

Proceedings of 9th Multi-Disciplinary Seminar



Committed to Excellence

Proceedings of the 9th Multi-Disciplinary Seminar

**Research and Knowledge Management Office
St. Mary's University**

August 2017
SMU-Multipurpose Hall
Addis Ababa

**Implementation of Gender Responsive Pedagogy at Debre Markos
College of Teacher Education**

Tilahun Fentie¹

Abstract

The main objective of this study was to explore the implementation of gender responsive pedagogy at Debre-Markos College of Teacher Education. To this end, observational case study was employed and non-participant observation; in-depth interview and focus group discussion were used. Data was collected from seven purposively selected teacher-educators and six students. The collected data was analyzed and interpreted qualitatively. As it was revealed in the results, study participants (teachers and students) were found to have low understanding about gender responsive pedagogy. Moreover, the different teacher-student classroom interactions, teachers' classroom language use, classroom management, leadership assignment and students' seating arrangement were not gender responsive. They were found to favour towards male students than females. Hence it could be concluded that teachers' classroom teaching practice has not been carried out in a gender friendly manner. Thus, it was recommended that the college administrative body and other concerned stakeholders should offer sustainable, practical and efficient training to teacher-educators to enable them to consider gender issues in their day-to-day classroom practices.

Key words: - gender, pedagogy, gender responsive pedagogy

¹ **Debre Tabor University**

1. Introduction

This part of the study deals with background of the study, statement of the problem, objective of the study, significance, delimitation, limitation and operational definitions of terms.

1.1 Background of the Study

It is obvious that education plays a pivotal role for people to grow and transform themselves in several aspects of their lives. This will be realized when its quality is ensured. One fundamental element to ensure educational quality is to consider the gender dimension (FAWE, 2006). Gender responsive teaching is as equal as quality education. The changes we make to education to better meet the specific needs of girls and boys is similar to the changes we need to make to ensure that everyone receives a better quality education (INEE,2010). Whatever changes teachers make that promotes gender equality in and through education will also by

definition improve quality of education overall (ibid).So, ensuring gender equality in education implies ensuring quality education. Thus, at least minimum conditions should be created for schools to operate as safe, healthy and attractive teaching - learning environments. A safe, attractive and healthy school environment is realized when it fulfils the issue of inclusiveness in terms of ethnic, racial, gender and disability situations (UNICEF, 2010). Hence schools need to be responsive and friendly to the specific needs of girls and boys.

As FAWE's study indicates, majority of schools in Sub-Saharan Africa are not gender- responsive. Gender-responsive school is one where the academic, social and physical environment and its surrounding community consider the specific needs of boys & girls. Moreover, the academic provisions such as teaching methodologies and materials, classroom interactions, assessment techniques and management of academic processes are gender-responsive.

FAWE, LABE and UNATU (2011) define gender responsiveness as designing appropriate mechanisms to correct inequalities between girls and boys & women and men in learning institutions. Pedagogy is noted to be the term that includes what is taught, how teaching takes place and how and what is taught is learned. Gender responsive pedagogy refers to teaching and learning processes that pay attention to the specific learning needs of girls and boys. Gender responsive pedagogy calls for teachers to take an all-encompassing gender approach in the process of lesson planning, teaching, and classroom management and performance evaluation.

According to FAWE (2006) the main obstacle encountering teachers today is the lack of gender skills necessary for instruction. Teachers do not seem to be aware of the particular needs of girls and boys and discriminatory practices against girls appear in classroom participation and distribution of learning materials. This undermines girls' effective performance in the teaching-learning processes. FAWE defines gender-responsive pedagogy to be the teaching –learning process in which attention is paid to the particular needs of girls and boys. However, inadequate pedagogical teacher training and pre-existing gender norms continue to be counter-productive and contribute to higher rates of female dropout and expulsion (UNESCO, 2003). According to Mluma et.al (2005), appropriate and authentic gender-responsive pedagogy promotes gender equity and ensures quality education. Moreover, McElroy et.al (2011) describes gender equality to be the removal of deep-seated barriers to equality of opportunities and outcomes, such as discriminatory laws customs, practices and institutional processes. Moreover, the promotion of gender equality in educational setting relates to upholding the

delivery of quality education. Gender equality is linked with educational quality since one educational system lacks key aspects of quality when it is gender-biased.

As researchers have understood from various literatures and research results, the instruction delivered in most schools of most countries is not gender-responsive. It is patriarchal in that it encourages the supremacy of males over females. In connection with this idea, Pooja et.al (2006) have found out that in a school where gender-based constructions underpin ideas of classroom discipline and strict divisions are obvious, a girl who is interactive is likely to be pulled up for violating the gender code. For example, for the past consecutive years, we (teachers) were assigned to observe the teaching practice of 3rd year students in various Woredas. At that time we had the opportunity to see the instructional process being delivered in most primary schools. From what we observed, we have assured that the instructional process is gender-biased in a sense it encourages the dominance of males over females. For instance, the different roles assigned in the classroom, the teachers' language use and motivations are observed to be male-dominated. Most females are seen to be passive listeners. In addition, most of the feedbacks teachers give to the students do not seem to be gender-responsive. Thus, to identify the problem and suggest possible solutions, the researcher was motivated to conduct a study on the area under discussion.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Many efforts have been made to eliminate gender discrimination and to create gender friendly environments in the area of education. For about 25 years, the international community has been developing and pursuing goals and strategies related to the achievement of gender equality and responsiveness in education (IREX, 2013). International commitments such as the Dakar framework for Action, Education for All, 2000, UN Millennium Development Goals, 2000, the Beijing Declaration and Plat form for action 1995, World Declaration on Education for All, 1990 and Convention on the elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) 1979 are some of the efforts made. Similarly, the government of Ethiopia has made several national and regional efforts to eliminate gender based disparity and to promote gender friendly atmosphere in the education system. For instance, women's affairs departments are established within the Ministry of Education. Guidelines for integrating gender issues in the preparation of teaching-learning materials are developed. Sensitization and advocacy activities are undertaken at all levels of the education sector. Furthermore, efforts are made to encourage women's participation in the informal education programs. Strategies to

increase the school enrolment of girls in pastoral areas are also formulated (FDRE, 2006).

Moreover, as Plan International (2011) suggested, many efforts were made to close the gender gap between women and men. For example, many countries have passed legislations against gender discrimination and have outlawed practices that are supposed to harm girls. A number of girls have been attending school and completing their education. Moreover, women were made to work in public offices and also they have got opportunities to participate in the economy. But everywhere in the world, girls and women have been still affected by poverty, injustice and discrimination. They have lower social status than boys and men and also they have less decision making power, less access to services and economic resources (Ibid). Similarly, a report of the USAID project stated that the concern of many countries is on the enrolment and attendance of students, particularly girls rather than on obstacles which bring about fundamental inequalities and inequities between girls and boys in the teaching-learning process in the classroom.

Furthermore, practical change has not been registered yet. What is designed in the policies of governments and what is practically observed on the ground is different. This is evident in many governmental institutions. One practical example is the one observed in the educational sector. As several studies indicate; the education sector is not gender-responsive. The pedagogy that teachers use in most educational institutions is not gender-responsive. It does not consider the particular needs of girls and boys (Daniel Mawere, 2013). Even the government of Ethiopia has been convinced that misconceptions and lack of awareness towards gender issues is still a challenge which requires continuous effort to be addressed. Similarly, a review made by FAWE in 2006 has assured that the majority of schools in Sub-Saharan Africa are not gender responsive.

For the past consecutive years, we (teachers) went to many primary schools to observe 3rd year students assigned for teaching practice. Besides, we have repeatedly observed 2nd year students assigned to different schools for practicum 201 & 202. At that time; we were able to observe the situation there. From our observation, we have come to terms that the majority of the activities that teachers used in the instructional process were not gender-responsive.

For example, the duration of time teachers gave for girls to answer a question was shorter than the one given to boys. Teachers were observed to be negligent to give feedback to girls for incorrect answers. The tone of voice teachers used to encourage girls was weaker than boys. The conflict resolution technique teachers used for girls and boys was discriminatory in the sense that they advise girls to be

conformist, passive and to act as if they were physically weaker than boys. This is an indication that primary school teachers do not have enough awareness about gender equality and responsive pedagogy which several scholars and gender-experts underline to be the basis for quality education. Therefore, to explore the implementation of gender responsive pedagogy in Debre-Markos College of Teacher Education and suggest possible solutions, the researcher has developed the following research questions.

