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Abstract

The present research shows the results of a qualitative interpretative study that inquired about the way teachers' gender-related beliefs shaped their pedagogical practices in single-sex EFL classrooms in a private coeducational school in Bogotá, Colombia. As emergent categories, the study showed that teachers’ practices did not change because of the gender of their students; however, classroom management was mediated by gender and it was necessary to adopt a discipline system specific for boys demonstrating behaviors from the laddish culture. Furthermore, neither classroom environment nor students’ engagement was mediated by gender. Nevertheless, teachers’ beliefs showed binary conceptions of their students from a gender perspective, as they conceived them as academically opposites and such conceptions were related to teachers' historical legacies and culturally held beliefs.
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Resumen

La investigación muestra los resultados de un estudio cualitativo e interpretativo que indagó acerca de la manera como las creencias acerca del género de profesores de inglés moldearon sus prácticas pedagógicas en salones diferenciados por el género en un colegio mixto y privado de Bogotá, Colombia. Como categorías emergentes, el estudio demostró que las prácticas pedagógicas no cambiaron en razón del género de los estudiantes. Sin embargo, el manejo de grupo fue mediado por el género y se hizo necesario adoptar un sistema para el manejo de la disciplina en los grupos masculinos que demostraron actitudes de la cultura “machista”. De igual manera, ni el ambiente de clase, ni el grado de atención fueron mediados por el género. Sin embargo, las creencias de los docentes mostraron concepciones binarias de sus estudiantes desde una perspectiva de género en tanto los concibieron como opuestos académicos y dichas concepciones se relacionaron con los legados históricos de los docentes y sus creencias culturales.

Palabras clave: género, creencias, prácticas pedagógicas, salones diferenciados por género.
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**Introduction**

When I was told that the school where I was going to work followed a model with gender perspective, I got really excited because I thought schools were now understanding the need of inclusion and gender equality. However, the fancy term became a little confusing when I realized that although it was a coeducational school, boys and girls studied in separate classrooms. As a teacher, I embarked in this idea that seemed more an experiment than an educational model, just to realize that it was the perfect scenario to explore gender and language teaching.

The present document reports a qualitative, interpretative study that explored the way teachers’ gender-related beliefs shaped their pedagogical practices in single-sex classrooms in a coeducational school. This process took me to understand the way teachers and students acted as gendered subjects in gendered environments and how beliefs manifested their historical legacies (Ivinson and Murphy, 2007) that led them to make very specific decisions in their classroom contexts.

The document is divided into six chapters that give an account of the research journey undertaken. Thus, the first chapter presents the research problem, research questions and objectives that underpin this study. The reader can find in this section the reasons that led me to explore gender and L2 and the way the EFL community benefits from the findings of the research.

The second chapter will provide the reader with the theoretical constructs that support the study. In this section, concepts such as gender and language, single-sex education and teachers’ beliefs and pedagogical practices will be presented.
The third chapter will present the research design. Thus, the methodological framework that was utilized in order to carry out this study will be explained as well as the context and participants involved.

The fourth chapter presents the data analysis undertaken. This chapter will provide the emerging categories from the data gathered and that answer the research question.

Finally, the fifth chapter will acquaint the reader with the conclusions drawn from data analysis, as well as the limitations of the study, the pedagogical implications that the findings might have in the ELT community and the further research that is suggested after the study.
Chapter 1

Statement of the Problem

The relationship between gender and ELT has gained importance in the last decades. Issues in regards to gendered agency in language learning, (Pavlenko and Piller, 2008), gendered interactions in the classroom (Durán, 2006; Sunderland, 2004) and gender in the curriculum (Davis and Skilton-Sylvester, 2004; Pavlenko, 2004) have been studied. These studies show how students' identities as language learners are shaped by the gender they are ascribed to. Hence, the interactions that take place in the classroom are also mediated by gender and teachers and students appear to consciously or unconsciously privilege certain gendered interactions. These studies have shown how curricula have also been created by gendered subjects privileging a group in particular.

