

The Asian EFL Journal May 2018 Volume 20, Issue 5



Senior Editor: Paul Robertson



Published by English Language Education Publishing

Asian EFL Journal A Division of TESOL Asia Group Part of SITE Ltd. Australia

http://www.asian-efl-journal.com

©Asian EFL Journal 2018

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of the Asian EFL Journal Press.

No unauthorized photocopying

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the Asian EFL Journal.

editor@asian-efl-journal.com Publisher: Dr. Paul Robertson Chief Editor: Dr. Paul Robertson

Associate Production Editor: Ramon Medriano Jr.

Assistant Copy Editor: Eva Guzman

ISSN 1738-1460





Table of Contents

1. Fahrus Zaman Fadhly / Nita Ratnaningsih	07-33
Reconstruction of Cognitive Process in Popular Article Writing	
2. Feky R. Talahaturuson / Hendrik J. Maruanaya	34-40
Maximizing the use of Wondershare Quiz Creator Program to Promote High School	
Students' Engagement in EFL Reading Comprehension Lesson	
3. Geminastiti Sakkir	41-50
Interest and Writing Skill of the University Students on using Social Media- Facebook	
in Writing Class (STKIP Muhammadiyah Rappang, Indonesia)	
4. Hairus Salikin / Muhlisin Rasuki	51-66
Developing Second and Foreign Language Proficiency: Insight from the Learners	
5. Hanna Sundari	67-71
The Qualities of an Effective English Teacher: University Students' Perception	
6. Hendrik J. Maruanaya	72-77
Multiple Intelligences and Group's Performance in TEFL Projects	
7. Honest Ummi Kaltsum / Ratnasari Diah Utami	78-95
The Effectiveness of Folklore Media against Students' Motivation in Learning English	

25. Murni Mahmud	290-294
Gender Differences in English Language Teaching	
26 Nasarilah M Harra Dh D	205 211
26. Nasmilah, M. Hum, Ph.D	295-311
Learners' Motivational Traits and Strategic Investment in Learning through EFL	
Immersion Program: A Study at Insan Cendekia Madani Boarding School Tangerang	
Indonesia	
27. Ngo Thi Hien Trang	312-317
The Use of Pictures in English Speaking Classes for Pupils at DANANG Primary	
Schools: Reality and Solutions	



Title

Gender Differences in English Language Teaching

Author

Murni Mahmud

Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

Bio-Profile:

Murni Mahmud is a Professor of English Education Department at Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia. Her research interests include gender studies and discourse analysis. She has a Ph.D. in Anthropology Linguistics from the Australian National University and currently teaches Anthropology Linguistics and Sociolinguistics. She can be reached at murnimahmud@unm.ac.id

Abstract

This paper examines the use of sex-based grouping (female-sex group, male-sex group, and mixed-sex group) in teaching English subjects. The subject of this research is one class consisting of 30 students taken randomly in one Senior High School in Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia. To collect data, the teaching and learning process employing the sex-based grouping was observed. The study found that male and female students have different ways in learning English, which are influenced by gender differences. Male students preferred mixed-sex grouping whereas female students preferred the female-sex grouping.

Key words: gender, sex-based grouping, English language teaching

Introduction

Gender difference in communication has become important topics for discussion recently since the notion about 'women's language' was elaborated by Lakoff (1976) and followed by Tannen (1990). This notion emphasized that men and women have different styles

in communicating. Numerous studies on it then flourished (Keeler 1990; Kuipers 1990; Berman 1998; Itakuro and Tsui 2004).

This paper examined the issue of gender differences in teaching English by examining the use of sex-based grouping (female-sex group, male-sex group, and mixed-sex group) in teaching English subjects. Discussion in this paper becomes precious findings on the literature of English language teaching and literatures of language and gender.

Related Literature

Literatures had revealed differences of men and women in communication. Tannen (1990), for example, states that there is a tendency for men to use language to 'preserve their independence and maintain their position in the group'. Conversely, women use language to 'create connection and identity'. Biber & Burges (2000) also confirm that women's focus in conversation is on 'personal and interactional aspects of conversation', whereas men's focus is more on 'transferring information'. In addition, Stanton (2001) states that conversations for women are for the sake of 'developing and preserving intimacy', while for men, 'maintaining power' is more important than other aspects, such as intimacy.

Literature had also revealed the differences between men and women in terms of learning a language (Logan and Johnson, 2009; Mahmud, 2010). Logan and Johnston (2009) found that women 'have better reading comprehension' than men. Mahmud (2010, p. 182) mentions that some characteristics of female students such as being 'ashamed, nervous, not certain', can influence their English proficiency.

Research Method

This paper is based on the data taken in 2015. The subject of the research is the second year students of one Senior High School in Makassar. One class was taken randomly, consisting of 30 students. To collect data, the researcher conducted intensive observations in three meetings. In each meeting, students were divided into three groups: male single sex group, female single sex group, and mixed sex group of male and female. Each group was given a topic for discussion and was observed separately. The results of the observation was described and elaborated in relation to gender differences in English language teaching.