1. How do teachers understand gender responsive pedagogy?
2. How do teachers practice various teacher-student classroom interactions?
3. How does the class room seating arrangement look like?
4. How do teachers assign leadership roles to males and females in the classroom?
5. How do teachers use their instructional language in the class?
6. How do teachers practice classroom management in the class?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The general objective of this study was to explore whether gender responsive pedagogy was practically implemented at Debre-Markos College of Teacher Education. More specifically, the objectives of this study were to:-

- Identify teachers' understanding about gender responsive pedagogy
- Find out how different leadership roles are being assigned in the classroom
- Explore how the different teacher-student classroom interactions are made
- Explore whether the classroom seating arrangement is going on in a gender inclusive way or not
- Identify whether teachers' classroom language use is gender responsive or not
- Find out whether teachers do manage students in a gender responsive manner or not

1.4 Significance of the Study

After the study is completed, it is assumed to be significant for:

- Teachers to have enough awareness about gender responsive pedagogy and develop equal outlook for males and females
- Female and male students to respect and treat each other equally
- The college administrative body to have adequate understanding about gender responsive school environment and overcome the challenges hindering it

- Stake holders engaged in the area of education to give more attention for the implementation of gender responsive pedagogy

1.5 Delimitation of the Study

To ensure the manageability and feasibility of the study, it is important to specify its boundary. By definition it is believed that there may be similar problems related to gender in other sister colleges found in Amhara region. Moreover, it is believed that gender irresponsive and unequal classroom pedagogies may be practiced in other educational institutions such as primary schools, preparatory schools, high schools and Universities. However time, energy and financial constraints have made the researcher to delimit the study only to Debre-Markos College of Teacher Education

1.6 Limitation of the Study

Since the study is a small scale case study focusing on a specific setting and specific number of participants, many partners were not included. For example, the administrative and supportive staff, libraries, laboratories, sport and toilet facilities were not addressed in this study. Moreover, quantitative study approaches and other advanced statistical tools were not incorporated. Finally, analyses of curriculum materials such as text books, modules, lesson plans, and test and exam instructions were not made.

1.7 Operational Definition of Terms

- **Gender:** - a social construct assigned to females and males with respect to the roles they play in the society.
- **Gender responsiveness:-** teaching both genders equally to avoid gender bias and discrimination and to ensure gender equality and equity
- **Gender equality:-** avoiding all kinds of discrimination related to gender and ensuring equal opportunities and benefits for girls, women, boys and men
- **Gender equity** :- ensuring equal educational access and opportunities for girls and boys
- **Patriarchy** :- a belief or ideology that promotes the supremacy of males over females as God given asset
- **Gender responsive pedagogy** :- a teaching –learning process which gives more attention to the specific needs of girls and boys
- **Classroom instruction:-** teaching-learning practiced in the classroom

2. Research Methodology

2.1 Design of the Study

To pursue the research problem and to investigate research questions, the researcher adopted a qualitative case study approach. There are many factors which determine the choice of methodology. The nature of the research questions, participants, the research setting and the results to be sought by the study are some of the several factors which determine the choice of the research methodology. The present study involves observing various interactions of teachers and students in the classroom and investigates teaching and learning processes framed by the gender responsive practices of college teachers. These contextual parameters along with the research questions and the data which they require are crucial to select a methodological approach and methods which are able to give evidence to generate knowledge that brings the study into a successful conclusion (Wight, 2010).

2.2 Qualitative Research Approach

Firstly, the researcher began by exploring the difference between quantitative and qualitative forms of research. Creswell, 2005 (as cited in Wight, 2010) explains the difference between quantitative and qualitative research approaches in the following manner.

In quantitative research, the researcher decides what to study, asks specific and narrow questions, collects numerical data, analyses the data using statistics and conducts the study in unbiased and objective manner. Whereas qualitative research depends on the views of the participants and is used when the researcher requires an “exploration in which little is known about the problem and when a detailed understanding of the central phenomenon is required. Based on the definition above the present this study is qualitative in its approach because the researcher needs to explore and have detailed understanding of gender responsive classroom practices within a specific context of few selected classrooms and teachers in a college setting.

2.3 Case Study

A case study is used to attain an in-depth understanding of the subject under investigation. Case study focuses on the investigation and procedures rather than the final outcomes. It focuses on discovery rather than validating the results of the research with other research outcomes. A qualitative research theorist, Stake 1995, (cited in Wight, 2010) says that the case is an integrated system. Case study is preferred when “what, why, who and how” questions are asked and when the researcher has very little control over the events or when the focus is on present

day issue within the real life setting. A case study maintains holistic and meaningful characteristics within the research environment by collecting data through qualitative methods and usually requires considerable amount of data to ensure that sufficient understanding is formed. A case study is also preferred when narrative and descriptive approaches to collect data and understand the way things are, and what it means from the perspective of the research participant is required. Therefore, case study is appropriate to this research about few selected teachers and classrooms in which teaching practices are observed and documented through non participant observation techniques and in-depth interviews. In this study non participant observation and in-depth interview were used to acquire data.

As Yin, 2004 (cited in Wight, 2010) said, case study research enables the researcher to investigate important topics not easily covered by other methods through the narrative and descriptive approach. Case study usually involves the collection of very extensive data to produce an understanding of the entity to be studied (Burns, 2000, cited in Wight, 2010). It makes a specific focus in a specific setting to be studied. In this case the researcher has focused on specific research participants (7 teachers) within specific classrooms. The researcher observed how teachers interact and behave with students in relation to gender responsive teaching and learning. Literature reveals that there are several types of case studies (Wight, 2010). Some of them include historical, clinical and observational case studies. Of these case studies, my research project used observational case study because most of the research data was acquired through continuous observations. Generally, this type of case study has a specific focus (focusing on specific number of teachers and classrooms) in a specific setting; Debre-Markos College of Teacher Education.

2.4 Data Sources and Sampling Techniques

The main data sources of this study were teacher educators teaching at Debre-Markos College of Teacher Education. Seven individual participant teachers were selected purposively using criterion-based purposeful sampling method. The criteria used to select participants were their familiarity with the researcher and their volunteering behavior to be part of the study. Except one participant, all participants were middle-aged adults (35 and above years of age). With regard to their educational back ground, six participants had Master's Degree and one participant has a Bachelor Degree. Gender wise, five participants were males while two participants were females. Additionally, six student participants were selected and included into the study. Similarly, purposive sampling method was employed to select student participants. The criterion of selection was their active class participation observed during the observation session and their volunteering

behavior when asked to be part of the research process and the researcher's belief that these respondents would provide rich and resourceful data believed to increase the credibility of the study. Of the student participants, 3 were females while the other 3 were males.

2.5 Data Collecting Instruments

To collect dependable and credible data non participant observation, an in-depth interview and focused group discussions were employed.

2.5.1 Observation

In this study non participant observation was used to collect data regarding the presence or absence of characteristics involved in the practice of gender responsive pedagogy. The various classroom dynamics, classroom set ups, teachers' instructional behavior, feedback and encouragement, language use and treatment of students of both sexes would be critically observed, recorded and analyzed. In this study non participant observation was principally used to probe the dynamic interactions involved in the classroom. It was particularly used to record the different interactions to be made between teachers and students.

Non participant observation allows the researcher to consider the various aspects of student interactions in the flow of time and real events. It helped the researcher to probe beneath the surface to record, analyze and interpret unanticipated subtleties and variables operating in the classroom world. The subtleties and unanticipated variables must be considered if the researcher is to begin to fully understand classroom dynamics (Trout & Benjamin, et.al 1972).

2.5.2 Interview

In this research an in-depth interview is used to gather data from the research participants. An in-depth interview is a kind of data collecting instrument that the researcher uses to elicit information so as to achieve a holistic understanding of the participants' point of view. This instrument involves asking participants open-ended questions and probing whenever necessary to get data assumed to be useful for the study. It is flexible and adaptable to different circumstances (Creswell, 2007). Moreover this tool is appropriate to collect data from the participants' resourceful and real experiences accumulated through many years of teaching practices. So to dig out enriched and detailed information, an in-depth interview was found to be pertinent to this study. This instrument was developed from the various literatures reviewed.

2.5.3 Focused Group Discussion

Focused group discussion was employed to substantiate the data obtained from the non-participant observation and in-depth interview. This instrument was administered to gather data from the selected student participants.

2.6 Procedures of Data Collection

Before the actual data collection was carried out pilot study was conducted on three participants other than those selected for the study and accordingly some modifications were made.

2.6.1 Conducting the Observation

At first the researcher selected participants based on intimacy and their volunteering behavior to be part of the study. Then, the purpose of the observation was told to them. After that the researcher entered different classes and made observations on the classroom dynamics such as teacher-student interactions, teacher awareness, the students' seating arrangements, leadership roles, group discussions, reflections, teachers' language use, feedback, encouragement and treatment. The time taken to observe each participant (teacher) was 45 minutes. The observation took a month to be completed. Each participant was observed a minimum of 3 times and a maximum of four times. Because of the existence of closer and deep-rooted relationship between the researcher and participants, no artificiality was observed throughout the observation sessions. That is the data recorded from each observation session was natural and credible. Generally the observation procedure was completed successfully.

