of discourse* which is a new way of analyzing naturally occurring data (p. 18). It leads to the conclusion that an utterance *as an action* is "an interactive product of what was projected by a previous turn or turns at talk" as well as what the speaker actually does (p. 18). It also departs from the approach of speech-act analysis and it focuses on units that are larger than a sentence or utterance on its own and these units are conceived as *sequences of activity* (Drew and Heritage 1992: 18).

The third major feature of the CA perspective is called *the conception of context*. According to Drew and Heritage (1992: 18), a certain analytic attitude towards the conception of context in interaction is also represented by the interactional framework of CA. Firstly, within this framework, actions as well as utterances are *context shaped* as their "contributions to an ongoing sequence of actions" cannot be really understood without referring to the context in which they participate (p. 18). Secondly, actions and utterances are *context renewing*, which means that the context of interaction is constantly being evolved with every *successive action*. In addition, every current action has the function to renew (i.e. maintain, adjust, or alter) the context which actually is "the object of the participants' orientations and actions" (p. 18). The fourth feature is called *comparative analysis* and this feature is concerned with what distinguishes ordinary, casual conversation from an interaction, which, for example, involves *the specialisms* of the school (p. 19). According to Drew and Heritage (1992: 19), a distinct conclusion exists in that *comparative analysis* that treats institutional interaction as a contrast to normal interaction in ordinary conversation will put forward at least one crucial approach to theoretical and empirical advance.

In the light of comparative analysis as a perspective to CA, Drew and Heritage (1992: 22) have also proposed three points that decide whether interaction is considered to be institutional or not:

1. Institutional interaction involves an orientation by at least one of the participants to some core goal, task or identity (or set of them) conventionally associated with the institution in question. In short, institutional talk is normally informed by *goal orientations* of a relatively restricted conventional form.
2. Institutional interaction may often involve *special and particular constraints* on what one or both of the participants will treat as allowable contributions to the business at hand.

3. Institutional talk may be associated with *inferential frameworks* and procedures that are particular to specific institutional contexts.

According to Drew and Heritage (1992: 25), these three dimensions are the main features of talk that is focused on as an evidence of "distinctively institutional orientations in talk at work." As mentioned above, very often these dimensions of interaction are compared with ordinary, mundane conversation (Drew and Heritage 1992: 25).

Walsh (2006: 50) points out that in a sequence of classroom conversation, the following and previous turns are linked, which represents the kind of discourse that could only occur in a classroom context. It is, however important, to remember that even though L2 classroom discourse does and should not be interpreted as "fully resembling a conversation", there are however, relevant reasons for using the CA method (Walsh 2006: 51). In addition, Walsh (2006: 52) points out that conversation in the classroom does entail two-way interaction, such as turn-taking and it includes several features of ordinary conversation such as "false starts, hesitations, errors, silence, back-channelling and so on." Moreover, Walsh (2006: 52) points out some clear parallels that show CA's relevance to L2 classroom context, for example, classroom talk consists of more than one participant and in order for meanings to be explicit, there has to be "smooth transitions and clearly defined expectations." Possibly the most significant role of CA is to *interpret* from the data and not to *impose* categories that are predetermined functional or structural (Walsh 2006: 52). As Levinson (as quoted in Walsh 2006: 45) also claims, CA approach is interested in the function of the language as a means for social interaction and more specifically

> social contexts are not static but are constantly being formed by the participants through their use of language and the ways in which turn-taking, openings and closures, sequencing of acts, and so on are locally managed.
>
> (Sacks as quoted in Walsh 2006: 49-50)

According to Walsh (2006: 52-53), there are five features to summarize the CA approach in analysing the second language classroom. Firstly, unlike the DA approach, the CA is entirely empirical, i.e. there is no attempt to *fit* the data to "preconceived categories; evidence that such categories exist […] must be demonstrated by reference to and examples from the data" (p. 52). Secondly, the goal of the one who observes the interaction is to view the experience through the eyes of the participants (p. 53). Thirdly, unlike DA where discourse is considered to be static, conversation analysis sees classroom contexts as being a dynamic and ever-changing process that can vary from one stage of a lesson to another (Cullen, as quoted in Walsh 2006: 53). Fourthly, any contribution to the *talk-in-interaction* is considered to be goal-oriented. This means that the participants are striving towards an overall goal, related to the institution, in the classroom, for example, to learn a second language. The last feature of how the CA approach applies to analysing the L2 classroom points out that the analysis of the data is *multi-layered* in a way that it emphasizes context but also that the utterances are sequential (Walsh 2006: 53).

The study of institutionality in the second language classroom and the overall features of CA approach to classroom discourse, or "talk-in-interaction", are important background information for the present study in order to understand the classroom as a specific context where the interaction differs from talk outside the classroom. As Drew and Heritage (1992: 22) as well as Walsh (2006: 53) pointed out, this kind of interaction is always goal oriented. In the classroom, the teacher and the pupils all have certain goals that affect the interaction, especially the feedback the pupils receive. In the next section, the pedagogical goals of the teacher are discussed in more depth.

3.3. Pedagogical features of language discourse

Many researchers have studied the pedagogical features and effects of classroom interaction. In this section, questions such as how does classroom discourse affect learning, what kind of strategies do teachers use in order to get a correct answer and how do they control the learning process, will be discussed.

Cazden (2001) has explored classroom interaction from a pedagogical viewpoint. One of her goals was to find answers to questions such as how do words spoken in the classroom affect learning? She has also studied speaking rights and responsibilities of listening as well as intonation as a form of feedback, and how it can affect the learner's motivation. One interesting area of her research is the question of pupil participation in the classroom and how the lack of participation affects the pupils' ability to learn efficiently. According to Cazden (2001: 86), it is important for the teacher not to interpret silence as somehow lack of knowledge. This can be especially hard in a world were communicative skills are always emphasised and respected.

As a way of understanding interaction and communication in the second language classroom, Walsh (2006: 5) presents four principal features of L2 classroom discourse that show in how many different levels the teacher has to work at the same time to achieve the pedagogical goals he or she has set for him/herself. The first one is called *control of patterns of communication* and it simply put means that it is always the teacher who controls classroom discourse. One example of this is the way the structure of L2 lessons is typically represented by IRE/IRF (p. 5). According to Musumeci (as quoted in Walsh 2006: 5-6), the traditional IRF patterns triumph for four reasons in the classroom. First, students and teachers believe that the question-answer routine is appropriate behaviour in the classroom. Second, teachers feel that feedback is an important part of making the students feel good about themselves. Third, this way the teacher has more power and control in the

classroom and finally, the question-answer routine is most effective when facing with time constraints. In this way the teacher controls "both the content and the procedure of the learning process" (p. 6).

The second feature of L2 classroom discourse that Walsh (2006: 7-9) presents is *elicitation techniques*. According to Walsh (2006: 8), even though the purpose of teachers' questions is to elicit responses from students, it is important for the teacher to know that "the use of appropriate questioning strategies requires an understanding of the *function* of a question in relation to what is being taught." For example, if a question is a display question where the teacher knows the answer in advance, or a referential question where the teacher does not know the answer (Walsh 2006: 8).

The third feature in Walsh's (2006: 10-11) research is *repair or error correction*, which is one form of teacher feedback and one of the aims of the present study and also discussed in section 3.4. According to van Lier (as quoted in Walsh 2006: 10), in addition to questioning, the correction of errors is what characterizes language classrooms best. According to Walsh (2006: 10), even though there are some scholars who are against error correction, there are no reasons why, in a second language classroom, errors should not be corrected. He continues to point out that error correction can be *direct* or *indirect*, *overt* or *covert* and that the teacher's fast decision may affect the pupil's learning opportunities (p. 10). Van Lier (as quoted in Walsh 2006: 11) points out that repair is "closely related to the context of what is being done", in other words, related to the kinds of goals the teacher has in a given situation.

The fourth characteristic of L2 classroom discourse that Walsh (2006: 12-14) has chosen is how teachers modify speech to learners. According to Walsh (2006: 12), it is important to understand the different ways in which L2 teachers change their speech to learners in order to gain more insights on how interaction is organized in the classroom and to help teachers use the

strategies in a better way. Chaudron (as quoted in Walsh: 12), for example, found four aspects of language modification teachers use in the classroom. First, the teacher usually simplifies vocabulary and avoids idiomatic phrases to help students understand better. Second, the teacher simplifies grammar by using shorter utterances and the present tense. Third, the teacher modifies pronunciation by using slower and clearer speech and standard forms and fourth, teachers use a lot of different facial expressions and other gestures. Walsh (2006: 13) compares these aspects of modification to parents talking to their younger children who are acquiring their first language. Lynch (as quoted in Walsh 2006: 13), on the other hand, found different ways the teacher modifies his or her interaction in the classroom. They include *confirmation checks* that teachers use make sure they understand the learner; *comprehension checks*, to ensure that learners understand the teacher; *repetition; clarification requests*, where the teacher asks the students for clarification; *reformulation*, where the teacher rephrases a learner's utterance; *completion*, to finish a learner's contribution and finally *backtracking*, where the teacher returns to an earlier part of a dialogue.

According to Walsh (2006: 13), these features can have real learning value when they become *interactional strategies* and are used consciously in order to gain intended learning outcomes. In addition, "sensitizing teachers to the purposeful use of interactional strategies to facilitate learning opportunities in relation to intended pedagogical goals is, arguably, central to the process of SLA" (p. 13).

According to Mehan (1979: 11), students should answer the teacher's questions correctly and in an appropriate manner for interaction in lessons to proceed smoothly. He also demonstrates that the pupil has to recognize the teacher's *initiation* act as well as interpret *the turn-allocation procedure* in order to provide a response that is consistent with a question. This means that the previous speaker's turn coincides with the next person's turn taking. In addition, Mehan (1979: 12) points out, that participants in the classroom are

"tied together in sequences of interaction". He also makes an interesting observation on the importance of knowing what a student did immediately before a teacher's reaction in order to solve the question of what other students did or did not do when they, for example, were given praise. This is an important observation, because it lets us know, for example, whether students who bid for the floor are ignored or in the present study, whether girls or boys who bid for the floor are ignored.

3.4. Corrective feedback and the treatment of error in the language classroom

In order to describe the differences in the teacher's feedback to pupils' erroneous responses, the different types of teacher feedback in error correction need to be presented. As the previous section introduced different features of classroom discourse and more specifically discussed different reasons and strategies for initiating and giving feedback, this section enables the present study to identify different types of corrective feedback from the data as background information in understanding the nature and complexity of the teacher's choice of reaction in a given situation, and to show that not all feedback is necessarily corrective.

According to Lyster and Ranta (1997: 38), there is too little research for the second language teacher when help is needed in dealing with students making errors in the classroom so that they would lead to communicative competence. However, they continue to point out that there are many *state-of-the-art* discussions on how to treat an error in classroom SLA and many researchers in this field agree with and use the framework and questions used by Hendrickson (1978) in terms of error correction in the classroom. These questions are:

1. Should learners' errors be corrected?
2. When should learners' errors be corrected?
3. Which errors should be corrected?

4. How should errors be corrected?
5. Who should do the correcting?

Although these questions are not considered in the analysis of the present study, they are vital in presenting the background for error correction as one of the foci of the present study is whether the correcting of errors differs if the pupil is a boy or a girl.

According to Panova and Lyster (2002: 573), corrective feedback has recently become more and more important in studies of ESL, as many researchers have become more aware of its role and nature in second language teaching and learning. They continue to say that

> much of this research has been motivated by the theoretical claim that, although a great deal of L2 learning takes place through exposure to comprehensible input, learners may require negative evidence (i.e., information about ungrammaticality), in the form of either feedback on error or explicit instruction, when they are not able to discover through exposure alone how their interlanguage differs from the L2.
>
> (Panova and Lyster 2002: 573)

According to Chaudron (as quoted in Panova and Lyster 2002: 574), corrective feedback refers to all kinds of teacher reactions, which in a clear way either transform, demand improvement of, or disapprovingly refer to the learner's utterance.