Issues about gender and language have been as well addressed by Colombian studies in regards to gendered positioning, power relationships and the conceptions of gender that students and teachers have. Accordingly, Castañeda-Peña (2008) explored gender positioning in an all-girls school in EFL classes, Durán (2006) revealed teacher and students’ conceptions about gender in an EFL setting, Rojas (2012) studied the way interaction discourses in the EFL classroom unveiled the construction of gender identities and power relationships and Castañeda (2012) also addressed the issue of gendered positioning, but in her study she found the construction of egalitarian power relationships among EFL women-learners. The Colombian studies align to the international ones in the sense that both study how students as gendered subjects try to
get a place in their classrooms and how teachers' perceptions of their students are shaped by the gender they are ascribed to.

However, there is not much said about the particular condition of having boys and girls in separate classrooms and what teachers experience in this matter. Although similar experiences have been reported in English-speaking countries, framed within educational policies intended to create boys-friendly pedagogies, (Martino et al., 2005; Younger & Warrington, 2006 Ivinson & Murphy, 2007) information about single-sex classes in coeducational settings in the Colombian context is scarce.

This particular situation takes place at Colegio New Hampshire (CNH)\(^1\), a bilingual school in Bogotá where classrooms are gender-differentiated spaces. Colegio New Hampshire was originally an only-girls school, but when boys were admitted in the 90s, boys and girls started studying in separate classrooms. The school adopted what was called "a model of coeducation with a gender perspective". (Colegio New Hampshire, n.d)

It is important to mention that the official documents of the school, such as the PEI (Proyecto Educativo Institucional), Quality System Policy and PCD (Plan Curricular de Departamento) do not provide any theoretical references that support this model. This model, however, consists of having boys and girls studying in separate classrooms, "as a means of boosting the capacities, learning styles, particularities and multiplicities of each gender. In addition, boys and girls share the rest of the common areas for cultural, sports and social events. There are also programmed projects in which boys and girls have the opportunity to work together". (Colegio New Hampshire, n.d) Colegio New Hampshire's PEI states in its mission that the school "takes advantage of the

\(^1\) A fictitious name has been provided
Boys and girls study in separate classrooms 40%
Boys and girls study in separate classrooms but share other spaces 15%
Boys and girls learn differently 17%
Capacities in each gender are boosted 12%
Not clear 9%
Other 7%

potential of each gender group (masculine / feminine) through pedagogic strategies and spaces appropriate to each”. (Colegio New Hampshire, n.d)

Nonetheless, there are two situations that caught my attention as a member of the school community. Firstly, teachers at school did not seem to clearly understand the model or the reasons behind it. In my role as a teacher, I constantly wondered about the ways we teachers faced such particular context in our daily practices. And secondly, it was not clear to me what were those pedagogic strategies appropriate to each gender in my English classes, which were promulgated by school's mission.

In regards to teachers’ understanding of the model, a survey was carried out at “III Foro de Coeducación en el Colegio New Hampshire” to 114 teachers in August, 2012. The survey showed that this model was understood from varied perspectives. Figure 1 displays a graph that shows the ways teachers defined the model.

Figure 1. Teachers' Understandings about Coeducation with Gender Perspective

Source: Own
Teachers adopt the physical separation as the core of the model, but the reasons behind the measure are not clear. Even when teachers assert ideas such as the fact that boys and girls learn differently or that the model boosts their capacities, those evidences are not clearly supported. Teachers are immersed in a context mediated by gender but they do not understand why or how their practices should be or adapt the demands of the model. An informal interview carried out to four elementary teachers showed these tensions and misunderstandings.

"Boys and girls study in separate classrooms because of the coeducation with gender perspective, boys and girls study in separate classrooms but they can socialize in other spaces like the recess and buses" Margarita. Int.1

Margarita knows there is a model that school follows but she does not give an account of why boys are separated from girls and how this impacts her practices, she privileges the fact that students can share common spaces, but the way the model works is still blurry.