2.6.2 Conducting and Recording the Interview

In the first place pleasant greetings were made between the researcher and participants. Simple introductory questions were asked to warm up respondents. To produce adequate and relevant answers from participants the researcher asked only one question at a time. He listened to the responses of participants seriously and observed their non-verbal signs such as gestures, facial expressions and body movements. The researcher became neutral from suggesting insights to the interview questions. He didn't show signs of wonder, surprise and other emotional expressions till the end of the interview. The maximum time taken to conduct the interview was 1 hour and the place of the interview session was conducive. Tape recorder was used to record the responses of participants. The researcher used tape recorder because it enabled him to fully attend what respondents said and it also saved much time. Moreover, tape recorder enabled the researcher to avoid irrelevant data that were recorded during the interview session.

2.6.3 Conducting the Focus Group Discussion

A comfortable place was selected with the consent of the participants. The six participants were made to take part in the discussion. The researcher thanked participants for coming and he told the purpose of the discussion to them. The researcher also informed participants that anything raised in the discussion would be kept confidential. Before the beginning of the actual discussion, the researcher used an ice-breaker to engage participants in the discussion process. The he started the discussion by giving turns to each participant to make him/her thoroughly express his/her knowledge, experience and view point regarding the topic under discussion. In the course of this the researcher initiated some silent participants to talk more and control those who dominate the discussion. The facilitator asked discussants non-threatening and relevant questions, probed them to clarify vagueness and he pauses to give them time to comprehend ideas. In this manner, the researcher made discussants to exhaust their ideas concerning the topic of discussion.

2.7 Procedures of Data Analysis

The data collected through observation was read exhaustively and repeatedly. In the course of reading, irrelevant ideas were cleared and avoided. Then the data was grouped thematically and analyzed in line with the research questions posed in part one of this study. Similarly, to analyze the data collected through in-depth interview and focus group discussion, video cassettes are listened carefully and exhaustively and irrelevant ideas were avoided. Finally, the data is analyzed through description, narration and interpretation and it was used to complement the data obtained through observation.

2.8 Ethical Considerations

Detailed discussions were made with the research participants, particularly with focus group discussants before the commencement of the data gathering process. In the discussion the following issues were dealt with.

- Respondents were informed that the researcher will collect data for research purpose
- Participants were asked if they were interested to participate in the study
- Participants were asked if they would be named or given pseudonyms and all of them agreed to have pseudonyms.
- Participants were asked to know their consent for audio-taping during the interview and focus group discussion. Fortunately, all of them agreed to be audio-taped

- Respondents were guaranteed the data obtained from them would be confidential

3. Result and Discussion

This part depicts the major findings of the study. In doing so, the data collected through observation, an in-depth interview and focus group discussion from the research participants were critically analyzed & presented in line with six interpretive themes. The interpretive themes were constructed based on the research questions posed in part one of this study. Subsequently, each theme is followed by descriptions, narrations and interpretations.

3.1 Presentation of the Results of case Observations

This section depicted findings obtained from participants. In this part, data obtained from non-participant observation, in-depth interview and focus group discussions were analyzed and each participant was given pseudonyms. To save space, time and kept confidentiality between the researcher and participants the pseudonyms were written in abbreviated form.

3.1.1 Results of Teacher Observation

A middle aged teacher entered a classroom with 42 students. In this class, the number of males was greater than females. As could be observed throughout the three consecutive sessions, Teacher E revised the lesson that he taught in the previous time. Then, he introduced the daily lesson. But an important event observed on the part of teacher E was that he did not ask any question to check students' previous understanding. He simply revised the previous lesson himself and went on introducing the daily lesson. He used approximately 10 minutes to revise the previous lesson. In his introduction of the daily lesson too he had been observed to have used the same amount of time. Just like the behavior he showed during his revision, teacher E did not allow students to express their perception towards the lesson being discussed. That is he did not use brain storming method to initiate students to suggest their ideas about the course being discussed. Teacher E did not use group formation, group discussion, reflection, role play, debates and many other active learning methods which were supposed to make students of both sexes participate actively and express themselves clearly. Teacher E appears to be conditioned by the traditional method of teaching-lecture method in the sense that he has been observed spending much of his time lecturing students.

With respect to the seating arrangement, students of both sexes were observed sitting differently. That was the majority of females were seen seated with females and also the majority of males were observed sitting with males. Moreover, most of

Proceedings of the 9th Multi-Disciplinary Seminar

the middle and front chairs were occupied by males while the back and corner chairs were occupied by females. This was not a onetime occurrence rather it was the occurrence of frequent times. Here an important behavior observed on teacher E was that he did not say anything about students' seating arrangement. He simply entered class and lectured students the course that he was assigned to.

Regarding his classroom management, Teacher E had smart and interesting quality. He was a careful and serious teacher in the sense that he managed students only with his eyes. He did not ridicule and harass students of both sexes rather he monitored the whole class systematically peacefully. He was a sort of authoritarian and charismatic teacher who preferred to socialize with students under controlled supervision. Throughout the 3 sessions no student of either gender is observed disturbing in the class. His voices were vigorous and energetic. Most of the teaching session was occupied by him. Students listened to him quietly and wrote his lecture notes in their exercise books.

At the middle and end of the session, teacher E used questioning and answering method. This was the only assessment method he used to check students' understanding of his presentation of the lesson. At this time when teacher E raised some questions few hands were raised to answer the questions. Unfortunately the majority of the hands were most likely raised by male students. Females tended to be quiet and passive observers. They seemed to be invisible in their participation in the classroom. The sadly occurrence observed there was that nothing was said on the part of teacher E about females' invisibility in the classroom. Teacher E simply invited only students who raised their hands to answer questions. He never encouraged female students to equally participate with their male counter parts. He was simply guided by those students who raised their hands. He did not tend to consider gender composition in this regard. So his method of teaching was not gender responsive.

Teacher E's feedback was entirely corrective in the sense that he didn't give more opportunities to the students to take time, think over and answer the questions. After one student had attempted the question, he did not invite another student to attempt it. Rather, the teacher himself gave the correct answer and passed to the next portion.

The instructional language teacher E used was mostly gender neutral. He mostly used terms like the plural pronoun "you" (እናንተ), students, trainees and class. No student was observed being called on in the name of either gender. Generally from the beginning to the end of the observation session lecture method was most dominantly used and students were observed to be passive listeners and writers.

They simply listened to him and took notes while he was lecturing. Child centered method of instruction which makes students of both sexes be active participants and interactive was not practiced in teacher E's classroom.

The classroom layout in teacher E's classroom was not gender responsive. Students of both sexes were observed sitting on different seats. Students were not made to be mixed in their classroom. Most girls were seen sitting at the back rows and corner seats while most of the middle and front rows were observed to be occupied by male students. This was observed for the consecutive three sessions. Teacher E didn't say anything about students seating arrangement. So, whether intentional or unintentional, teacher E's awareness about classroom set up was poor and limited. An interesting quality observed on the part of teacher E was that his language fluency and accuracy was amazing. His speech was coherent and organized. His eye contact and confidence were also attracting and encouraging. Teacher E's socialization with the students in and out of the class was limited. He was a kind of authoritarian and serious teacher and that was why he has limited social interaction with his students. Teacher E doesn't seem to be satisfied with the answers students give during question and answer technique. He did not give wait time for students while they were answering questions.

3.1.2 Results of Teacher Observation

Teacher M is a 40 year-old teacher who teaches action research in room 20. The total number of students in this room was 36. The number of females was 27 and that of males was 19. There the number of females was greater than males. As it was observed in the three observation sessions, teacher M revised the lesson that he taught in the previous time. An important limitation observed here was that teacher M didn't ask students to check their understanding of the previous lesson. He simply revised the lesson himself without allowing students to respond or comment on the lesson. Teacher M used around 10 minutes for revision. Then, he introduced students with the daily lesson. Just like the time he used for his revision he used 10 minutes for introducing students about the daily lesson.

Teacher M used mixed approach to teach his students. That was sometimes he used lecture method and sometimes he used student centered method. At the time of lecturing the only assessment technique to be used by teacher M was questioning and answering method. As the researcher observed repeatedly, teacher M didn't consider gender composition during questioning and answering. He was simply guided by those students who raised their hands first. That was to mean he invited only students who raised their hands first. The majority of these students were most likely males. Most females were simply looking at the interaction between the

teacher and male students. Their teacher-student interaction tended to be male-dominated. Teacher M seemed to fail to see this situation critically. He didn't seem to have enough awareness about gender responsive instruction with respect to questioning and answering.