Allwright (as quoted in Panova and Lyster 2002: 574) points out that studies on teacher feedback can help us understand and know more about how effective the instructional process is and about how we actually learn a language. According to Panova and Lyster (2002: 574), Allwright's analysis included different types of errors and different options for the teacher to choose from when responding to students' errors, for example, "ignoring vs. correcting an error, immediate vs. delayed correction." This revealed that the treatment of error in the classroom is "imprecise, inconsistent, and ambiguous" (Allwright as quoted in Panova and Lyster 2002: 574). Similarly,

Fanselow (as quoted in Panova and Lyster 2002: 574), in analysing different corrective techniques, found that feedback is not necessarily straightforward to learners in that they often receive simultaneous signals that are contradictory in terms of the form and the content of their utterances.

Chaudron (as quoted in Panova and Lyster 2002: 575) has developed a comprehensive model of corrective discourse, which is based on one of his studies. According to Panova and Lyster (2002: 575), it is so detailed that it clearly shows the complexity of error treatment as a phenomenon in a classroom setting and it is an important step forward in trying to identify different corrective techniques and a first real attempt in looking at the relationship between *type of error*, *feedback*, and *learner repair*. Chaundron found that the type of feedback most commonly used by teachers was *reformulation of learner utterances*, together with various other features such as *emphasis*, *reduction*, *negation* and *expansion* or *unaltered repetition*.

Lyster and Ranta (1997: 44) found six different types of teacher feedback in their study; *explicit correction*, *recast*, *clarification request*, *metalinguistic feedback*, *elicitation* and *repetition*. They claim that the sequence of error correction begins with a learner's utterance containing at least one error. This launches a complex sequence as follows:

> The erroneous utterance is followed either by the teacher's corrective feedback or not; if not, then there is topic continuation. If corrective feedback is provided by the teacher, then it is either followed by uptake on the part of the student or not (no uptake entails topic continuation). If there is uptake, then the student's initially erroneous utterance is either repaired or continues to need repair in some way. If the utterance needs repair, then corrective feedback may again be provided by the teacher; if no further feedback is provided, then there is topic continuation. If and when there is repair, then it is followed either by topic continuation or by some repair-related reinforcement provided by the teacher. Following the reinforcement, there is topic continuation.
>
> (Lyster and Ranta 1997: 45)

Lyster and Ranta (1997: 46-48) explain the different kinds of teacher feedback in more detail. In terms of e*xplicit correction* the teacher clearly shows that the pupil's response is incorrect by providing the correct form. *Recasts*, on the other hand, involve the teacher's reformulating all or only part of a pupil's utterance, minus the error. According to Lyster and Ranta (1997: 46), the term is also referred to as *paraphrase* in the COLT scheme, as well as *repetition with change* and *repetition with change and emphasis*. They also point out that recasts are usually implicit in the sense that they are not introduced by phrases such as "You mean," "Use this word," and "You should say" (p. 46). *Translations* in response to a student's use of the L1 are also included in the term *recast* (Lyster and Ranta 1997: 46).

According to Spada and Frohlich (as quoted in Lyster and Ranta 1997: 47), *clarification requests* indicate to the pupils that their utterance is ill-formed in some way and in need of repetition or reformulation or it has not been understood by the teacher. This kind of feedback is considered to be a clarification request only when it is followed by a student error and it can refer to problems in accuracy or comprehensibility (Lyster and Ranta 1997: 47). According to Lyster and Ranta (1997: 47), a clarification request includes phrases such as "Pardon me" and "What do you mean by *X*?"".

Metalinguistic feedback, as explained by Lyster and Ranta (1997: 47) is either a comment, information, or a question related to the student's utterance, not necessarily clearly providing the correct form. In addition, metalinguistic comments usually indicate that an error is located somewhere, e.g. "Can you find your error?" and it can provide either a grammatical metalanguage referring to the nature of the error, e.g. "It's masculine" or to a word definition. According to Lyster and Ranta (1997: 47), metalinguistic questions can point to the nature of the error, for example by attempting to "elicit the information from the student (e.g., "Is it feminine?")."

In terms of the fifth feedback type, e*licitation*, at least three techniques are used, according to Lyster and Ranta (1997: 48), by the teacher to directly elicit the correct form from the pupil. Firstly, teachers elicit *completion* of their own utterance by pausing in a strategic way in order to allow the student to "fill in the blank", which may precede such metalinguistic comment as, "No, not that. It's a…" or by repeating the error. Secondly, the teacher can use questions to elicit correct forms, e.g. "How do we say *X* in English?". Thirdly, the teacher can ask pupils to reformulate their utterance.

The last type of teacher feedback, *repetition*, refers to the teacher repeating the student's error, for example, the teacher adjusts his/her intonation to highlight the erroneous utterance. According to Lyster and Ranta (1997: 48), there can be a seventh feedback type, called *multiple feedback*, which refers to "combinations of more than one type of feedback in one teacher turn."

In a subsequent study, Lyster (as quoted in Panova and Lyster 2002: 577) discovered that it was more likely for corrective sequences involving *negotiation of form*, which are feedback types that give clues for *self-repair* rather than *correct reformulations*, to lead to immediate repair of *lexical* and *grammatical errors* than recasts and explicit corrections, as recasts were discovered to be effective in phonological error repair. Following repair, according to Lyster and Ranta (1997: 51), before teachers continue to topic continuation, they often stop and take a moment to *reinforce* the correct form by making short statements such as, "Yes!," "That's it!," and "Bravo!" or they repeat the student's corrected utterance. Lyster and Ranta have coded these kinds of statements as *reinforcement*.

According to Panova and Lyster (2002: 577-578), the research on feedback reviewed above with results of classroom observations reveal that *recasts* as a type of feedback are used the most in the observed classrooms and that *learner repair* with immediate feedback can be either repetition or learner-generated repair. According to Panova and Lyster (2002: 582), errors were

coded as *phonological*, *grammatical*, or *lexical* in order to see if there were any general tendencies in the teacher's corrective patterns. In the present study, these three types of errors are taken into consideration in order to see if there are any patterns in the learner error and the teacher feedback. The feedback types discussed above work as an important basis for the present study to examine whether different feedback, as a means to correct an error, is given when the pupil is a girl or a boy.

3.5. Previous studies

There are also other studies that focus on IRF, teacher feedback and error correction. The following studies show the variety of studies in this field and they are chosen, because of their relevance to the present study. The difference in these studies, compared to the present study, is that the issue of gender has not been taken into consideration. However, they are important examples of more recent research done in the field of classroom discourse.

Lee (2007) investigated the third turn in the IRF pattern and demonstrated that teachers not only respond to whether the student's second turn answers are correct, adequate or relevant but also to how they are produced: accurately, convincingly, or reluctantly. According to Lee (2007: 1205), even for correct answers, teachers often ask students to elaborate, reformulate or defend their answers. That is to say, what teachers do in the third turn position is not predictable. The question is "if and how we can take into account, analytically, these local contingencies that surround the teacher's third turn?" as these exigencies help us to see how classroom interactions become orderly, reliable and thus stable (p. 1210).

The data Lee (2007: 1211) gathered included three ESL composition courses and one speaking course; the data were collected through the video and audio taping of thirty class sessions taken from three composition courses, and six class sessions from a speaking course. The composition program had

three levels: two intermediate composition classes and one advanced class. The speaking class was part of the ESL program at the university that offers comprehensive and intensive language courses ranging from speaking, writing, reading and listening to grammar classes. The students in these classes were either immigrant or international students who were learning English in order to pursue their academic degrees at North American universities. There were two female native ESL teachers.

Lee's (2007: 1212-1225) analysis focused on class discussion between the teacher and the students. The analytic focus was on gaining insight into how the material contents enacted in the three turns are made intelligible and sensible to the participants as practical matters of their interactional exchange. The ESL-related problem of understanding was examined contextually by following the sequences of talk exchange. To summarize, Lee (2007) studied how the teachers parsed questions into several components, how they steered the third turn sequences, i.e. steered students into a particular direction, how the third turn often intimates the answer that the teacher has in mind. She also studied the context and action, as well as classroom management, all relating to the third turn.

This study relates to the present study, because of the investigation of the third turn in the IRF pattern. It gives up-to-date information on this complex method. For example, how a new question of the same topic is not considered to be a new initiation, but a new third turn, i.e. a so-called follow-up question, how the teacher's third turn is far from being definite and how the third turn is reactive to the student who gives the second turn (p. 1212-1215). The fact that according to Lee, the teacher's follow-up is reactive to the student, his/her gender, in particular is relevant to the present study.

Nassaji et al. (2000) investigated and tried to bring new views to the IRF pattern, especially from the dialogue perspective. This study was a

collaborative action research project conducted over the years 1991-97. It involved nine elementary and middle school teachers and three university researchers in Toronto. The study had two aims: 1. to explore ways of adopting an inquiry approach to learning and teaching and 2. to investigate the role of spoken and written discourse in the activities that took place in the participating teachers' classrooms. The study was conducted in two phases (1991-94 and 1994-97).

Nassaji and Wells (2000) carried out quantitative analyses to answer the question of what are the various forms and functions of triadic dialogue in teacher-whole-class episodes of interaction in the corpus as a whole and how does the choice of follow-up move affect the nature of the students' participation. 44 sequences studied involved teacher-whole-class interaction. All nine teachers of the project contributed, but over different time spans. Each episode was "tallied with respect to Episode Activity Orientation, number of constituent sequences, frequency of Student Initiations, frequency of Teacher Sequence Initiating Questions, whether demanding Known Information, Information for Negotiation, or Personal Information, and frequency of Evaluative Follow-up moves in relation to the type of initiating question" (Nassaji and Wells 2000: 390). These were combined into two groups and compared with Science and Arts classrooms. The results suggested that triadic dialogue was being used rather differently in the different categories. For example, Nassaji and Wells (2000: 391) showed that Negotiatory questions far exceeded Known information questions. They also claimed that this encouraged the students to participate more and give more complex and longer responses, because in the case of Negotiatory questions, the teacher's follow-ups were asking for clarification, explanations, alternative opinions, or by offering comments of their own. In addition, in the Known Information questions, the follow-up was almost always to evaluate the student response.

What was interesting in the findings was the fact that although teachers attempt to create a more dialogic style of interaction with students, the triadic dialogue continues to be the dominant discourse genre. This discovery supports the present study in the sense that the method used is not considered to be “old fashioned” or irrelevant in the research of classroom interaction. It shows that triadic dialogue allows the teacher to test and check students’ grasp of taught material and that it plays an important role in initiating sequences of discussion.

4. Methodological framework

Now that the theoretical background has been presented in terms of gender bias and different areas of discourse in the classroom, including corrective feedback, it is time to introduce the methodological framework of the present study. First the motivation of the study will be discussed, as to what are the reasons for this study and second, the research questions are clearly presented and discussed and third, data for the study is presented. Finally, the methods, in which the analysis of the data is based on, will be closely examined.

4.1. Implications and research questions for the study

As can be seen from the previous section, there have been a number of studies related to classroom interaction. Many studies have been conducted on oral corrective feedback, learner language and error analysis. Gender bias in books and other teaching methods has also been studied a number of times. However, gender and the teacher's reactions to pupils' responses in discourse situations in the EFL classroom have not been very thoroughly examined. Jane Sunderland is a pioneer in studying gender in the foreign language classroom, but other than that, there are only few studies that are relevant to the present study.

Motivation for this study comes from a need to develop my own identity and philosophy as an EFL teacher. This is an area that all teachers should think of and the University to include in its teacher training programs. By concentrating on the teacher's reaction in terms of the gender of the pupil, the present study can focus more specifically on the differences in the teacher's feedback, which is an important tool for the teacher to evaluate the pupil's use of the target language during the lesson. With the follow-up sequence the teacher is also able to give positive or negative feedback to the pupil and with that decision, he or she also affects the pupils' motivation and

learning. By treating the pupils differently because of their gender, the teacher also has an impact on the pupils' self esteem and on their identity. By giving more attention to the other gender or challenging the others more, it can have negative connotations for the other group that is neglected because of inequality in the classroom.