FindingsTable 1 Students' Performance in Sex Based Grouping

Group	1st meeting	2 nd meeting	3 rd meeting
Female	Each member expressed	Each member expressed	Each member expressed
	opinions and work	opinions and the topics	opinions n the topics
	together to make good	All work together to	All work together to make
	report; Some produced	make good report	good report
	questions; In the	Some produced	Some produced questions;
	reporting, some of the	questions and others are	others try to answer
	members are trying to	trying to answer the	In the reporting, some of the
	answer the questions;	questions	members are trying to
	Most members speak in	Members tried to solve	answer the questions
	turn	problems together	
Male	Tended to be silent more	Tended to be silent	Tended to be silent
	rather than talking	Members are expecting	Talking should be prompted
	Only one or two try to	each other to talk	Not a good report
	talk on the topics	No one from the group	Only one of the members
	Sometimes one member	answered the questions	tried to write reports; others
	was asked to talk but no	in the reporting sessions	are just waiting
	comments		
Mixed	Members try to express	Members try to express	Members try to express their
	their opinions	their opinions	opinions
	Questions and answers	Members spoke each	One member who tried to
	were lively	other freely	express opinion will be
	Members were cheerful	Some felt ashamed with	supported by clapping hand
	(laughing and yelling)	her opinion	

Table 1 above shows differences in the way each member of the group participate in the group discussion. In each meeting, groups of the female single sex always performed good participation in the class. In the first meeting, each member try to express opinions about the given topics, some tried to probe questions which can make their discussion was directed to the main issue of the topics. They also show good order in talking. Last they worked together

to produce good reports. In the reporting session, members were actively asking questions. These phenomena can also be observed in the second and third meeting.

A different style of discussion can be seen in the male single sex setting where all of the members are male students. As observed for three meetings, members did not show cheerful discussion that can be seen from the high tendency to be passive and keep silent. Questions need to be prompted, and sometime only one or two tried to talk.

Another different case can be seen in mixed sex setting. From the three times of observation, members of this group tended to be very noisy as they were shouting and laughing each other when one of them was expressing their opinion. During the discussion, most members tried to be active and in fact they made a discussion into long debate. When a female member was expressing her opinion, other members were yelling and clapping hands However, they still can produce good report after long debate.

Therefore, it can be inferred that female and male students have different styles in communication. The female single sex group has more potential to show their good participation in English discussion, compared to the male single sex group. Mixing the group of men and women could also show active participation. This study proves the existence of 'women's language' that had been observed by Lakoff (1976) and Tannen (1990). Tannen (1990) indicates that the superior language-related communicative skills of females are related to their difference in communicative styles. As addition, Tannen (1990) characterizes male speech as conflictive and female speech as cooperative. This results in better communicative competency among female language learners since they are more active in listening and able to convey the message in a harmonious way.

Conclusion

It can be concluded that gender differences are important aspect in English language teaching. Students in the class are various and come from different background and therefore, they are different. Findings from this study prove that those differences can be caused by gender differences, particularly the notion of women's language (Lakoff 1976; Tannen, 1990). In order to accommodate students' differences in the class, English teachers need to create a great atmosphere for learning. The study shows that sex-based grouping can become an alternative way.

References

- Berman, L. (1998). Speaking through the silence: Narrative, social conventions, and power in Java. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Biber, D & Burges, J. (2000). Historical change in the language use of women and men: Gender differences in dramatic dialogue. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 28(1), 21-37.
- Itakuro, H. & Tsui, A. B. M. (2004). Gender and conversation dominance in Japanese conversation. *Language in Society*, 33(2), 223-248.
- Keeler, W. 1990. Speaking of gender in Java. In J. M. Atkinston and S. Errington (Eds). Power and difference: Gender in island southeast Asia (pp. 127-152). Stanford, California, Stanford University Press:.
- Kuipers, J. C. (1990). Talking about Troubles: Gender Differences in Wayéwa Ritual Speech Use. In J. M. Atkinston and S. Errington (Eds.). Power and difference: Gender in island southeast Asia (pp. 153-176). Stanford, California, Stanford University Press.
- Lakoff, R. T. (1976). Language and woman's place. New York: Octagon Books.
- Logan, S. & Johnston, R. (2009). Gender differences in reading ability and attitude: examining where these differences lie. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 32(2), 129-214.
- Mahmud, M. (2010). Language and Gender in English Language Teaching. *TEFLIN Journal*, 21(2), 172-184.
- Stanton, A. (2001). Men and Women in Conversation: Finding a Way to Bridge the Gap,
 University of Massachusetts. http://www.healthandage.com/public/health-center/28/article/1284/Men-and-Women-in-Conversation-Finding-a-Way.html.

 Accessed 10 July 2008.
- Tannen, D. (1990). You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation. New York: Harper Collins.