At times of using active learning method (student centered method) he predominantly used group formation, group discussion and reflection. During group formation the criteria teacher M used random assignment of students to the different groups. Students' identification number (ID.N0) was the main assignment criterion of students into the various groups. Gender composition was not teacher M's criterion to form discussion groups. At the end of the assignment what was observed was that some groups were found to be composed of only females while some others were of only males. Teacher M did not seem to be aware of such a situation. He simply went on distributing discussion activities to each and every group.

Regarding leadership assignment what teacher M did was that he simply ordered different groups to select their discussion leader/ presenter. At the end of the day, what happened was that the majority of group leaders were observed to be male students. Sometimes male students were entirely seen to be group leaders. Teacher M didn't seem to be impressed by such a situation and thus continues to facilitate the discussion to be held in the class.

Concerning reflection/presentation males were observed to be leading the stage dominantly except one/two females appearing on the stage. In this regard, also, teacher M also did not appear to practice gender responsive reflection/presentation. He tended to favour towards male students. The other important point observed there was that after a student had reflected an activity, the teacher himself gave the correct answer to the whole class. That was to mean teacher M did not pick the activity and gave to another student to respond it. He seemed to have corrective behavior in his interaction with the students.

The other important point with regard to teacher M was his classroom language use. As it was understood from the three observation sessions teacher M's classroom language use was gender neutral. He commonly used words like students, class and the plural pronoun you (እናንተ) to interact with his students. He had never been seen calling on students' individual names during his class room interaction. However, his eye contact was interesting and holistic. He seemed to see students of both sexes equally and positively. He did not seem to be busy with other things particularly when students responded to questions as well as gave

comments. He seemed to be serious and attentive while communicating with students of both sexes.

The last important point to be raised was teacher M's facilitation role. During group discussion teacher M moved between groups to facilitate the discussion held in the classroom. He gave support when some students signal him to do so. This signal was most dominantly come from male students. Females did not signal him to help them. They passively looked at males' active engagement and participation in the discussion. Teacher M didn't seem to be aware of females' passive role in the discussion. He simply expects some kind of signal from the students. In short his facilitation role was not gender friendly.

3.1.3 Results of Teacher T Observation

Immediately after she entered class teacher T took attendance regularly. She always called on students' individual names using their ID number. Then she revised the lesson she taught in the previous period. She took almost 10 minutes to revise the lesson. During her revision, she allowed students to participate in questioning and answering but not always. One important thing that she lacked during questioning and answering was that she didn't seriously observe which sex was participating actively. She seemed to be guided by those students who raised their hands first. As it was repeatedly observed in her teaching session, the majority of students who raised their hands first were males. In fact, there were females who participated in hand-raising although their number was few. She was not observed encouraging students who participated passively. These students were most likely females. This was one limitation observed on the part of teacher T.

In teacher T's class, the total number of students was 42. Of this figure, the number of females was 32 while that of males was 10. There the number of females was greater than males even if males outperform females in many activities. Concerning students' seating arrangement boys and girls were seated differently. Many females were seated alone without being mixed with males and the same was true with males. For example, 8 males were seated at the front rows while 15 females sat at the back rows and the remaining sat at the corner and the middle seats. As I observed frequently, students of both sexes were seated in their permanent seats. Teacher T didn't seem to be impressed by this situation.

After revising the previous lesson, teacher T introduced the daily lesson. As seen in the 3 observation sessions teacher T taught 3 different topics. For instance, the topic taught in one observation session was "lychophaitina". By the way teacher T is biology teacher and thus teaching lychophaitina found in biology course. After she introduced the lesson for certain minutes, she went to group formation.

At the time of group formation what teacher T did was that she ordered students to form groups of five and discuss the given activities. Gender was not used as a criterion to form discussion groups. The criterion used here was randomization method. She randomly assigned students to the different groups based on their ID number. After groups were formed what happened was that most females were grouped alone without being mixed with males. The same occurrence was seen on the part of male students. Teacher T didn't practice gender-based group formation. She used two criteria to assign students to the different groups during group formation. One was by using randomization method (using students' ID number) and the other was telling students to form groups on their own. As I frequently observed the criteria she used didn't make her gender responsive teacher. Commitment, practical involvement and serious observation about what was happening during group formation seemed to be expected on her.

With regard to facilitating group discussions, some gaps seem to be observed. As usually, teacher T rounds between groups to facilitate the students' discussion but she does not identify which sex is predominantly playing a significant role in leading the discussion and which one participates passively. She simply gives some help when asked by students.

During reflection what happened was that first teacher T assigned five questions to the five discussion groups. Then she invited volunteering students to come to the stage and reflected on what they did during their discussion. Secondly, she used randomization method (used students' ID number) to select presenters. As I have frequently seen, teacher T did not seem to bother about which gender was repeatedly participating in the presentation. What I mean was her selection criterion was not based on gender rather it was based on students' volunteering behavior and randomization method.

At the end of her session, it was common for teacher T to check students' understanding. To this end she raised some questions. As usual she allowed volunteering students to answer questions. But an important thing that I observed was that teacher T's teaching method is active, participatory and democratic despite the fact that females' participation in various activities is weak and invisible

3.1.4 Results of Teacher B Observation

Middle-aged teacher came into class with 32 students. In this class the number of male students was 14 and females were 18. The first thing teacher B did in the classroom was to greet students. Then, he revises the lesson that he taught in the previous period. The time he uses for revision varies from session to session.

Proceedings of the 9th Multi-Disciplinary Seminar

Sometimes he used ten minutes and sometimes he used more than ten minutes. In the course of his revision teacher B practiced questioning and answering techniques to check students' understanding of the lesson. As usual, some students raised their hands to react to the teacher's questions. An important phenomenon I observed there was that the majority of hands raised by students were males' hands and few hands raised were by female students. What made teacher B special compared to other respondents (teachers) was that he mostly advised female students to equally participate with their male equivalents. Unfortunately because female students did not show volunteering behavior to participate in any activity practiced in the classroom, the classroom interaction was predominantly led by male students. One crucial thing that I would like to emphasize is that teacher B's instruction was student centered. He allocated little time for his role. A great amount of time was lost by students doing each and every activity given by the teacher.

When teacher B completed revising the previous lesson he introduced the daily lesson. He used few minutes for introduction. Then he ordered students to form groups' with 5 students in each group. Teacher B attempted to see gender proportionality in each group and if students of both sexes were disproportionately assigned in one group him attempted to proportionate them. Teacher B moves around groups and checked each group to ensure that each group was forming on the basis of gender equality. After that teacher B distributed discussion activities to each group and facilitated the discussion. In course of his facilitation he checked which student was participating consciously and which one was not. He approached to each group and gave help particularly for low participating students. During the group discussion he encouraged female students to be active participants and helped them when they asked him to do so. Teacher B allocated much time for group discussion.

After the discussion was completed what teacher B did was he assigned questions to each group and gave turns for each question to be answered. At the time of presentation teacher B tried to be gender responsive in the sense that he gave turns to students of both sexes to participate in calculating and demonstrating activities on the writing board. Teacher B was a mathematics teacher and hence he invited students to calculate, draw pictures and demonstrate activities on the black board. Two students (one female and one male) were made to calculate equations on the board and when they finished calculating questions teacher B asked the whole class to check whether the calculated questions are were correct or not. At this time he gave turns for students of both genders to tell if the answer was correct or not. In each activity teacher B encouraged students of both sexes equally. Despite teacher B's strong and continuous effort to be gender responsive in students' participation,

female students did still seem to be reluctant and passive in their classroom activities.

After students completed their reflection, teacher B summarized the daily lesson. During his summary he explained few but very important points to the students and as usual he checked the participation and understanding of each student about the lesson he was concluding. One important point I observed was that teacher B seemed to miss his class room management behavior. As it was observed in the three consecutive sessions students of both genders disturbed and show unnecessary behaviors in the classroom. Teacher B seemed to fail to resolve this problem. He was not seen either advising or criticizing disturbing students of both genders. The language teacher B used in the class room was gender neutral. He did not call on students' individual names. Instead he used words like students and the plural pronoun 'you' to communicate with the whole class. The other crucial point to be raised in teacher B's observation was about assignment of roles to students of both genders. Particularly, during group discussion role assignment was a usual practice for teacher B. What teacher B did was that he seriously considered gender composition when he selected group leaders/coordinators. Moreover, when he wanted students to clean the writing board he was not gender biased rather he gave turns for students of both sexes to participate in cleaning the black board. Generally teacher B was gender responsive in several aspects of class room activities.