My aim is to develop my proseminar work further by analyzing classroom interaction, focusing on the differences of teacher feedback and evaluation (i.e. the third turn) according to the gender of the student. The research questions are as follows:

1. How does an English teacher react and give feedback to his/her students' responses, especially when the pupil's response is an error or more specifically, to responses that are not portrayed as "correct" according to the teacher?
2. How do these reactions differ when the student is a boy or a girl, i.e. whether any kind of gender bias is involved in the teacher's reaction when a student produces a response?
3. Are there other areas of teacher-student interaction in the IRF pattern, where inequality in terms of the gender of the pupil is discovered?

The purpose of these research questions is not to assume anything, but to give the analysis certain boundaries and guidelines. The first of these questions function as a starting point to the analysis of the follow-up in the IRF pattern in order to see if there are any similarities and consistency in the teacher's reaction to the pupils' responses. It also turns the focus of the analysis to studying specifically the follow-up.

The second question then turns the focus to the gender of the pupil and the differences that might be found in the teacher's feedback. Its purpose is to see whether the teacher evaluates and reacts differently according to the

gender of the pupil. It also presents the possibility whether the other gender group receives feedback that is different in quality than the other group's feedback. According to previous studies (Graddol and Swann, Sunderland), it has been examined that boys do receive more attention than girls do, but very often it is in the form of feedback that is more negative in tone than with the girls. This indicates that there can be found some differences in the quality of the teacher's feedback.

The third question is a valid one to take in to account in the present study, because the attention the teacher gives is not necessarily bound only to the feedback of the teacher. As indicated in the previous studies in chapter 2, there seems to be a consensus that male pupils receive more attention than female pupils in the classroom context. Although the focus of this study is on the feedback, different forms of gender bias can occur in all the areas of interaction between the teacher and the pupils, especially when differential teacher treatment is concerned.

4.3. Data

The data for the present study has been provided by the Department of Languages at the University of Jyväskylä. It contains four video-taped lessons, or two double lessons that have been recorded on two consecutive days at the same English course. The lessons have been transcribed and the transcription symbols can be found from appendix 1. The classroom consists of an upper secondary, 1st year students and their female teacher in her fifties. In the classroom there are 8 boys and 6 girls. Because there are approximately a same number of boys and girls, the differences in the teacher's behaviour, in terms of giving feedback to the pupils, can be made without taking into account that there are many more boys than girls in the classroom. As Sunderland wrote in her study (1998: 57):

> I wanted a class with approximately equal numbers of boys and girls, in order to obviate the possibility of what looked like a 'gender effect' in fact being a 'majority group' or 'minority group' effect.

From the four EFL lessons, interaction between the teacher and all of the pupils is analyzed to find answers to the research questions. The analysis has been made using qualitative methods, such as discourse analysis and IRF-sequencing, or "triadic dialogue", as well as conversation analysis. As a framework, SETT and IRF have been used to sort out the different interactional sequences that occur between the teacher and the pupils.

4.4. Methods of analysis

According to Walsh (2006: 54), there are some limitations to the CA approach, for example, because there are no "preconceived categories", there is "no attempt to impose any kind of order." Thus, in the present study, both DA and CA approaches are used so that the categories provided by discourse analysis, such as the IRF sequence, are used to show the different discourse sequences and patterns between the teacher and the pupils. According to Sunderland (2001: 6), "in the third part of teacher-initiated IRFs, the teacher also acts as a judge" and that is why it its important to brake down all the relevant examples of interaction into responses and feedbacks in order to see if the teacher "judges" the boys differently than the girls. In addition, the feedback sequences are analysed more precisely with a more pedagogical approach, SETT, which is presented next.

Walsh (2006: 62-92) provides a framework for analysing classroom interaction called Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk (SETT). Its purpose is to help teachers adopt an understanding of interactional processes as well as describe the classroom interaction of the lessons (Walsh 2006: 62). What this means is that the L2 classroom context does not exist per se, but contexts "are locally constructed by participants through and in their interaction in the light of overall institutional goals and immediate pedagogic objectives" (p.

62). Walsh (2006: 62) uses the term *mode* to define and encompass "the interrelatedness of language use and teaching purpose." In addition, he defines it *microcontext* in the second language classroom, which has clear pedagogic goals and interactional features that are determined by a teacher using a language, and it is used to foster the idea that there is an "inextricable" link between interaction and classroom activity. This link needs to be acknowledged, because when the focus of a lesson changes, so does the interaction patterns and pedagogic goals (p. 62-63). Walsh (2006: 64) analysed his data inside the SETT framework by using CA methodology that had a central focus on turn-taking mechanisms in relation to the perceived goal of the moment and the aims of the lesson given by the teacher. With the help of this procedure, he was able to identify four microcontexts, called modes that were characterized by specific patterns of turn-taking: *managerial mode*, *classroom context mode*, *skills and systems mode* and *materials mode* (p. 64). The idea was to provide a system for teachers in order to have the opportunity to extend their understanding of "the interactional processes operating in their own classes" by looking beyond the IRF sequences and focusing on topic management and mechanisms of turn taking "at longer stretches of discourse" (p. 65). According to Walsh (2006: 66), these modes all have certain interactional features and pedagogical goals in them.

According to Walsh (2006: 68), managerial mode is something that occurs when the lesson starts and can be identified as "an extended teacher turn of more than one clause and a complete absence of learner turns". In this mode, the teacher's goal is to "'locate' the learning temporally and pedagogically […] or spatially" (p. 68). After this the pupils are "invited to participate" (p. 68-69). Of course this mode can also occur inside the lesson as a "link between two stages in a lesson" (p. 69). To sum up, managerial mode's main pedagogical purpose is "the management of learning, including setting up a task, summarizing or providing feedback on one particular stage of a lesson" (Walsh 2006:69).

Materials mode focuses on the materials being used and one of the typical interactional features of this mode is the predominance of the IRF sequence "closely managed by the teacher" (Walsh 2006: 70). In his own study, Walsh (2006: 70-72) discovered that when the interactional organization of classroom is determined by the material, for example an exercise based on a text, both the teacher and learner turns are "mirrored by the material: the teacher elicits responses […] and learners respond […]". He goes on to point out that this kind of sequence in the materials mode "is 'classic IRF', the most economical way to progress the interaction, with each teacher turn functioning as both an evaluation of a learner's contribution and initiation of another" (p. 70). To summarize the materials mode, Walsh (2006: 71) states that turn taking as well as topic choice are largely determined by the material.

According to Walsh (2006: 73), skills and systems mode has pedagogical goals that are "closely related to providing language practise in relation to a particular language system (phonology, grammar, vocabulary, discourse) or language skills (reading, listening, writing, speaking)". Some of the key goals of this mode are "to provide corrective feedback" and "to display correct answers". The interactional features in this mode that the present study will be looking at in its data (as the main focus is on teacher feedback) are "the use of direct repair", "extended teacher turns" and "teacher echo" in order to display correct responses, as well as "form-focused feedback", which is also present in the materials mode. In this mode, as Walsh (2006: 74) claims, "the IRF sequence frequently occurs" and the turn taking often is in the teacher's hands. In skills and systems mode, practising language is managed by the teacher with the frequent use of teacher prompts, whereas in materials mode the language practise "evolves around a piece of material" (p. 76).

According to Walsh (2006: 79), in classroom context mode "the principal role of the teacher is to listen and support the interaction, which frequently takes

on the appearance of naturally occurring conversation". Moreover, "relinquishing control of turn-taking and topic choice are fundamental interactional strategies in classroom context mode, which are essential to successful learning" and this is why errors are not often repaired at all and the only feedback the teacher gives is "content-based, normally in the shape of a personal reaction" or that of clarification request which "compel learners to rephrase or extend a previous contribution" (p. 81).

Some of these goals and features are related to the "third turn" and thus help with the analysis of the present study to identify certain patterns of feedback the teacher has. Walsh's (2006) features that are relevant to the present study and that help to analyse the teacher's reactions are as follows:

Interactional feature	*Description*
Scaffolding	(1) Reformulation (rephrasing a learner's contribution). (2) Extension (extending a learner's contribution). (3) Modelling (correcting a learner's contribution).
Direct repair	Correcting an error quickly and directly.
Content feedback	Giving feedback to the message rather than the words used.
Referential questions	Genuine questions to which the teacher does not know the answer.
Seeking clarification	(1) Teacher asks a student to clarify something the student has said. (2) Student asks the teacher to clarify something the teacher has said.
Confirmation checks	Making sure that the teacher has correctly understood the learner's contribution.
Teacher echo	(1) Teacher repeats a previous utterance. (2) Teacher repeats a learner's contribution.
Teacher interruptions	Interrupting a learner's contribution.
Turn completion	Completing a learner's contribution for the learner.
Display questions	Asking questions to which the teacher knows the answer.
Form-focused feedback	Giving feedback on the words used, not the message.

Now that the motivation, research questions, data and methods of the present study is presented, the findings of the qualitative analysis are examined next. In sections 5.1 and 5.2, the data is analyzed by using the IRF in order to indicate the teacher's Initiation, the pupil's Response and the teacher's Reaction (if any) to the pupil's response. In addition, the Feedback sequences are analyzed by using the SETT framework in order to indicate any patterns of feedback the teacher might use differently with boys and girls.

5. Findings

In this section the findings of teacher reactions are presented in detail. This part of the present study is divided into two sections in order to establish the different categories of feedback according to the gender of the pupil. This division also controls the analysis as well as the research questions that were presented in section 4.3. The examples are divided into two sections. Firstly, in section 5.1 a few examples from the data are presented where certain similarities can be found from the teacher's feedback. Secondly, in section 5.2 more examples are discussed where the teacher's feedback differs according to the gender of the pupil. 5.2 is also divided into three more sub-sections, where in the first one, the teacher's attitude in the Feedback sequence is discussed in terms of the male pupils and in the second sub-section from the point of view of the female pupils. The third sub-section, 5.2.3, examines if any male dominance can be found form the data, which has been so many times discovered in previous studies of gender bias in the classroom. In section 5.1 the teacher's feedback to the pupils' responses is quite similar in terms of the gender of the pupil and then in section 5.2 the feedback differs. After chapter 5, the findings are summarized in chapter 6.

5.1. Similarities in the teacher's feedback to boys' and girls' responses

In this subsection the focus is on interaction between the teacher and both male and female pupils. In the data some similarities can be found in interaction between the teacher and all of her pupils. The purpose of this section is to show some of the patterns of feedback the teacher uses with both girls and boys and to analyze other interactional and pedagogical behaviour between the teacher and her pupils, especially gender-specific behaviour. What is interesting to see in this section is that even though the teacher's feedback patterns might be similar in terms of the IRF, other aspects of the teacher-student interaction, e.g. the teacher's Initiation or other behaviour can have some differences in terms of the gender of the pupil. As can be seen

in the extracts, the teacher almost in all examples interacted with either the boys or the girls, which seems to indicate that the teacher treated the pupils as two different gender groups. In addition, the girls were treated as a separate group even more, as the teacher many times referred to the girls as a group and not once did this happen with the boys, who were always referred to by their first names.

All of the extracts in this section (1-6) have similar patterns of teacher feedback in spite of the gender of the pupil. Although the situations in each extract may differ and other differences in the interaction between the teacher and the pupils can be found, the feedback sequences, which are indicated in the right-hand side column in each example, are almost identical. Minimal responses such as *mhh*, *hmm*, *okay* and *aha* are repeatedly used in all of the extracts in this section. These sequences of discourse usually indicate acceptance of the pupil's response and are a quick way to give positive feedback. In some cases, though, this kind of feedback can also be a way for the teacher to have a short pause while thinking about how to give feedback to a response, which is incorrect or not quite what the teacher expected it to be. However, other areas of discourse and behaviour from the teacher can be found that are different in terms of the gender of the pupil. In the extracts, I have marked the sequences of IRF in the right-hand side column and the sections of discourse that are in Finnish have been translated inside brackets and written in italics. All the names have been changed.

In extract 1 the class is starting the 1st lesson and the teacher is warming up the class by introducing the subject of that day's lesson.

Extract 1 (lines 1-25)[1]

1	T	(xx) have you already discovered your skills?	I
2		(1.2)	
3	LM1	öö	

[1] The original line numbers of the data

4	T	start [with]	
5	LM1	[(x)]	
6	T	yeah	
7	T	te- tell me something about your skills	
8		do **you** have any special skills?	
9		(1.3)	
10	LM1	ahh (.) not **very special** (1.3)	R
11		I have some skills (.)	
12	T	for ins↑tance	I
13	LM1	ahh (.) I play guitar (.)	R
14	T	hm (1.4) okay	F
15	T	what's your favourite ahh guitar (.) player?	I
16		(1.2)	
17	LM1	slash (.)	R
18	T	[who's *that*]	I
19	LM	[((somebody] coughs))	
20	LM1	hiz (.) ahh an old guitarist by (0.7) the band Guns an Roses	R
21		(1.1)	
22	T	Guns an Rose- <heavy metal>	I
23	LM1	ahh rock	R
24	T	r*ock* (0.8)	F
25		°I don't know anything about them°	

At a first glance, this example looks like a normal conversation between the teacher (T) and one of the male pupils (LM1). Nevertheless, clear sequences of IRF can easily be found, which indicates that instead of naturally occurring conversation, this is a typical pattern of classroom discourse. The piece of discourse begins with the teacher's Initiation on lines 1-9, where the teacher first addresses the question to the whole class and then on lines 7-8 rephrases the question to LM1. Lines 3 and 5 have not been taken into consideration here, although some might claim that they could be forms of response from LM1. However, here they are not relevant in terms of the research questions as they do not contribute to the teacher's Feedback and as they occur while the teacher is producing an Initiation.

The piece of discourse continues between the teacher and LM1 on line 10, where the pupil Responds (*ahh (.) not* ***very special*** *(1.3)*) to the teacher Initiation. The teacher keeps the conversation going by re-Initiating on line 12 (*for ins↑tance*) as the pupil has not mentioned any specific skill, which

would be sufficient response that the teacher is looking for. After the Response on line 13 (*ahh (.) I play guitar (.)*), a first Feedback sequence can be found on line 14 (*hm (1.4) okay*). There is a short pause between *hmm* and *okay*, which indicates that the teacher is thinking about how to continue the conversation with the pupil. Thus, straight after giving short feedback to LM1, she produces another initiation on line 15 (*what's your favorite ahh guitar (.) player?*). Three sequences of traditional I-R follow and then finally on line 24-25 the teacher gives feedback in the form of a statement, which also ends the conversation with LM1.

Keeping in mind the research questions, we need to give more attention to the teacher feedback. The first F *hmm (1.4) okay* can be described as an acceptance of the pupil's response, but with the short pause the teacher indicates that the response is not quite enough to fulfil the pedagogical goals of the interaction, which seems to be to "promote oral fluency" by giving "minimal repair" (Walsh 2006). The other feedback sequence *rock* looks like a teacher echo, which describes the situation where the teacher repeats a learner's contribution. The goal of the teacher echo is to provide feedback, for example for pronunciation or as a way to accept the response. Here, the teacher is merely accepting the response, but also conveying that she does not know much about rock 'n' roll music.

When comparing the teacher's reactions to male and female pupils, a similar kind of feedback sequence can be found in the next extract of discourse between the teacher and two girls. The class is talking about a text they have just listened to.

Extract 2 (lines 855-874)

1	T	shu'dup (0.5)	
2		okay but if you practise (x)	I
3		do you often (0.2) talk with strangers=	
4	LM5	=no	R

5	T	in cafes an	
6		how ‘bout you girls	I
7		(2.1) ((there’s talk))	
8	T	I don’t think it’s very Finnish (0.5)	
9	T	okay	I
10		why was Declan out of work	
11		did you get that?	
12		(1.1)	
13	T	Raisa whaddo you say?	
14	LF3	(I don’t know that)	R
15		(1.1)	
16	T	mm↑m (0.2)	F
17		Tiina?	I
18		any idea?	
19	LF6	°no°	R
20	T	[Ville]	I

In this example the teacher begins this piece of discourse with an Initiation on lines 2-3 that is addressed to the whole class. After one of the male pupils (LM5) has answered the question with *no*, the teacher re-Initiates the question to the girls on line 6 (*how ‘bout you girls*). When no Response is produced, the teacher quickly moves on to another question after stating that talking with strangers is not very Finnish (line 8). The second Initiation is quite long (lines 9-13) and now instead of referring to the girls as a group, the teacher chooses one of the girls (LF3- Raisa) to answer the question. After she says that she does not know the correct response to the question, the teacher accepts the situation and moves on to Tiina (LF6) by Initiating the same question. When Tiina as well does not know the answer the teacher moves on to one of the male pupils on line 20.

As mentined above, the feedback in extract 2 is similar in terms of the “acceptance” of the response, as was in extract 1 on line 14. The situation, on the other hand, is different, as the teacher’s acceptance of the response in the first extract is to a correct, or the kind of response the teacher was looking for, and in the second extract, the response is not correct and still the teacher accepts this situation on line 16 (*mm↑m (0.2)*). In the SETT framework, the Feedback has similarities, although in extract 1 the teacher asks referential

questions (see section 4.4) and in extract 2 the teacher asks a display question (*why was Declan out of work*). However, at the beginning of extract 2 the teacher is talking about cultural differences in general. This kind of interaction is similar to extract 1, because the goal is also to "promote oral fluency" through casual conversation. To sum up, extract 1 and extract 2 are similar in terms of the Feedback, although the pedagogical goals change in extract 2.

An issue in terms of gender bias that cannot be ignored in extract 2 is that the teacher refers to the girls as a group before referring to the girls as individuals by their name, which does not happen with the boys in extract 1 or in any other example for that matter, when the teacher refers to the boys. One other thing that is worth mentioning is to look at what happens in extract 2 before the initiation on line 1 (*shu'dup (0.5)*) and how in such an upfront and rude way the teacher interacts with one of the male pupils.

To continue with the teacher's use of very minimal feedback to both boys and girls, in extract 3 the class is thinking about qualities that different people in certain professions have and the teacher is directing her questions to three of the boys.

Extract 3 (lines 646-691)

1		okay an: d how about an architect (0.7)	I
2		that's an easy one	
3		(5.7)	
4	T	Miikka	
5		(1.0)	
6	LM4	umm creative (1.5.) innovative	R
7		(5.3)	
8	T	hmm I would ac- mm add here practical	F
9		I add them to be practical	
10	LM5	and I would add just	R
11	T	(x) hm↑m	F
12	LM5	<so that (1.4) house won't show up (1.2)	R
13		out (0.8) into a tree>	

14	T	hm↑m (0.9) how about journalist?	F/I
15		(3.6)	
16	T	we should be **bold** (.) shouldn’t we	
17		(1.6)	
18	LM5	<**en**thusiastic>	R
19	T	hm↑m	F
20	LM5	an strongminded	R
21	T	a↑ha=	F
22	LM5	=sociable	R
23	T	aha	F
24	LM5	and flexible	R
25	T	an:d	F/I
26		(1.3)	
27	LM5	(kind of) creative	R
28	T	aha (0.9)	F
29	LM5	and effective	R
30	T	mh↑h	F
31		ahh how ‘bout aa psychologist?	I
32		(3.0)	
33	T	have you eve-	
34		do you know ↑a↓ny (.) °psychologists°?	
35		(1.9)	
36	LM5	yes	R
37	T	no	F
38	LM5	nouh ((makes a small laughing inbreath))	R
39	T	£okay ((laughingly))	F
40		so whaddo yo-	I
41		>whaddo you say Aki<	
42		what should they be like	
43	LM2	I think that open minded is very important	R
44	T	aha	F
45		(1.4)	
46	T1	I would say so too	

This example is quite a long piece of discourse, but not at all uncommon in the data, as during the four hours of English lessons the teacher interacts with the male pupils much more and in longer stretches of discourse than with the female pupils (discussed in more detail in section 5.2.3). All in all, this example consists of five Initiations by the teacher, 12 Responses from the pupils and 12 Feedback sequences from the teacher, which also shows that although the traditional IRF pattern in terms of Initiation is not as straightforward, here the balance between Responses and Follow-ups is even. In this example also the teacher Follow-ups *mainly* consist of utterances

such as *mhh* and *aha*, which all are ways of accepting the learner's contribution. However, on line 8 (*hmm I would ac- mm add here practical*), after more than five seconds have past after LM4's Response the teacher accepts the answer with the familiar *hmm*, but also provides more examples in order for the conversation to continue. According to SETT, this kind of behaviour from the teacher is one form of scaffolding, where the pedagogical goal is to "extend a learner's contribution", which differs from the goals of extract 1 and 2. A similar situation occurs on lines 14 and 31-34, where the *hmm* continues with a follow-up question to keep the conversation going. Line 37,the teacher's utterance *no*, is quite complicated to analyze as even though it is marked as F according to the IRF pattern, it is not a Feedback as such, but the teacher's reaction to the pupil's utterance of actually knowing a psychologist, which then after the teacher's turn, turns out to be untrue. Nevertheless, the teacher uses the word *no* with one of the male pupils, which does not happen with any of the female pupils. When this example is compared to interaction between the teacher and the girls, same kind of similarities in the feedback still continue. The following two extracts, 4 and 5 are examples of this.

In extract 4 the teacher is going through the same exercise as in the previous extract. However, this piece of discourse happens right before extract 3.

Extract 4 (lines 585-608)

1	T	any other qualities for politicians (0.6)	I
2		**ideal** politicians	
3		(1.6)	
4	T	Leena	
5	LF2	°sorry I didn't hear the question°	I
6	T	sor↑ry	I
7	LF2	I **didn't** hear the question	R
8	T	ahh qualities for a good politician	R
9		(1.0)	
10	LF2	a politician	R
11		(1.3)	
12	LF2	well (2.7)	

13		ahh he or she should be strong minded	
14	T	mh↑h	F
15	LF2	<so (1.5) he could (1.9)	R
16		do what> (0.5) he planned to do when he went there	
17	T	mh↑h	F
18		(1.5)	
19	T	okay .hh	F
20		have you already decided (.)	I
21		to vote or not to vote when yo- (0.5)	
22		when you are (.) old e↑nough	
23	LF2	to vote	R
24	T	hmm	F

Similarly to the previous extracts, the teacher's feedback consists of words like *hmm* and *okay*. Before the teacher's Follow-ups occur, there are a few interesting insights concerning some of the Initiations and Responses. Up until now, all the Responses are produced by the pupils and the Initiations by the teacher. In this extract, on line 5, LF2 produces an Initiation (°*sorry I didn't hear the question*°), a request for the teacher to repeat the previous question. Because the female pupil speaks with a very low voice, the teacher utters *sorry* with a rising intonation, which indicates that it is, in fact, a question. Now, LF2's previous Initiation on line 5 changes into a response (line 7: (*I **didn't** hear the question*) to the teacher initiation on line 6 (*sor↑ry*). This time the teacher hears what LF2 is saying and immediately repeats the question on line 8. This utterance is not a new Initiation but a Response from the teacher to the pupil's previous question on line 5. Its interactional feature is "clarification requests", where both the pupil and the teacher ask each other to clarify what they have said. In terms of similarity with extract 3, the teacher seems to have a pedagogical goal of keeping the conversation going by extending the learner's contribution (line 20-22), as was the case in extract 3.