3.1.5 Results of Teacher K Observation

The classroom where teacher K taught her lesson was room-12. In this class the total number of students was 34. From this total the number of females was 24 while the number of males was 10. It has to be noted that the number of females was greater than males. As it was observed for the 3 consecutive sessions, students' seating arrangement was not gender friendly. Female students were seen seated alone without being mixed with male students and the same was true with male students. Most of the back and corner rows were occupied by females whereas front and middle rows were occupied by males. Teacher k, without being impressed by this situation continued to revise the previous lesson. After revision she introduced the daily lesson. The time she allocated for revision and introduction was almost the same (10 minutes). During her revision as well as introduction she did not give more opportunities for students to participate either in reacting to the questions asked or to give comments. She simply preferred to give the correct answer herself. Most of the time the instructional method teacher K used in the class was gapped lecture. She sometimes used student- centered method and sometimes she used lecture method.

Proceedings of the 9th Multi-Disciplinary Seminar

After introducing the daily lesson teacher K gave group discussion activities to the students. But before giving activities she made students to form groups. At the time of group formation no effort was seen on the part of teacher K to make the group structure gender responsive. As it was noted for the consecutive 3 sessions, teacher K simply told students to form groups on their own. Her commitment and intervention during group formation was weak and gender- inconsiderate. At that time many students of the same sex were grouped together without considering the importance of gender composition. Of course, it was undeniable that there were some groups which were composed of males and females although their number was insignificant. Teacher K moved around groups to facilitate students' discussion. She gave support to groups when they asked her to do so. In the course of group discussion, what the researcher frequently observed was that most discussions were dominated by males. Females were observed performing activities passively. Most female students did not give comments and suggestions during group discussions. Rather they simply watched and listened to their male counter parts during their discussions. During this time no encouragement was made by teacher K to help female students to equally participate with male students. Some female students were seen writing and compiling reports but male students were observed producing important ideas and answers to the given activities. During group discussion teacher K did not seem to be aware of the outperformance of males over females. She simply moved around groups and gave support when she was asked to do so. At the time of questioning and answering, teacher K simply asked students to raise hands and answer the questions posed. Unfortunately most of the hands raised were made by male students. In fact there were few females who participated in raising their hands. There what teacher K did was that she simply allowed students who raised hands first. As it was repeatedly noted these students were most likely males. But most females were observed looking passively at what was happening in the classroom. In this regard no effort was seen on the part of teacher K to encourage females to scale up themselves.

As far as her instructional language was concerned teacher K did not call on students of either gender by their names. Rather she was seen using gender neutral terms like 'students' and the plural pronoun 'you' and 'trainees'. The language she used in the room did not touch the personality of either sex. She was interactive, approachable, sociable and friendly. She communicates with students of both sexes easily.

With regard to reflection/presentation teacher K showed an interesting behavior. What she did was that she gave 8 activities/questions to the students. For this to happen, she allocated 30 minutes. Then she made students to select only 4

activities/questions. After that she invited students to come to the stage and calculate the first question/activity. There in order to answer the questions students raised their hands. First a male student was allowed to calculate the first question. Secondly a female student was permitted to do the second question. The two students were made to calculate the two questions at a time. The female student finished her calculation before the male one. The female student was made to demonstrate what she calculated to the whole class. Then teacher k encouraged the girl and asked the whole class by saying “Is she correct?”. Then students said “no”. After that the teacher herself gave the correct answer. Then, the boy finished his calculation. Then, teacher K made the boy to demonstrate what he calculated to the students. The whole class of students reacted that the answer was not correct. At this time, teacher K did not give opportunity to another student to attempt the question rather she simply gave the correct answer herself. That was teacher K seemed to have corrective behavior during her feedback. The amount of time teacher K allocated for the two students to calculate the given questions was almost equal (8 minutes). The encouragement given to the two sexes was also almost similar and interesting. But this encouraging behavior was seen only in one observation session and hence it lacked comprehensiveness to confidently conclude that teacher k was a gender responsive teacher.

3.1.6 Results of Teacher A Observation

Teacher A taught in a class of 37 students. From this figure the number of female students was 27 while the number of males was 10. The number of male students was greater than that of males. As was observed and noted during the three observation sessions the students’ seating arrangement was not gender responsive. The indicators for this incidence were that most females were seated alone without being mixed with males. Moreover, the back, corner and side rows were dominantly occupied by female students. The front and middle rows were predominantly occupied by male students. There, teacher A didn’t say anything about students’ seating arrangement. He simply revised the previous lesson like other teachers did and went to introducing the daily lesson. The topic of the daily lesson was how to select teaching modules. To introduce the daily lesson as well as revise previous lesson teacher A took around 10 minutes. At the time of revising and introducing the lesson he sometimes used questioning and answering method and sometimes he did not. During questioning and answering, teacher A needs students’ signal instead of focusing on gender composition. What I want to say here is that he was simply guided by those students who raised their hands first. Passive and reluctant students were not given opportunities to be active participants and these students were observed to be most likely females.

Proceedings of the 9th Multi-Disciplinary Seminar

What is specially observed on the part of teacher A was that he didn't tell students to form groups. Rather he simply gave discussion activities to the students in their primary seats/as they were. He didn't tend to bother which activity was given to males and which one was assigned to females. Thus his gender friendliness during group formation and discussion was poor. After distributing discussion activities teacher A facilitated the discussion. At this time he didn't appear to seriously observe active and passive discussants while rounding between groups. But when some students call on him he went there and gave support to them. Without students' signal teacher a didnt deliver any help.

When the discussion was finished teacher A informed students to present what they had discussed. The main problem observed here was that teacher A did not give turns to the students of both genders. He simply gave opportunity to those students who showed their hands first. It did not matter for teacher A whether the student who raised his/her hand was a male student or female student. What was fundamental for him was a student who raised his/her hands quickly. What I observed was that confident and quicker students were more beneficial whereas shy and reluctant students were losers.

Concerning classroom management, no student of either gender was seen disturbing in the classroom. In teacher A's class silence seemed to be the order of the day. At the outset teacher A warned students to attend seriously till the end of the session. He was an authoritarian and serious teacher who managed students through controlled supervision. One special incident that I observed from teacher A was that the disciplining technique he applied to students of both sexes was different. That was teacher A gave harsh and strong warning for male students when they tend to show some sort of unnecessary behavior but he used soft and weak warnings for female students. There was a tendency to show gender biased procedure with regard to classroom management.

Regarding classroom language use teacher a showed gender irresponsible tendencies in the sense that sometimes he used harsh and threatening words. For instance, he warns a girl to behave like a woman and a boy to behave like a man. He seemed to have deep-rooted patriarchal ideology. He seemed to favour the supremacy of males over females. Moreover, he sometimes calls on the whole class in the name of a male sex. For example, it is now that every one of you should lay a foundation for future fate (እያንዳንድህ ለወደፊት እጣ ፈንታህ መሰረት መጣል ያለብህ አሁን ነጩ).

The last point to be mentioned was his role assignment to the students of both sexes. When teacher A assigned roles to students his criterion was not gender

responsive but by simply telling volunteer students to take the lead in doing class activities, assignments and projects. In addition to this, any volunteer and quicker student was allowed to clean the blackboard and other activities which require students' support and participation. Thus, teacher A's assignment of responsibilities was not gender friendly

3.1.7 Results of Teacher C Observation

Teacher C was an English teacher who taught his course in room 37. The number of students in this class was 36. The number of female students was 25 while that of males was 12. Teacher C came to class with a lesson plan. The lesson plan was framed in gender neutral form in the sense that it contained terms like *students*, *trainees* and the pronoun *they*. Teacher C after he entered class revised the previous lesson. At this time teacher C didn't say anything about students' seating arrangement even though students of the two sexes were found sitting differently. Teacher C asked some questions to remind students of the previous lesson. Students from both sexes raised their hands and attempted to answer the given questions. As the researcher observed, the majority of hands raised were seen to be the hands of male students. At this time teacher C didn't use turns to allow students from the two sexes to participate equally in answering questions. He simply allowed students who were volunteer to answer the questions quickly. After he finished revising the previous lesson he introduced the daily lesson to the students. The topic of the daily lesson was about "Reading skills". Teacher C made some explanations about the lesson. The time to be taken to revise and introduce lessons varied from session to session. During his introduction teacher C used brain storming questions to initiate students' to be more concerned about the lesson to be taught. But the problem observed there was that teacher C invited only those students who are quicker and volunteer to answer the questions posed. Slow, reluctant and hesitant students were not addressed well. Teacher C uses sometimes student- centered method and sometimes he used lecture method. After the end of brain storming, teacher C informed students that there were some activities drawn from the lesson and students needed to be ready to discuss the given activities. While informing students about their readiness to discuss the given activities he didn't say anything about gender composition. He told the whole class of students to be ready and concerned for the discussion.