A similar situation to lines 6-8 in extract 4 occurs in extract 5 as well, which indicates that the girls are not only more passive in interaction with the teacher, but also quieter in their speaking tone.

Extract 5 (lines 298-314)

1	T	Mari (0.8) a combination?	I
2		(2.8)	
3	T	did you understand this exercise?	
4	LF5	yeah	R
5	T	okay an:d (1.0) what did you get?	F/I
6		(3.6)	
7		((somebody coughs)) (0.7)	
8	LF5	maybe bee	R
9	T	sorry	I
10	LF5	maybe bee	R
11	T	ahh you're a bee person	F
12		you didn't (.) ↑say £anything£ (.) okay	
13	T	hau- how mu- how many points	I
14	LF5	°thirteen°	R
15	T	sorry	I
16	LF5	thirteen	R
17	T	thirteen (.) okay (0.8)	F

Again on lines 9 and 15 the teacher asks for a clarification from the female pupil LF5, because she speaks in such a low volume. These examples might be a reason to why the teacher treats the girls with such a cautious way, as can be seen in section 5.2.2 where the teacher's attitude towards the girls is examined.

Continuing to point out similarities in the teacher's feedback between boys and girls, the following extract also has some consistency with the previous extracts. This example is from the second lesson and the boys have just performed an oral presentation in front of the classroom. The teacher is asking for feedback from the girls.

Extract 6 (lines 527-554)

1	T	Tiina what- [what do you say about it	I
2	LM2	[(xx) mää en muistanu et tää oli täälä]	
3	LF6	it was quite] funny	R
4	T	FUNNY? (0.2) hmm .hh	F
5		>do you think there was a lot of < mm- (1.4) talk? (.)	I
6		[or ta]lking a lot	

7	LM(5)	[ehh]	
8	LF6	not too much	R
9	T	hm↑m (0.4)	F
10		do you think this would be a typical .hhh interview? (1.4)	I
11		uhh	
12	LM5	yes	
13	T	or do you think the the hockey players **are** like (0.5) °like that°	
14	LM5	i:-	
15	T	as stupid as- as as stupid [as they were]	
16	LF(6)	[yeah that yeah]	R
17	T	°hmm okay°	F
18		(0.9)	
19	T	characteristic.	
20	LM	krhm	
21	T	Leena whaddo you [say	I
22	LF	[((laughter))	
23	LF2	hmm it was quite short	R
24	T	hm-↑mh	F
25	LF2	but after [the game] I don't think that (0.2) the players (0.4)	R
26	LM5	[come on]	
27	LF2	have the energy (to talk that [long)]	
28	T	[hmm]	F

This example has four traditional IRF patterns. The teacher is the one who is dominating the discourse by Initiating and giving Feedback and the pupils are doing the Responding. The first of these are on lines 1-4, where the teacher asks two of the girls' opinion about the boys' presentation and LF6 Responds that *it was quite funny*. All of the teacher's Feedbacks again consist of some forms of *hmm* and *okay*, which are identical with the previous extracts.

This extract is interesting in many ways when considering it in terms of gender bias and differential teacher treatment. All the sequences of discourse between the teacher and the male pupils occur between the boys and the teacher. However, as this example illustrates, interaction between the teacher and the female pupils also involve some of the male pupils in some form of interruptions, which the teacher allows to happen. This kind of behaviour can be seen on lines 2 (*[(xx) mää en muistanu et tää oli täälä]*), 7 (*[ehh]*), 12 (*yes*), 14 (*i:-*), 20 (*krhm*) and 26 (*[come on]*). The teacher's Initiations and some of the

Feedbacks are also quite insinuating and sarcastic, for example, on line 4 the teacher clearly thinks that the presentation was not funny at all and on lines 5-7 insinuates that the boys did not talk very much, which is a negative thing when giving an oral presentation. This kind of forming of questions makes the answering easier for the female pupil, when the answer has already been implied in the question. This kind of Initiating happens also in the next question, which lasts from line 10 to 15. The female pupil does not have to explain her Responds on line 16 (*[yeah that yeah]*), because the teacher has done it for her. What is also interesting is the fact that the teacher does not ask the other boys to evaluate the boys' presentation, but seems to create a situation of "girls against the boys" by evaluating the boys' performance only with the girls.

The situation in this extract is different when compared to extracts 1-4, because of its setting with the teacher evaluating the boys' performance with the girls. Some of the interactional features and pedagogical goals are not as similar as between extracts 1 and 2, for example. The difference can be identified in terms of the oral presentation exercise for the boys, which was to practise presenting one's opinion clearly and with valid arguments. The interaction between the teacher and the girls in the example is more difficult to analyze in terms of the SETT framework. Because in an evaluation of this kind there are no right or wrong answers, only opinions, the interactional features can be described as referential questions, where the teacher asks "genuine questions to which the teacher does not know the answer", which is related to the pedagogical goal to "promote oral fluency", which was identified in many of the previous extracts as well. Nevertheless, the teacher is helping the girls to answer by giving them examples of "good" answers in the question, so that the interactional features also seems to be extending a learner's contribution in order to keep the conversation going, as was the case in extracts 3 and 4.

Now that the similarities of the teacher feedback for both male and female pupils have been discussed, the differences in the teacher's reaction and especially in the teacher's attitude, according to the gender of the pupil, will be presented and analyzed.

5.2. Differences in the teacher's feedback to boys' and girls' responses

This section deals with the differences in the teacher's feedback, according to the gender of the pupil, which were found from the data. In addition to the feedback, any gender-specific behaviour from the teacher is examined (as in section 5.1). The findings are divided in three sections. The first section discusses interaction between the teacher and male pupils, where Feedback sequences have differences in some respect compared to examples presented in section 5.2.2 with examples of interaction between the teacher and female pupils. In addition to the Feedback, what is even more significant, in terms of differential teacher-treatment, is the difference in the teacher's attitude towards the pupils according to their gender. In section 5.2.3, the issue of male dominance in the language classroom is examined to show if there it has any relevance to the teacher's feedback and attitude. After each sub-section, the findings are summed up before moving on with the analysis.

5.2.1 The teacher's attitude towards the boys' responses

While studying and analysing the data for the present study, it has become evident that there are differences in the teacher's behaviour towards the male pupils when compared to the female pupils. In the next five extracts, the teacher's feedback is analyzed and the teacher's attitude examined. These findings will be then compared to the extracts in section 5.2.2.

The following extract is an example of an interaction between the teacher and two male pupils. The whole class is going through exercises that the pupils

have done at home and now the teacher decides to do one extra exercise together with her pupils.

Extract 7 (523-545)

1	T	(it'll) be more interesting (.)	
2		.hh whaddo you think hmr ((clears her throat))	
3		you have a list of adjectives there (0.5)	
4		ahh what kind of qualities (.)	I
5		does a business person **NEED** (0.7)	
6		to be a **good** ↑one	
7		(4.2)	
8	T	Ivan	
9	LM6	mhh (0.5) <effective sociable (1.0) systematic>	R
10		mite se sanotaa *(how do you say it)*	
11	T	systematic yes	F
12		(1.4)	
13	LM5	and bold	R
14		(0.6)	
15	LMs	((boys laugh at this))=	
16	T	=bold	F
17	LM6	no (they don't have to be bold)	R
18	T	okay (.) how about warm hearted	I
19	LM(5)	no (x)	R
20	T	no that's an- (0.6)	F
21		(would it harm) (0.7) if he was (.) warm hearted	
22		(1.6)	
23	T	perhaps (0.6)	

With a quick glance, a very traditional analysis of classroom interaction can again be made by using the IRF pattern. On lines 1-8 the teacher produces an Initiation and on line 8 chooses a pupil to respond to that initiation (*Ivan*). LM6 Responds with some hesitation on line 9 (*mhh (0.5) <effective sociable (1.0) systematic*>) and actually produces an initiation of his own on line 10 by asking whether he has, in fact, pronounced the word *systematic* in a correct way. The teacher gives a Response and Feedback at the same time on line 11 (*systematic yes*). On line 13 another male pupil (LM5) also Responds to the teacher's Initiation. The teacher's reaction is on line 16 (=*bold*). On line 18 the teacher re-Initiates by asking the pupils if they think *warm-hearted* is a good quality for a business person and does this again on line 21 to keep the

conversation going. When this does not work, she moves on to another exercise after line 23.

In terms of the Feedback sequences in this extract some pedagogical goals and interactional features that differ from the Feedback discussed in section 5.1. First of all, the pupils have a list of adjectives to choose from and the teacher's goal is to provide practise "around a specific piece of material". Secondly, "repair is used to correct errors and give further examples", which can be seen on lines 18 (*okay (.) how about warm hearted*) and 21 (*(would it harm) (0.7) if he was (.) warm hearted*), where the teacher gives further examples in order to provide more practise based on the material. Turn taking again lies with the teacher.

Three more interactional features can be found in this extract, which explain the three different types of feedback the boys receive from the teacher in this example; direct repair, content repair and teacher echo. Direct repair, with short and quick correction can firstly be seen on line 11, where the teacher quickly confirms the correct pronunciation of the word *systematic*. This way the "flow" of the conversation is uninterrupted. On line 16, this kind of sequence is clearly a teacher echo, where the teacher repeats a learner's contribution *bold*. This kind of interactional feature is a quick way of giving positive feedback. The last F in this extract is on line 20 (*no that's an- (0.6)*). Here, the teacher disagrees with the male pupil by saying *no* and continues to give a form of content repair, by "providing feedback to the message, rather than the words used" on lines 21-23. Although the feedback on line 16 is a positive one, the reaction on line 20 is negative in its tone and interesting in terms of gender bias, as the teacher at times gives corrective feedback to the boys by using negative words such as *no*. As can be seen in the next three extracts, the teacher seems to have a clear pattern of giving the male pupils feedback in terms of how she feels about the boys and what kind of attitude she has towards them.

In the following extract the teacher asks LM6 whether he has done an exercise he was supposed to do at home before the lesson. Before asking LM6, she asks two of the girls if they have done the exercise.

Extract 8 (177-195)

1	T	>[how 'bout you] girls<	I
2	LF(2)	yes	R
3	T	okay an you	F/I
4	LF(5)	yes	R
5	T	okay only the- (.)	F
6	T	an Pekka (.)	I
7		did you do this (0.8)	
8		aah (0.4) thing on the page (0.2) fifty nine	
9	LM6	mhh ahh I- I do- (i think I'm not)	R
10	T	yeah	F/I
11	LM6	(°I haven't°)	R
12	T	okay (0.7) so we won't play it for you	F
13	T	ahh now you (.)	I
14		you very (.)	
15		you know (.) your skills al↑ready	
16		so we'll listen now	
17		and then we'll discuss later your skills (.) okay	
18		°so°	
19		(4.8)	

Lines 1-5 consist of two IRF patterns that are quite simple and traditional. On line 6 the teacher singles out one of the boys and asks if he has done the exercise; she even repeats the page number where the exercise is, because she notices that it came as a surprise to Pekka that she asked him the question. This is an easy way of getting the pupil's attention, when he is not paying attention to what the teacher is saying. Pekka's Response on line 9 shows his uncertainty and surprise. Line 10's *yeah* has been marked as both a Feedback from the teacher but also an Initiation, because with the tone of her voice, the teacher gives negative feedback, but also wants the pupil to answer in a correct manner, as he does on line 11 ((*°I haven't°*)). The teacher's reaction to this on line 12 (*okay (0.7) so we won't play it for you*) shows how more upfront and even rude the teacher is towards the male pupils. After this almost hurt

and disappointed utterance on line 12, the teacher quickly moves on with the lesson. What is also worth noticing in this extract in terms of gender bias, is how again (also in extract 2) the teacher refers to the girls as a group on line (>*[how 'bout you] girls*<).

Continuing to examine the teacher's attitude in the Feedback sequence, in the next extract, the teacher asks display questions from one of the male pupils.

Extract 9 (711-722)

1	T	Jani? (0.2) what's an applicant (0.3)	I
2		any idea?	
3	LM7	se on se hakemus °tai (x)° *(it's the application or)*	R
4	T	no:	F
5		it's not [hake]mus	
6	LM(7)	[(x)]	
7	LF	hakija *(an applicant)*	R
8	T	haki**ja** (0.3)	F
9		APPLICA**TION** (0.8) <is hakemus> (0.8)	
10		cee vee?	
11		(1.8)	
12	T	curri[culum *vi]tae*	

In this example there are two Feedback sequences from the teacher, on lines 4 and 8. As in extract 7, here again the teacher uses the very negative word *no* as a reaction and evaluation to the male pupil's Response on line 3. She continues the Feedback by saying that *it's not [hake]mus* in Finnish. After this something out of the ordinary happens on line 7, when one of the female pupils gives a Response without being referred to by the teacher. As can be seen in section 5.2.3, it is more often the male pupils who call out answers. The teacher gives the girl Feedback in the form of a teacher echo, but then continues to give Feedback to LM7 by indicating that *application* is *hakemus* in English. She even highlights the word *application* by saying it in a louder voice. A similar use of the word *no* can again be found in the next extract, where the teacher is discussing with the pupils about adjectives and how to use them in different situations.

Extract 10 (lines 1647-1660)

1	T	.hh ja sit vähä varotte tiettyjä adjektiiveja (0.5) *(.hh and then you have to watch out a little with certain adjectives)*	
2		kuin sanan kohalla (0.5) *(with the word than)*	
3	T	elikkä than ei saa aina laittaa *(so you can't put than)*	
4	T	miten sää sanot hän on erilainen kuin minä britti englanniksi	I
5		(1.7) *(how do you say he is different from me in Brit English)*	
6	LM5	she different from	R
7	T	mmh different from me (1.0)	F
8		samanlainen kuin minä (0.8) *(similar to me)*	
9	LM5	similar as me	
10	T	ei oo *(no it's not)*	
11		similar	
12		(1.5)	
13	LM	(for)	
14	T	similar to me (0.8) similar to (.) mm	

The teacher's Feedback can be seen on line 10, where again the teacher reacts to the male pupil's response in quite a frustrated manner.

The last extract in this section also confirms the claim that the teacher has a tendency to treat the male pupils in a much more upfront and demeaning way compared to the female pupils. This extract is from the second lesson and the class is going through grammar, more precisely adjectives used as nouns.

Extract 11 (1571-1597)

1	T	mikäs oli ruotsalaiset? *(what was the Swedish?)*	I
2		(1.7)	
3	LM	(°xx°)	
4		((there's a [laugh] from the boys))	
5	LM9	[gay]	
6	T	nii ruotsalaiset *(yeah the Swedish)*	
7	LM9	°gays°	R
8		(1.7)	
9	T	Tuomas	F
10		pientä rajaa taas (	
11		pientä raja	

12		(pitää ottaa se) yksityiselämä taas *(you have to take that personal life again)*	
13	LM	(xx)	
14		(1.3)	
15	T	hmm ei meiän tartte kaikkia täälä °luetella (xx)° *(we don't have to list everything here)*	
16	LM9	ai kaikkia ruotsalaisia *(do you mean all the Swedish)*	
17	LMs	((laughter))	
18	T	omia taipumuksia *(your own tendencies)*	
19		Samuli=	I
20	LM	=(x)	
21	LM7	the Swedish	R
22	T	the Swedish (0.2) joo-↑o *(yes)*	F
23		(4.0)	
24	T	ja yks kappale *(and one person)*	I
25	LM	(x)	
26	LM8	a Swede	R
27	T	a Swede	F

In this example the teacher's behaviour with the male pupils is culminated in lines 9-18, where the teacher reacts to LM9's Response on line 7. The teacher actually implies that Tuomas is a homosexual in his personal life. The comment is meant to be a joke, but the fact that the teacher uses this kind of language with the male pupils shows how different the interaction is between the teacher and the boys when compared to the girls.

A phenomenon can be found in the findings; the teacher's feedback sequence shows a clear pattern of behaviour with the male pupils. In the following sub-section, this behaviour is compared to findings where the teacher interacts with the female pupils.

5.2.2 The teacher's attitude towards the girls' responses

As can be seen from the next three extracts, the Feedback that the girls receive when producing a Response is quite different in tone. In extract 12, the teacher is going through an exercise with the pupils and now it is one of the girls' turn to answer a display question:

Extract 12 (lines 2020-2031)

1	T	so whaddo you suggest (.)	I
2		one	
3		(1.2)	
4	T	which:h (1.0) which one	
5		(4.8)	
6	T	ää Leena	
7	LF2	two	R
8	T	three is correct an [astronaut]	F
9	LF	[astronaut]	
10	T	okay (0.5)	
11		two (0.9)	
12		whaddo you suggest	

In this example the teacher Initiates by asking what the correct answer to question one is and the pupil who the question is referred to, Responds on line 7. The answer is incorrect and the teacher reacts by displaying the correct answer and moving on to a new Initiation-Response-Feedback sequence on line 11. An interactional feature of scaffolding can be found on line 8, where the teacher corrects the learner's contribution. This kind of feedback is also form-focused, because the feedback is given on the words, not the message.

In terms of difference in the gender, in the previous extracts, the male pupils received corrective feedback that was quite negative in tone, but as can be seen with LF2 on line 8 (*three is correct an [astronaut]*) the teacher avoids using any negative words, such as *no*, so that she does not focus the other pupils' attention to the fact that LF2 made a mistake. This can also be seen in the next extract on line 7, where the teacher is very cautious with giving negative feedback to the girls.

Extract 13 (lines 1377-1386)

1		mites sanositte **nuoret** *(how would you say **the young**)*	I
2		(6.3)	
3	T	nuoret	
4		(1.7)	
5	T	Tiina	

6	LF6	(youth) (0.8) ei *(no)*	R
7	T	you::thki mut sit jos me iha tätä samaa systeemiä käytetää nii *(also youth but if we use the same system so)*	F/I
8	LM	the young	R
9	T	the young	F
10		(1.5)	

In the Feedback on line 7 the teacher does not imply that LF6's Response is incorrect, even though it is, but that the female pupil was, in fact, correct, but the answer was not what the teacher wanted. There are no cases in the data, where the teacher gives a similar form of Feedback to any of the male pupils and because of that it seems that the teacher is much gentler with the female pupils.

In the next extract a same kind of cautious behaviour occurs again as in extract 12 and 13, but in a different form of "helping". The situation in this extract is the same as in extract 1, but now the teacher is interacting with the girls.

Extract 14 (lines 86-143)

1	T	HOW 'BOUT YOU girls any special (0.9)	I
2		Ma↑ri	
3	LF5	no	R
4	T	any- any skills=	I
5	LF5	=no=	R
6	T	=whaddo you do at home (.) in the evenings (0.5)	I
7		watch ↑tv	
8	LF5	yeah	R
9		(1.1)	
10	T	all the ↑time	I
11	LF5	no	R
12	T	what else (.) do your homework [(x)]	I
13	LF5	[no] (I read x books)	R
14	T	you ↑read (.)	F
15		you don't cook o:r	I
16	LF5	yes sometimes	R
17	T	aha (0.8) so do you cook amm (0.5)	F
18		wha kind of fo- what's your favorite **dish**	
19		(4.0) ((LM1 and LM2 talk during the pause))	
20	T	you can cook yourself	I

21		(3.2) ((the same pair talks still, talk unidentifiable))	
22	LF5	yeah I don' know	R
23	T	mm↑m (0.7) Finnish sh-sh--stuff [or]	F/I
24	LF5	[no]	R
25	T	something from your own [country-] your old country (0.7)	I
26	LF5	[yeah]	R
27	T	okay (.)	F
28		how 'bout you Raisa (.)	I
29		your special skills	
30	LF3	<no shkills>	R
31	T	no skills?=	F/I
32	LF3	=no	R
33	T	↑nothing (0.7)	I
34		okay none so (0.5)	
36		so Lii↑sa	I
37	LF1	hmm I draw (.) pictures=	R
38	T	=you draw?	I
39	LF1	sometimes	R
40	T	aha (0.8) <by pencil or (.) watercolour>	F/I
41	LF1	sometimes	R
42	T	aha	F
43		(1.1)	
44	T	Leena	I
45		(1.1)	
46	LF2	aa I donno mm	R
47		I've been to these handicrafts (.) school for (.) over five years	
48		an I've got some skills	
49	T	↓mh↑m (1.0) mh↑m (0.5)	F
50		and you think that the skills you now have (0.5)	I
51		will be ah useful in in fu↑ture	
52		(1.2)	
53	LF2	maybe I'd like to think so	R
54	T	mh↑m	F
55		have you already thought about your future	I
56	LF2	not real[ly]	R
57	T	< [car]eer job whatever>	I
58	LF2	no	R
59	T	°a↑ha° (0.5)	F

Firstly, this example is an exceptionally long piece of interaction between the teacher and the female pupils. Secondly, there are 19 Initiations form the teacher, 18 Responses from the pupils, but only 10 Feedbacks from the teacher, which makes it uncommon in terms of the IRF pattern as well. The first Feedback from the teacher is not until line 14 (*you ↑read (.)*) where the teacher repeats the pupil's Response. What is different about this is that even

though this kind of repetition is normally an acceptance of the pupil's response or has a pedagogical goal to make sure that everyone in the class hears the response. In this case, however, the teacher Initiation (line 15: *you don't cook o:r*) that follows the Feedback indicates something else; that the teacher is not content with the answer, but wants to suggest another activity that would be suitable for this pupil to do at home in the evenings. The Initiation is also quite sexist, because it suggests that the teacher seems to hold on to a stereotype of women rather cooking than reading at home. This is a valid example of stereotypes maintained in the classroom, especially in this case where the female pupil happens to be from another culture, as can be seen on line 25 (*something from your own [country-] your old country (0.7)*).

Other features of differential teacher treatment can be seen in this extract. First of all, the teacher makes many of the questions easier for the girls by continuing the Feedbacks with Initiations. Keeping the conversation going happens with the male pupils as well, but not with such blatant simplification of the questions. An example of this kind of behaviour can be seen on line 17-20, where the teacher is trying to form her question as simply as possible. Secondly, the teacher is much more cautious with the girls than with the boys in her feedback. For example, on lines 28-44, the teacher accepts that some of the girls cannot think of any skills in English and moves onto another girl on line 36. Here the teacher asks if LF1 draws by pencil or watercolour and even though the responds is *sometimes* and not in any terms qualifying as a correct response, the teacher says *aha* and again quickly moves on to LF2 on line 44. Finally, one more feature of gendered talk is worth mentioning; again the teacher specifically targets the girls as a group on line 1 by saying *how 'bout you girls*. This happens repeatedly as was seen in extracts 2 and 8, as well as in the next extract, which takes place during the second lesson, when the class continues with more grammar. All in all, the teacher refers to the girls as a group on seven occasions during the four lessons, but not to boys.