With respect to group formation teacher C informed students to form 8 groups consisting of 5 members. As it was noted from the consecutive observation sessions, teacher C divided students into 8 groups with 5 members each. A crucial point observed on the part of teacher C was that he didn't consider gender

composition while forming discussion groups. As a result of his failure to consider gender composition 4 groups are composed of only female students and the remaining 4 groups were composed of more males with few females. After the formation of discussion groups and distribution of activities the next task to be performed by teacher C was to facilitate the discussion. At this time teacher C moved around groups and observed the discussion. He offered support when he was asked but did not encourage reluctant and shy students. He tended to require some kind of signal from the students. The signal was mostly observed to be shown by male students but females were observed to be disadvantaged in this respect. Thus, the issue of gender sensitiveness of teacher C in the area of facilitation was poor. During group discussion some students of both sexes were seen disturbing and bullying, particularly those who sat at the back rows. Even though teacher C moved around to facilitate the discussion, he was not able to manage the classroom properly. His classroom management behavior was poor. But the teachers' behavior was good and approachable. He treats students positively though the idea and practice of gender sensitivity was observed to be poor. As it was seen frequently, the time allotted for group discussion was 30 minutes. The remaining 20 minutes were used for lesson revision and introduction.

After the discussion was completed, teacher C used sometimes questioning and answering method and sometimes he made students to present what they had discussed. What made teacher C special from other participants was he raised several questions to promote students participation. He made all of the eight groups to participate in both answering and asking questions. Unfortunately, the majority of students observed participating in both answering and asking questions were male students. Many females were seen to be passive observers who simply look at what was happening between the teacher and male students. An important point to be noted was that nothing was said by teacher C about the unequal participation of students of both sexes. As could be understood from the observation session teacher C didn't call on students in their names. Rather he used gender neutral language such as students and trainees to communicate with the students. Behaviourally, teacher C was well mannered, tolerant and approachable

3.2 Results Obtained from the In-Depth Interview

Differences were seen among the interview participants with respect to the concept of gender responsive pedagogy. Some participants perceived gender responsive pedagogy in a short, shallow and narrow manner but some others viewed it in a relatively detailed way. Still others offered irrelevant and unrelated concepts to it.

Proceedings of the 9th Multi-Disciplinary Seminar

With respect to classroom interactions, most teacher-student classroom interactions were not carried out in a gender responsive manner. For instance, in questioning and answering, most teacher-student interactions were found to favour towards male students. Similarly, teachers' tradition of forming discussion groups was not found to be gender sensitive. During group formation teachers were reported to use other criteria than gender. Instead teachers' were found to use students' ID. number, and nearby seats to form discussion groups. In addition to this, teachers were found to leave students to form discussion group by their own. To offer support to the students teachers were found to expect clues from the students. Their skill and strategy to identify participant and passive participant students was found to be low. Moreover, teachers' tradition of selecting presenters during presentation was found to favour towards males. But in feedback, teachers had reported that they would give equal treatment to boys and girls. Furthermore, interviewees have reported that female and male students used deferent seats in the classroom. Teachers considered students' seating arrangement as a normal tradition and thus they contributed nothing to change/reshuffle it.

As it was understood in the interview, most participants were found to use gender neutral language in the classroom. For example, gender neutral terms such as *students*, *class*, *trainees* and the *pronoun you* were reported to be used commonly. During the interview no participant was reported to call on students' individual names in his/her interaction with the students.

Almost all interview participants have reported that there was no difference among teachers in the management of both boys and girls. When participants were asked how, they responded that they did not consider gender when they punish, criticize or praise students. Their focus was on the disruptive behavior occurred rather than the gender of the student to be penalized.

As interview participants said, gender was not considered to be the criterion to assign leadership role to the students. Instead students' ID number and ability were reported to be used to select student leaders in the classroom. Moreover, participants have reported that they used another way to select student leaders. That was they gave complete responsibility to the students to select group leaders and presenters on their own. Due to cultural factors female students do not dare to shoulder responsibilities and to be leaders and hence they leave the opportunity to male students to lead/coordinate many activities carried out in the classroom and out of it.

3.2.1 Results Obtained from the Focus Group Discussion

Participants of the Focus Group Discussion were students drawn from the classrooms in which observations were made. The total number of discussants was six. Of this figure, 3 students were females while the remaining 3 were males. As they had suggested in the discussion majority of discussants did not have detailed understanding about gender responsive pedagogy. They described gender responsive pedagogy in a shallow, simple and narrow way.

When participants were interviewed about classroom presentations/reflections, they replied that most reflections were pre-dominantly made by male students. Females' contribution in the presentations was reported to be low. Participants of both sexes have attributed females' low contribution to the past deep-rooted cultural factors which encourage the supremacy of males over females.

When discussants were asked concerning their participation in questioning and answering, they responded that the participation of males in either asking questions or giving comments was found to be higher than females. When they were asked about teachers' role in questioning and answering, they reported that teachers were basically initiated by active participant students and these students were reported to be most likely male students. Hence, teachers were reported to favour towards male students at the time of questioning and answering. When discussants were interviewed about teachers' role during group formation, they replied that their method of group formation was not based on gender rather teachers were reported to orally tell students to form groups by their own. They were reported to lack practical involvement in group formation.

When asked about teachers' classroom management behavior, respondents replied that most teachers had problems in monitoring students in the classroom. Teachers were reported to show some differences when they manage students. For instance, oral punishments, warnings and criticisms that they forward to male students was stronger than the one to be given for females. Teachers were reported to give positive advices and soft criticisms to female students than the male ones. With regard to students' seating arrangement discussants responded that majority of male and female students were seated differently at the beginning of the session until teachers tell them to form discussion groups. So, students' use of classroom seats was not gender sensitive.

With respect to teachers' leadership role assignments, students have reported that teachers lacked the awareness, seriousness and practical involvement when they allocated leadership roles to the students of both sexes. What teachers did was that they simply gave complete responsibilities to the students to select their leaders on

their own. The other thing was that teachers used students' ID number and high achiever students to select leaders/coordinators for the different activities carried out in the classroom and out of it. At this time female students did not take the initiative to be leaders of the various activities undertaken in the classroom. Due to this male students took the opportunity to lead/coordinate most of the activities practiced in the classroom and outside. However, students did not deny that there were certain teachers who were observed to practically involve themselves in the assignment of leadership roles to the students though their use of gender as their central focus for leadership assignment was limited and weak

3.3 Discussions

In this section the researcher discusses teachers' understanding of gender responsive pedagogy, various teacher-student classroom interactions such as (questioning and answering, group formation, group discussion, facilitation, presentation and feedback), teachers' classroom language use, and classroom management, leadership role assignments and students' seating arrangement

3.3.1 Teachers' Understanding of Gender Responsive Pedagogy

Data obtained from the results of observations and from in-depth interview and focus group discussions revealed that participants (teachers) did not precisely understand the concept of gender responsive pedagogy. Teachers understand gender responsive pedagogy as simply providing equal educational opportunities for male and female students. They do not have detailed and practical understanding about its meaning. But the concept of gender responsive pedagogy as confirmed by many literatures and research results was beyond teachers' understanding and awareness (UNATU et.al (2011). Gender responsive pedagogy was understood to be not only providing equal learning opportunities but also integrating the experiences and the different needs of male and female students into each activity practiced in the classroom (McElroy (2011). In support of this idea, kyungah Jung (2005) has confirmed that teachers perceived gender equality as simply offering male and female students with equal educational opportunities or teaching gender equality awareness theoretically. Similarly FAWE (2006) has disclosed that teachers do not seem to be aware of the particular needs of male and female students. According to FAWE (2006) gender responsive pedagogy is understood as being responsive and fair in activities such as lesson planning, classroom interaction, teaching method, assessment technique and content delivery. Moreover, gender responsive pedagogy should be viewed as enabling teachers to overcome traditional patriarchal gender roles through education. Besides treating the different needs of males and females, gender responsive pedagogy enables

classroom teachers to be skilful, committed, and practical and be able to make gender issues as part and parcel of their day-to-day practices (kyungah Jung, 2005). Similarly, data obtained from the in-depth interview and focus group discussion substantiated the above finding. Particularly the results of the focus group discussion revealed that most of the teachers' activities were not gender responsive.

3.3.2 Teacher-Student Classroom Interactions

As data gathered from classroom observations indicates, teachers do not show gender responsive practices during questioning and answering. They do not give turns when they ask questions and give comments to males and females. They were observed to favour towards males than females. In line with this finding, Matthew (2008) has confirmed that teachers do not have the tradition of checking whether a proportionate number of girls and boys participate or not. Similarly, UNESCO (2003) has pointed out that inadequate pedagogical teacher training and pre-existing gender norms continue to be counterproductive and contribute high rates of female dropout. Moreover, teachers were found to be initiated by those students who are quicker and volunteer in raising their hands. In support of this idea Nematullah et.al (2007) have assured that mostly, teachers tend to be attracted by those students who raise their hands first. They tend to be simply guided by first hand-raisers. In light of this idea a research undertaken by Equity Initiative Unit (2010) points out that gender unfriendly teacher calls only on students who raise their hands. As it was made sure from the results, majority of first hand-raisers were found to be male students. But majority of female students were observed to show shyness, reluctance and fear to raise their hands. This finding coincides with Nematullah et.al, (2007) findings which demonstrate that teachers' choices of males is a reflection of visibility rather than gender. Teachers' did not seem to recognize the particular needs of females properly because they were observed to make less contact with female students compared to the male ones. In connection with this idea, Matthew (2008) disclosed that male students tend to be aggressive and quicker to respond while females appear to be slow and reluctant to react to a question. As it was reported in the in-depth interview, some teachers have agreed that they make more contact with males than females due to fear of sexual harassment. This might be attributed to the traditional patriarchal gender norms. Similarly, Pooja et.al(2006) has found out that in a school where gender-based constructions underpin ideas of classroom discipline and strict divisions are obvious, a girl who is interactive is likely to be pulled up for violating the gender code. As a result of the deep rooted cultural norms, females need wait time to be motivated and answer questions. Whether it is implicit or explicit, teachers do not tend to be aware that females need more time to be motivated to answer questions.

Proceedings of the 9th Multi-Disciplinary Seminar

This finding coincides with Anne Geer (1997) ideas which state that college teachers have not yet addressed the particular needs of girls in the classroom. Furthermore, teachers' feedback was not found to be descriptive and detailed. During feedback teachers were observed to affirm correct answers and negate incorrect ones. Besides, when the first student is not able to answer a given question, teachers' do not pick up the question and give it to another student. Instead they give the correct answer themselves suggesting that teachers appear to have corrective behavior when they give feedback to their students. Thus, concerning feedback teachers were not found to be gender equal

With regard to group formation, teachers do not consider gender composition properly. That is to mean teachers do not form discussion groups on the basis of gender. As it was understood from the observation results, the main criteria teachers use to form discussion groups are students' ID number, nearby seats and oral orders. Some teachers were found to use students ID number for dividing the whole class of students into groups. Some others were found to allow students to form discussion groups on their own. Regarding this finding, Equity Initiative Unit (2010) demonstrates that gender irresponsive teachers allow students to form discussion groups on their own. And still others were found to use nearby seats to divide students into groups. So, the way teachers use to form discussion groups is not gender friendly. Moreover teachers' facilitation role during group discussion is not gender responsive. During group discussion teachers tend to consider females passivity and silence as a normal tradition. In light of this idea, SWV (2013) stated that during group discussion, teachers consider girls as passive and quiet and hence they overlook girls' role in the discussion. Teachers tend to lack critical observation to identify active participants from the non-active ones. They were also reported to intervene and give support when they are asked. They expect some clues from students to offer support.

During presentation teachers' selection of presenters was not found to be gender friendly. Teachers were found to select presenters randomly using their ID number. Also, they were observed to choose presenters based on their interest or volunteering behavior. As it was noted from the findings of observations first hand raisers or volunteering students were more likely to be selected for presentation. As it was confirmed from the observation results majority of first hand raisers and volunteering students were found to be male students. But majority of females were observed to be invisible and passive in their participation.

3.3.3 The Status of Students' Classroom Seating Arrangement

As the observation data showed students' classroom seating arrangement was not gender equal. Majority of male and female students were found to use different seats. Supporting this finding a study conducted by UNESCO (2004) has ascertained that in traditional classrooms boys are seated on one side of the room and girls on the other. Majority of the back and corner seats were mostly occupied by female students. Supporting this idea FAWE (2006) has pointed out that seating arrangements which place females at the back and corner rows reinforce them to be passive participants. Most of the middle and front seats were occupied by male students. This condition was confirmed to be true in most observed classes. In connection with this idea a research conducted by Dowley (2011) demonstrates that teachers tend to overlook students' seating arrangement because they simply start their actual teaching without considering classroom seats. As it was explained in the in-depth interview and focus group discussion, at the beginning of the year, most males and females were reported to sit alone (females with females and males with males). These students were thought to use their permanent seats throughout the semester and teachers tend to see this situation as anormal tradition. In connection with this finding, FAWE (2006) has ascertained that teachers have no say about the type of furniture found in the classroom. Similarly, a study conducted by Maureen Bohan (2011) indicated that teachers continue to demonstrate traditional attitudes in relation to classroom organization. Generally gender responsiveness in the area of students' seating arrangement has not been addressed yet.

3.3.4 Teachers' Leadership Role Assignments in the Classroom

As it was suggested by many literatures and research results, the deep-rooted traditional gender beliefs which encourage the supremacy of males over females have made female students not to be assertive in taking leadership and decision-making roles in the classroom and out of it (Blessing et.al, 2008). Teacher participants did not seem to be aware of this situation and as a result male students were observed taking the opportunity to play leadership as well as decision-making roles. As it was explained in the finding, the majority of male students were found to be leaders of the various tasks to be practiced in the class. In line with the above idea Catherin Bean (2014) has assured that boys are more likely than girls to take on leadership roles in the classroom. Moreover, Susanne et.al (2012) has pointed out that women are poorly represented in leadership positions due to male-dominated societal norms. Most observed teacher participants were found to simply tell/order students to select leaders on their own. Teacher participants were found to lack the commitment, readiness and practical involvement in the selection

of group and many other activity leaders. Similarly, data obtained from the in-depth interview and focus group discussion results reveals that most of the students assigned to be leaders/coordinators were found to be males. Most female students were assigned to be subordinates and assistants.

On the same token, many of students' 1-to-five organization leaders were found to be male students. Besides, most assignment/project coordinators were found to be male students. In line with this idea, McElory (2011) has found out that teachers' misunderstanding of gender bias in favour of boys is the reality which forces many females to abandon their schooling. Similarly, DESA (2009) points out that around the world traditional gender roles and structural inequalities related to power imbalances rooted in patriarchal societies continue to place women at a disadvantage relative to men in all spheres of life. Moreover, a study conducted by Neera Narang (2014) points out that teachers tend to assign male students to monitor classrooms more than females. In addition to leadership roles, there are some tasks which seem to be reserved only for males. For example, cleaning the blackboard, moving teaching materials (modules) from the store to the classroom and arranging furniture during tests and exams were found to be commonly allotted for male students. This finding coincides with Lasnow (2011)'s research which states that teachers allocate tasks that require strong muscular exercise to males than females. As it was made sure from the finding, volunteer students were most likely male students. In general females' participation in leadership and many other related activities were found to be insignificant.

3.3.5 Teachers' Classroom Language Use

Most of the observed teachers were found to use gender neutral language in their communication with students. They were observed to frequently use terms like students, class, trainees and plural pronoun *you*. They were also seen to use the singular pronoun *you* when they communicated with the students. Unfortunately, no teacher was observed calling on students' individual names like (Abebe, Aster etc.). Teachers' frequent use of gender neutral language might be attributed to their conscious or unconscious belief about gender sensitive instructional language use. Several studies suggest that classroom teachers use gender neutral language either because they are not aware of its implication and negative impact on students' academic performance or they do not want to be gender responsive in their language practice. Teachers used gender neutral language when they intend to use traditional patriarchal gender norms in an implicit manner. Most gender researchers advise teachers to use gender sensitive language like calling on students in their individual names. However, teachers did not use harsh, offensive and threatening

words when they communicated with their students. Most of the words, phrases and sentences they said in their communication were positive and soft. But one teacher participant was observed to call on the whole class of students in the name of a male sex/gender. For example, “every one of you who come to class without doing this activity will get your consequence!”

3.3.6 Teachers’ Classroom Management Behavior

As it was made sure from the observation data, differences appeared to exist among the observed teachers. Some teachers seem to manage the whole class of students seriously. Their eye contact tends to be holistic in the sense that they seriously observe each and every student from corner to corner (teacher E and M). They tend to have authoritarian and corrective behavior because no student of either gender was seen disturbing till the period was completed. Each and every student seemed to be seriously engaged in the teaching-learning process.

Nevertheless, some others tended to have biased classroom management. They didn’t tend to have holistic eye contact with their students. Rather than manage the class skilfully, they appeared to be busy with some other things. The other limitation observed on the part of these teachers was that their skill of punishing disruptive students was different based on the sex/gender of the students. These teachers showed some sort of strict and hard behaviors when they punished male students. The tone of voices they exerted to warn disruptive males were stronger than the one they used for females. The voices they used to warn females were simple, soft and low-voiced. In a nutshell, teachers’ classroom management system was not gender responsive.

4. Conclusion and Recommendation

4.1 Conclusion

In an attempt to know teachers’ understanding of gender responsive pedagogy a due attention was made to analyze factors related to gender issues. Subsequently, lessons drawn from the analysis were treated under the following six interpretive themes. These include teachers’ understanding of gender responsive pedagogy, teacher-student interactions, student seating arrangements, classroom management, classroom language use and teachers’ leadership assignments to students. So, in this section a focus was made on the key findings of each theme and summary of observations and responses to the research questions posed in part one of this study were also made.