Extract 15 (lines 1512-1533)

1	T	mites sanottas *(how would you say)*	
2		do you believe (5.3)	
3		do you believe (0.7) mahdottomaan *(in the impossible)*	
4		(2.6)	
5	T	onko tytöillä mitään (0.2) aavistusta? *(do the girls have any idea?)*	
6	LM	(o)	
7	T	Jaana mite sanosit *(Jaana how would you say)*	
8	LF4	(mmm)	R
9		(3.1)	
10	T	ei: *(no)* (0.9) Rai°sa°	F/I
11		(2.1) Leena tietää *(Leena knows)*	
12	LF2	do you believe in the (0.5) (unim[possible)]	R
13	T	[m in the] impossible	F
14		(4.4) ((quiet whispering))	
15	T	eli (0.2) aina jos me tehää siitä adjektiivista substantii↑vi *(so always if me make that adjective in to a no↑un)*	
16		nii pitää laittaa määrätty °artikkeli° (0.5) *(so you have to put a definite article)*	
17		.hh näitäkin näkee *(.hh you can see these)*	
18		ei nyt niin kamalan useesti mutta kuitenki *(not that often but anyway)*	
19		(6.9)	
20	T	ja sielä on pari muuta esimerkkiä kirjassa nii voitte lukee *(and you have a couple of other examples in the book so you can read)*	
21		(2.7)	
22	T	ööHHH sieltä *(mmh from there)*	

On line 5 the teacher referring to the girls as a group can be seen again. When the Feedback is concerned, on line 13 the teacher almost underestimates LF2's potential, because she does not let the pupil produce her Response on line 12, when she already corrects her. Leena's Response is incorrect, but the teacher right after the first syllable, when she hears that Leena is producing an error, jumps and takes over. Perhaps this is a way not to give sufficient time for her to make a mistake in front of the class.

There is one more example that shows the teacher's attitude towards both the male and female pupils in the classroom, in extract 16, where the teacher gives sentences in Finnish for the pupils to translate.

Extract 16 (lines 1413-1432)

1	T	no niin otetaas ensin ne vertailusanat HHH *(ok let's take first the comparative words HHH)*	
2		miten tämmöne (0.6) perusesimerkki kun *(how about a basic example like)*	
3		**Ville** on yhtä komea kuin Tom Cruise *(Ville is as handsome as Tom Cruise*	
4		(4.2)	
5	T	tulee Ville esimerkkejä kaikki *(All the examples are Ville-examples)*	
6		(1.7)	
7	T	Ville on yhtä komea kuin Tom Cruise	I
8		(1.9)	
9	T	helppo *(easy)*	
10		(3.6)	
11	T	sanokko Raisa *(would you Raisa say this)*	
12	LF3	aa Ville is as <ha:ndshome [as]> Tom Cruise	R
13	T	[as]	F
14	T	<handsome (0.5) as (1.3) Tom> (0.8) Cruise	F
15		(2.7)	
16	T	<yhtä komea kuin> *(as handsome as)*	
17		(2.0)	
18	LM5	kostatsä ny vielä sitä (.) *(are you still aveging that)*	I
19		[mun kommenttia] *(my comment)*	
20	T	[kostan] koko loppu kurssin *(I'll avenge for the rest of the course)*	R

Firstly, the teacher's attitude to the girls can be seen on line 9, when the teacher Initiates a sentence and before choosing Raisa to answer, she says that the sentence is easy. What is interesting about this is that after the teacher has implied that the task is easy, she chooses a female pupil to answer it. In addition, while Raisa is producing her Response, the teacher helps her on line 13, although the pupil does not need any help. As can be seen from the transcript, the teacher says *as* at the same time as Raisa, which indicates that the teacher had a preconceived idea that the female pupil would make a mistake. However, LF3 produced a correct utterance.

Secondly, the teacher's more upfront way of interacting with the male pupils can be proven again on lines 18-20, where the teacher admits that she is teasing LM5 from an earlier comment he has made about being good-looking. They both use the word *avenge* in the sense that the teacher is avenging him, which sounds a bit too harsh.

To sum up, when compared to the male pupils, in addition to treating the girls as a group instead of individual pupils, the teacher also in some cases gave feedback in a different way. As the teacher did not hesitate to bring forward in a negative tone her feedback when the boys produced an error or to mock and tease them, the fact that this did not happen with the girls, can be described as gender bias in the EFL classroom. The question to whether there were differences in the teacher's feedback according to the gender of the pupil, can be acknowledged, but did the teacher favour the other gender is a different matter. The next section tries to shed some light on the issue.

5.2.3 Male dominance in the EFL classroom

As was already seen in the previous section, the boys had a tendency to interrupt and talk while the teacher was interacting with the girls. The focus of this section is to examine the male pupils' behaviour in order to see whether the teacher actually favoured the boys over girls and if the teacher, probably unconsciously, let the boys dominate the interaction. All in all boys interacted much more with the teacher during the four lessons than the girls did, although no quantitative analysis has been made. The boys seemed to have more turns than the girls did, for example, in the longest piece of discourse between the teacher and the boys, the boys had about 145 turns, whereas in the longest conversation between the teacher and the girls, the girls had only 17 turns.

In terms of the male pupils interrupting and calling out answers, the next extract is one example of that. In extract 17 the class has just listened to a text

and now they are talking about it and the teacher is picking out example sentences for the pupils to translate.

Extract 17 (lines 1013-1046)

1	T	any words phrases difficulties in understanding	
2		(4.4) ((some quiet talk))	
3	T	no? (0.2) everybody un-	
4		so (0.2) how would you say in Finnish	I
5		a good cee vee is tight (0.4) containing your personal details an so on	
7		(0.3) how 'bout this one in Finnish ↑please	
8		(2.7)	
9	T	Marko	
10		(1.0)	
11	LM1	hyvä se ansioluettelo on semmone (0.6) tiivis pakkaus °joso ° (0.5) *(that good cv is like (0.6) a tight package that has)*	R
12		(persoona noista tiedoista) *(person about that information)*	
13	T	personal details	F
14		what **are** they in fact	I
15		(2.0)	
16	LM1	henkilötiedot=	R
17	T	=y:e-es	F
18	LM1	no: sitten siinä on tota *(well: then it has like)*	
19	LM	((coughs))	
20	LM1	mikä oli (2.3) öö tota mikä oli >*qualification*< *(what was hmm like what was >qualifications<)*	I
21		(1.0)	
22	T	suggestions?	I
23		(2.0)	
24	T	qualifications?	
25	LM5	vaatimukset	R
26		(1.9)	
27	T	yes you can translate it by pätevyys vaatimukset but (0.7)	F
28		wh- what does it mean here Leena?	I
29		(3.1)	
30	LM5	(saavu-) *(achievem-)*	R
31	T	[I'd say]	F
32	LM5	[saavutukset] *(achievements)*	R
33	T	koulutodistukset for instance *(school reports for instance)*	F
34	LM5	(xx)	
35	LM1	(x) koulutodistukset ja sitte (0.3) taidot ja (1.4) *(school reports and then skills and)*	
36		ja että se o jotenki hyvin esitetty (0.2) kaikki siinä ja (0.7)	
37		helposti (0.7) luettava *(and that it's somehow well presented (0.2) everything there and (0.7) easily (0.7)*	

		readable)	

This extract is interesting in many ways. First of all, in terms of gender, the teacher initiates a discourse on line 28 to Leena and after 3.1 seconds when no response has been produced, one of the boys (LM5) takes over in telling the answer. The teacher is not bothered about this, but goes on discussing further with the boys. This kind of behaviour from the teacher indicates that she does not even notice when the boys call out answers. It also seems that the boys are used to come between the teacher and the girls, because they might sense that they have more power in the classroom that the girls have. The situation in extract 16 has happened with one of the girls as well in extract 9, but as was mentioned when analysing the extract, it was very unusual behaviour from the girls. Another example of male dominance can be seen in extract 18 and 19.

Extract 18 (lines 1262-1277)

1	T	Raisa (1.7)	I
2		mistä tää on tää vertailumuoto mikä tän perusmuoto on (1.0) *(where is this this comparative form what is its basic form)*	
3		better known	
4		(2.6)	
5	LF3	(aa) emmää tiiä *(I don't know)*	R
6	LM	°good°	R
7	LF(3)	°hyvä°= *(good)*	R
8	T	mistä tää tulee tää better= *(where does this better come from)*	I
9	LF3	°good°	R
10	T	sor↑ry	I
11	LF3	good (0.8)	R
12	LM5	@good@	R
13	T	ei oo good sanasta *(no it's not from the word good)*	F
14	LF3	w[ell]	R
15	LM1	[well] known	R
16	T	well known se on well known (0.8) *(wk it is wk)*	F

The teacher Initiates the question to one of the girls on line 1-3. After this the girl Responds that she does not know the answer and immediately on line

six one of the male pupils tries to help the girl by producing a Response that is incorrect. The girl then repeats the boys utterance in Finnish on line 7, which the teacher then re-Initiates on line 8 (*mistä tää tulee tää better= (where does this better come from)*). Then a sequence of RIRR occur as the LF3 Responds by repeating the word *good*, suggested by the male pupil on line 6. The teacher does not (again) hear the girl's Response and asks her to clarify by saying *sor↑ry* on line 10. After LF3 repeats her answer again, LM5 concurs with the Response and repeats it himself as well on line 12. However, it still is not the correct answer so the teacher gives Feedback by saying that the word *good* is not correct. LF3 is given a new opportunity to answer the question and tries to do so, on line 14. Before she gets to the correct answer, one other male pupil (LM1) interrupts and Responds on line 15. The Responds is the one the teacher was looking for so she gives positive feedback to the male pupil in the form of a teacher echo. Again, a male pupil gets the credit for what belonged to a female.

As mentioned above, extract 19 is also an example of male dominance, because it again shows how the male pupils call out answers, even though the question is pointed out to a female pupil. During the extract, the class is going through adjectives used as nouns.

Extract 19 (lines 1434-1442)

1	T	ja sokeat sää voit tietysti sanoa että the blind (0.3)	F
2		mitä olis työttömät? *(how about the unemployed?)*	I
3		(1.7) ((there's talk))	
4	T	työttömät? (0.8)	
5		Liisa (.) muistatko semmosta sanaa? *(Liisa do you remember such word?)*	
6	LF1	en *(no)*	R
7	T	ei mu- (0.5) Raisa muistatko? *(no-Raisa do you remember?)*	F/I
8	LF3	en	R
9	LM	°the unemployed°	R
10	LM	[the un]employed	
11	T	[nih]	F
12	T	**the** unemployed	

As can be seen on line 7, the teacher has repeatedly asked the question of what *työttömät (the unemployed)* is in English and now she asks Raisa if she remembers what it is. Right after she Responds *no* on line 6, one of the male pupils call out the correct answer, in which, as happened in the previous extract, the teacher reacts to by giving Feedback in the form of a teacher echo. The teacher does not seem to be bothered about the fact that one of the male pupils called out the answer and interrupted the interaction between the teacher and one of the female pupils.

In section 5.2 the differences in the teacher's feedback to boys' and girls' responses was examined and the findings seems to indicate there to be some patterns where the pupil's gender plays an important role. The teacher's attitude towards the boys' responses and the attitudes towards the girls' responses were compared and the findings showed certain differences in the teacher's behaviour, especially when the pupil produced an incorrect response. As the data was closely examined, it also showed clear patterns of male dominance, which was also discussed in this section.

What can be said about all of the findings presented in chapter 5 is that interaction in the classroom between the teacher and the pupils is far from being straightforward. It has unique patterns and subtle varieties, which are dependent on the context of this institutional setting. In the next chapter the findings examined here are summarized and discussed in more detail in relation to the research questions and previous studies. As a conclusion, the process of the present study is discussed.

6. Discussion and conclusion

In this chapter the data that was presented and analyzed in chapter 5 is discussed further and the findings summarized in terms of the research questions that were presented in chapter 4 and the previous studies that were presented in chapters 2 and 3. After this the contributions of the present study, its process, as well as its limitations will be discussed. In addition, directions for further studies will also be suggested.

The aim of the present study was to examine the theoretical framework that exists in the research of classroom discourse and gender bias to see whether any differences can be seen in the teacher's reactions according to the gender of the pupil. Gender in the language classroom and especially differential teacher treatment were the focus of interest in examining previous studies and implementing them in the analysis of the present study. In terms of classroom discourse, research done in the field of DA and CA was examined to find frameworks such as IRF, SETT and studies in the field of corrective feedback that were used in the analysis of the data in order to identify certain patterns of feedback the teacher had and other interactional sequences that occurred between the teacher and the pupils.