Proceedings of the 9th Multi-Disciplinary Seminar

- It was disclosed in the finding that teachers' understanding of gender responsive pedagogy was found to be low. It was found to be short, shallow and simple.
- It was found out in the findings that the different teacher-student class room interactions such as questioning and answering, group formation, group discussion, reflection feedback and assessments were found to be not gender sensitive. Teachers' classroom interactions were found to favor towards males than females. Moreover, teachers were found to give responsibilities to students to form discussion groups on their own. They were found to have poor involvement in the formation of discussion groups.
- As it was made sure in the results, students' seating arrangement was found to be not gender friendly. Majority of the back and corner rows were found to be occupied by female students while majority of the front and middle rows were found to be occupied by male students. Majority of teachers were observed to begin their actual teaching without considering students' seating arrangements.
- As it was confirmed in the findings, most teachers were found to use gender neutral language in their classrooms. Gender neutral words such as "*students*", "*trainees*" and the pronoun "*you*" were found to frequently be used by teachers. But few teachers were observed to call on the whole class of students in the name of a male gender.
- As it was indicated in the findings, teachers were found to have slight differences in the management of males and females in the classroom. It was found out that their punishments and oral warnings to be given to male students was found to be stronger than that of female students
- It was found out that teachers' assignment of leadership roles to male and female students was not gender responsive. Teachers were found to lack commitment, practical involvement and readiness in the assignment of leadership roles. They were found to simply give full responsibilities to the students to select leaders/coordinators on their own.
- Teachers did not have their own established rules and regulations which helped them to consider gender issues in their day-to-day classroom routines.

4.2 Recommendations

Based on the results obtained, the following recommendations were drawn.

Proceedings of the 9th Multi-Disciplinary Seminar

- Continuous training should be given to teachers' to enable them to have adequate and detailed understanding about gender responsive pedagogy
- Teachers need to take continuous training to be gender sensitive in their day-to-day classroom interactions with their students.
- Teachers' consciousness and understanding about students' seating arrangement is low. So, sustainable training should be given to teachers to raise their awareness and to enable them to skillfully monitor students' classroom seat ups.
- Teachers' were found to use gender neutral language in the classroom. Gender neutral terms like students, trainees and the pronoun you were found to be commonly used in the classroom. As several studies suggest, teachers should call on students' individual names to give them recognition and praise and to make the teaching-learning process gender friendly
- Teachers' need to be trained to narrow down their management gap that they use for male and female students. They should equally manage students of both genders.
- Teachers should be trained to be committed and to practically involve themselves in the allotment of leadership roles to students of both sexes. They should not leave everything to the students to do on their own.
- At the beginning of the year, teachers should develop rules and regulations that can remind of them to consider gender issues in every classroom routines.
- Generally teachers were found to lack detailed understanding, commitment, readiness and practicality regarding the implementation of gender responsive teaching-learning process. So, sustainable training should be given to them to be ready, committed, conscious and practical in their implementation of gender responsive teaching – learning processes in the classroom

Reference

ACD Indonesia (2013) Gender Equality in Education in Indonesia. Educational Sector Analytical and Capacity Development Partnership:Retrieved on April 14/2015 from [http://www. https://openaccess.adb.org/.../Policy-Brief-ACDP-Gender-Equality-English...](http://www.https://openaccess.adb.org/.../Policy-Brief-ACDP-Gender-Equality-English...)

Anita Allana, et.al. (2010). Gender in Academic Settings: Role of Teachers. International Journal of *Innovation*, Management and Technology, Vol.1, No.4October, 2010

Biwei (Vivian) Huang (2010).Gender Bias Faced by Girls and What We Can Do:

Proceedings of the 9th Multi-Disciplinary Seminar

Carly-Lee Wight (2010). Gender Inclusive Practices within the Primary Classroom. Retrieved on January 10/2015 from [https:// researchbank.rmit.edu.au/eserv/rmit:9478/Wight.pdf](https://researchbank.rmit.edu.au/eserv/rmit:9478/Wight.pdf)

CEDAW (1979).CEDAW and Women's Rights: History, Purpose, and Application within Indigenous Communities. Retrieved on February 10, 2015

From [http://www.7genfund.org/.../CEDAW%20and%20 Women' s% 20Rights % 20-%2...](http://www.7genfund.org/.../CEDAW%20and%20Women's%20Rights%20-%20...)

Creswell, J.W. (2007) Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choose among the Five Approaches (2nd -Ed). Thousand oaks', SAGE Publications

Daniel Mawere (2013). An Evaluation of the Implementation of the National Gender Policy in Teacher Education in Zimbabwe: International Journal of Asian Social Science, 2013, 3(2):443-450443. Retrieved on February, 2015 from [http:// www.pakinsight.com/pdf-files/ijass%20443-450.pdf](http://www.pakinsight.com/pdf-files/ijass%20443-450.pdf)

FAWE (2006). Gender Responsive Pedagogy. A working Document prepared by for the ADEA Biennial Meeting. Retrieved on February 10, 2015 from http://www.adeanet.org/portalv2/adea/biennial-2006/doc/.../B5_2_fawe_en.pdf

FDRE (2006). Report on the Implementation of the AU Solemn Declaration on Gender Equality in Africa

INEE, (2010).Gender Equality in and through Education: INEE Pocket Guide to Gender Retrieved December2015fromhttp://Equalwww.ungei.org/resources/files/INEE_Pocket_Guide_to_Gender_EN.pdf

Karen Zittleman and David Sadker (2003). Teacher Education and Gender Equity: The Unfinished Revolution. Retrieved on May 10/2015 from <http://www.sadker.org/PDF/TextbooksandGenderEquity.pdf>

Kecken (2007). A study of Primary classroom Interactions: Is there Gender Imbalance in the Primary classroom? Retrieved on May, 2/2015from http://wwwresearch.ncl.ac.uk/ARECLS/volume_4/CHEN.pdf

Maureen Bohan (2011).A Study on Combating Gender Stereo typing in Education. Retrieved May, 2015 https://www.coe.int/t/.../gender.../CDEG_2011_16_GS_education_en.pdf

Neera Narang (2014). Exploring Gender Relations in the context of School Practices. Retrieved on March, 2015 from <http://www.impactjournals.us/download.php?...Exploring%20Gender%20Relat...>

Proceedings of the 9th Multi-Disciplinary Seminar

- One Student's Perspective and Appended Information from the Center. Retrieved on October/20/2015 from <http://www.smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs/gend...>
- Penina, Mlana (2005). Gender Responsive Pedagogy: A Teacher's Handbook. Retrieved November 2015 from http://www.ungei.org/files/FAWE_GRP_ENGLISH_VERSION.pdf
- Plan International (2011). Because I am a Girl - Plan Canada. Retrieved on March 20, 2015 from http://www.plancanada.ca/Downloads/.../Girl_Report/BIAAG-Report-2011-prerelease.pdf...
- Rebecca Stefan Elli (2004). Gender Equity: Is There Gender Equity in Your Classroom? Retrieved on April, 2015 from www.cedu.niu.edu/~shumow/itt/Gender%20Equity.pdf
- Riordan D.D' (2011). High and Low Inference Test of Teacher Gender Attention Bias Hypothesis. Retrieved on January, 2015 from <http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu> > ... > Honours Theses (Bachelor's)*
- Society without Violence (2013). GENDER EQUALITY IN ARMENIAN HIGH SCHOOLS. Retrieved December, 9/ 2014, from <http://www.swv.am/.../GENDER%20EQUALITY%20IN%20ARMENIAN%20...>
- Troutman, Benjamin, I. Jr. (1972). Using Non participant Observation in Curriculum Assessment: A case Example .Retrieved June 2015 from http://files.eric.ed.gov/full_text/ED075295.pdf
- UNATU (1995). Gender Responsive Pedagogy for Primary Schools in Uganda. A Teachers' Hand Book. <http://www.labeuganda.org/.../Gender%20Responsive%20Pedagogy%20for%20Prim...>
- UNGEI AT10: (2009). A Journey to Gender Equality in Education. Retrieved on March 15, 2015 from http://www.https://www.unicef.at/fileadmin/.../UNGEI_at_10_EN_062110.pdf
- UNICEF (2005). Strategies for Girls' education. Retrieved on April, 4/2015 from http://www.unicef.org/sowc06/pdfs/sge_English_Version_B.pdf*
- USAID (2008). Education from a Gender Equality Perspective. Washington D.C., 2008. Print. Retrieved on May 20, 2015 from http://www.ungei.org/.../Education_from_a_Gender_Equality_Perspective.pdf