The analysis of the data, where interaction between the teacher and the pupils was examined, showed there to be both similarities and differences in the teacher's reactions when compared to girls' and boys' responses in the classroom. In terms of the research question as to in what way an English teacher reacts and gives feedback to his/her pupils' responses, some interesting conclusions can be made. The teacher had certain feedback types and ways to react to the pupils' responses that can be described as being consistent. Follow-ups of the type *hmm*, *ahh* and *okay* occurred very often in the teacher-initiated IRF sequences. This kind of follow-up occurred after both correct responses and in some cases after incorrect responses. This kind of feedback type allowed the teacher to quickly move forward with the

exercises and the lesson as well as to give positive feedback by accepting the pupil's response without further analyzing and evaluating it. This pattern of feedback did not have any differences according to the gender of the pupil, as they were quite equally distributed to both genders. Even though the pattern of feedback was similar in the examples presented in section 5.1, the situation and the pedagogical goal was not dependent on the feedback. However, the goals in the feedback sequences can be divided into two groups; first, giving practice in oral fluency by giving minimal repair or second, keeping the conversation going by extending the learner's contribution, so that after the words like *hmm*, the teacher continued to re-initiate, for example, *mm↑m (0.7) Finnish sh-sh--stuff [or]* or *okay an:d (1.0) what did you get?*. This type of feedback allowed the teacher to smoothly keep the conversation going or to quickly move on to another pupil. Although these two types of follow-ups are the ones that stood out the most, there were, of course, other types that were not as consistent. Those follow-ups were usually the ones that created a difference between the feedback given to the male and female pupils from the teacher, which brings us to the second research question.

The second research question asked how the teacher's reactions differ when the pupil is a boy or a girl, i.e. whether any kind of gender bias is involved in the teacher's reaction when a pupil produces a response. In section 5.2 the difference in the teacher's feedback according to the gender of the pupil was examined and the findings from the data were also very interesting. Although the teacher's reactions in the follow-up sequence did differ according to the gender of the pupil, they were not as different as was expected. It was actually the teacher's attitude that made the most difference in the feedback sequence. Firstly, the follow-ups that had some difference in the teacher's treatment towards male and female pupils showed that the teacher's feedback to boys was more negative in tone and the girls were more "protected", especially if the response was incorrect, as was indicated in

section 5.2.2. Secondly, when continuing the feedback sequences with re-initiations, the teacher often helped the girls more than the boys by including an answer inside the question, as could be seen for example in extract 14. Thirdly, although no calculations were made, the transcripts showed that the teacher had more interaction and longer sequences than she did with the girls during the four English lessons. Finally, no sign of the male pupils getting feedback that was higher in quality or vice versa was found in the data. Perhaps in some cases the teacher evaluated a boy's response more thoroughly, but this was not enough to make any definite conclusions about it.

In addition, the teacher's attitude in terms of the gender of the pupil was not expected to be so obvious. Also other aspects of the teacher-student interaction that did involve gender bias, could be found in section 5.2.3, where male dominance was examined. These findings are related to the last research question which asked if there are other areas of teacher-student interaction in the IRF pattern, where inequality in terms of the gender of the pupil is discovered. Some of the findings that were discovered show that it was not only in the teacher's feedback where differences in terms of the gender of the pupil could be found. Firstly, when examining the teacher's attitude towards the girls, the teacher referred to the girls as a group on seven occasions during the lessons and not once did she do that with the male pupils. Secondly, the teacher interacted with the male pupils much more than with the female pupils during the lessons. Finally, the male pupils were allowed to interrupt and call out answers, when the teacher was interacting with the girls and the boys also dominated the question-answer sequences more than the girls did.

The findings of the present study are somewhat similar to previous studies done in this field, but also some unique qualities that might only be created because of the qualities of the teacher and the pupils, were also found in the

data. In terms of Sunderland's (1998) study, the findings of the present study also confirmed that the teacher gave more of her attention to boys, for example in terms of number of times boys' names were mentioned. In addition, what was also found in Sunderland's study was the fact that girls' responses to the teacher's solicits were treated as broadly correct rather than incorrect. Nevertheless, although the methods of the present study were not similar to Sunderland's study, the findings presented in the previous chapter did not confirm Sunderland's findings in terms of the teacher asking the girls more questions that required an answer of more than one word or that the teacher produced more academic solicits to the girls in which they were expected to answer in the foreign language. In addition, whereas in Sunderland's study the girls were seen as the more academic and more academically challenged group, in the findings of the present study, the situation seemed to be the opposite; the boys were challenged more and the girls helped more with their responses.

As to the implications of the present study, it is relevant in the sense that it hopefully offers teachers and the research community new information about the everyday life and actions of teachers so that these issues would be more addressed in pedagogical studies and teacher training. Moreover, it brings forward a relatively new viewpoint to how the English language is used in the EFL classroom and how small things can affect the quality of interaction between a teacher and his/her pupils. In terms of inequality and gender bias, the teachers should focus more on their own behaviour, so that certain stereotypes are not maintained in the classroom. As Constantinou (2008: 28) points out that even though it is assumed that teachers try to provide "equitable learning opportunities" in a fair way, it seems to be common that the teachers sometimes treat female and male pupils in a different way and have stereotyped attitudes towards them. In addition, as was seen in extract 13, even though it is better to be gentle than rude, a teacher's pedagogical goal should never be to underestimate a pupil or to

accept a wrong answer as correct, only to “keep up with appearances”, as it so evidently seemed to be the case between the teacher and girls in the present study.

There are many further studies that could continue the path of the present study. Firstly, it would also be interesting to see whether the sex of the teacher has any relevancy in how the pupil is treated and in what light has his/her responses seen. Secondly, it would be interesting to see whether boys are rewarded with attention, because of their unwillingness to participate as much as the girls or if girls are getting less reaction and feedback from the teacher, because they are thought to be better performers than boys. Or, is this kind of generalization necessary at all? Thirdly, in addition to mixed-sex classrooms, all girl-groups could be compared to all boy-groups and to see if there are any differences in the teacher’s feedback. Fourthly, a quantitative study, with similar purposes as the present study had, could be an interesting and a fruitful study to conduct. In that case, the amount of feedback the teacher gives according to the gender of the pupil could be examined in more detail than it was done in the present study. Finally, in addition to the data and analysis in the present study, it could have been interesting to interview the teacher and to see if she noticed any of the differences that were found in the data. These issues have not been studied enough, especially from the point of view of gender bias. The way a teacher reacts to a student’s response is a very important target of study, because when the teacher realizes how differently he or she treats his or her students according to their difference in gender, something can be done about it. According to Swann (1992: 77), “at a practical level, it is necessary to monitor talk among pupils and between teachers and pupils and to introduce strategies to ensure that quieter pupils have a chance to participate” as girls usually are “crowded out” by boys.

Although the findings of this study contribute to research done in the field of gender bias in the EFL classroom, it has certain limitations. The data for the present study is too narrow to draw any definite conclusions about the difference in the teacher's reaction to a pupil's response according to the gender of the pupil, or to generalize the teacher's negative and rude behaviour towards all male pupils. The situation in the classroom is always unique and in this case the age of the pupils (16-17 years old), might have been a factor in generating a more relaxed interaction between the teacher and the boys. However, the interaction with the teacher and the girls in this specific classroom, during those specific four lessons was undoubtedly much more cautious and sparse compared to interaction with the boys.

Male dominance in the classroom, the IRF pattern and gender bias have been studied extensively in the past, but not as a single study. That is one of the reasons that make this study interesting and hopefully it works as an incentive to future studies done from this point of view. As we look to the future of foreign language classroom research, it becomes much more evident that in a world where people are demanding even more to be treated as equals, issues such as gender bias and differential teacher treatment need much more attention.

Bibliography

Brilli, J. and R. Potka 1988. *Gender as a factor influencing discourse production*. Unpublished Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages.

Cazden, C. B. 2001. *Classroom discourse: the language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Constantinou, P. 2008. Heightening Our Awareness of Gender Stereotypes. *Strategies: A Journal for Physical and Sport Educators* 21 (3), 28- 34.

Cook- Gumperz, J. and M. Szymanski 2001. Classroom "families": cooperating or competing—girls' and boys' interactional styles in a bilingual classroom. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 34(1), 107–130.

Drew, P. and J. Heritage (eds.) 1992. *Talk at work: interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goddard, A. and M. Patterson 2000. *Language and gender*. London: Routledge.

Graddol, D. and J. Swann 1989. *Gender voices*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lee, Yo-An 2007. Third turn position in teacher talk: Contingency and the work of teaching. *Journal of Pragmatics 39, 1204–1230*.

Lemke, J. L. 1990. *Talking science: language, learning and values*. Norwood (N.J.): Ablex.

Lindroos, M. 1995. The production of "girl" in an educational setting. *Gender and Education* 7 (2), 143-155.

Lyster, R. and L. Ranta 1997. Corrective feedback and learner uptake: negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 20, 37-66.

Mehan, H. 1979. *Learning lessons: social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: ?

Nassaji H. and G. Wells. 2000. What's the use of ´triadic dialogue´? An investigation of teacher-student interaction. *Applied linguistics* 21 (3), 376-406.

Panova, I. and R. Lyster 2002. Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly* 36 (4), 573-95.

Seedhouse, P. 2004. *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: a conversation analysis perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Sinclair, J. McH. and R. M. Coulthard. 1975. *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sunderland, J. 1992. Gender in the EFL classroom. *ELT Journal* 46 (1), 81-90.

Sunderland, J. (ed.) 1994. *Exploring gender: questions and implications for English language education*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Sunderland, J. 1998: Girls being quiet: a problem for foreign language classrooms? *Language teaching research* 2 (1), 48-82.

Sunderland, J. 2000. New understanding of gender and language classroom research: texts, teacher talk and student talk. *Language Teaching Research* 4 (2), 149-173.

Sunderland, J. 2001. Student initiation, teacher response, student follow-up: Towards an Appreciation of Student-initiated IRFs in the Language Classroom. http://www.ling.lancs.ac.uk/groups/crile/docs/crile55sunderl.pdf

Sunderland, J. 2006. *Language and gender: an advanced resource book*. London: Routledge.

Swann, J. 1992. *Language in education: girls, boys & language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Walsh, S. 2006. *Investigating classroom discourse*. Oxon: Routledge.

APPENDIX

TRANSCRIPTION SYMBOLS	
[text]	overlapping speech
[text]2	
(.)	a pause, shorter than 0.4 seconds
(0.7)	a pause, timed in tenths of a second
(2.0)	a pause, timed in seconds
(~2.2.)	estimated length of a pause
text=	
=text	latching speech
CAPITALS	loud speech
bold	prominence, via pitch and/or amplitude
exte:nsio:n	noticeable extension of the sound or syllable
cut off wo-	cut of word or a sentence
high circles	soft speech
.	falling intonation
↑	rising intonation
↑↓	falling-rising intonation
,	continuing intonation
marked	marked pronunciation
mispronounced	mispronunciation
((coughs))	transcriber's comments
(x)	incomprehensible item, probably one word only
(xx)	incomprehensible item of phrase length
(xxx)	incomprehensible item beyond phrase length
(text)	uncertain transcription
. laughing.	laughing production of an utterance
(h) (h)	laugh tokens
@	altered tone of voice
<tekstiä>	slow speech
>tekstiä<	fast speech
singing singing	production of an utterance
whispering	whispering production of speech
h h	outbreath
hh	inbreath

SYMBOLS TO IDENTIFY WHO IS SPEAKING	
T	teacher
LM1	identified male learner, using numbers (M1, M2…)
LF1	identified female learner, using numbers (F1, F2…)
LM	unidentified male learner
LF	unidentified female learner
LF(3)	uncertain identification of speaker
LL	unidentified subgroup of class
Ls	learners
LMs, LFs	male learners, female learns