In this regards, Younger and Warrington (2006) inform us about the importance of carrying out research in this field in order to make informed decisions and implement pedagogies efficiently.

“There is little research to support a case for gender-specific pedagogies and that single-sex classes do pose significant challenges to the teacher, not only in terms of management and motivation but also in terms of dealing with the wider ability span present in single-sex classes and students’ subsequent greater requirements for differentiated learning approaches and resources.”(p.614)

Those gender-specific pedagogies that Younger and Warrington mention and that are part of Colegio New Hampshire's mission are not clearly evidenced in the EFL
classrooms at CNH. Firstly, lesson plans are designed indistinctively for boys and girls. Teachers are requested to plan in advance for the grade level and there are not different versions for boys' or girls' groups. Annex 1 shows a sample of a lesson plan designed for ninth grade at Colegio New Hampshire, which shows a series of activities to be carried out and does not mention any variation or difference according to gender. Secondly, during the interview, EFL elementary teachers at Colegio New Hampshire showed that when teachers plan their lessons, gender is not considered.

“No, I don't actually do it. Lesson plans are the same for both boys and girls, when I teach them, at that specific moment; I probably do different things with boys or girls” Angie. Int.1

Teachers' pedagogical practices are different in each classroom, but asserting that this happens due to the gender their students are ascribed cannot be clearly established. However, it caught my attention that teachers make decisions in class time based on the way they perceive their students as gendered subjects.

“Boys prefer to work individually and girls prefer to do things with their hands, so the same activity can be carried out in different ways” Angie Int. 1.

Teachers assume that there are specific behaviors in their students depending on their gender and those assumptions lead them to the decisions made in the classroom. In this specific case, Angie perceived her male and female students as subjects with certain preferences mediated by their gender and those differences are taken into account when teaching them. This situation puzzled me in regards to the role teachers' beliefs play in the classroom particularly in regards to gender.

Consequently, I could perceive two problematic situations at Colegio New Hampshire. Initially, teachers live tensions and misunderstandings about the model of
coeducation with a gender perspective that school adopts and subsequently, there is a gap between what school promulgates in its mission and what is really happening in the EFL classrooms. I decided to pose the following research question in order to better understand this phenomenon.

How do teachers' gender-related beliefs shape their pedagogical practices in single-sex EFL classrooms in a coeducational school?

In order to answer this question, there are two sub-questions that also need to be addressed.

What are teachers' gender-related beliefs when teaching English in single-sex EFL classrooms in a coeducational school?

What are teachers' pedagogical practices when teaching English in single-sex EFL classrooms in a coeducational school?

Hence, the objectives of the present study will be:

• To analyze teachers' gender-related beliefs when teaching English in single-sex EFL classrooms in a coeducational school
• To analyze EFL teachers' pedagogical practices when teaching English in single-sex EFL classrooms in a coeducational school.
• To examine the way teachers' gender-related beliefs shape their pedagogical practices when teaching English in single-sex EFL classrooms in a coeducational school.
Justification

I have pointed out how studies about gender and language are informing the community of the multiple issues that occur when L2 learning/teaching takes place. The present study will particularly inform the ELT community about gender-differentiated classrooms and the pedagogical implications of these kinds of pedagogical decisions in EFL classes. Since the information in the Colombian context is scarce, Colombian institutions will be informed in this matter and will be able to understand this phenomenon better, in case the experience is replicated.

Internationally speaking, many schools have implemented this policy. The results of this research will inform international communities about teachers' experiences and beliefs in regards to the implementation of single-sex classes from the teachers' point of view. Hence, knowledge about this gender-related phenomenon will be enlarged through the outcomes of this research.

In my role as an English teacher the findings of this study will guide my own pedagogical practice into the school's context and my students' realities as gendered subjects. The informed decisions made after this research process, will benefit my students since gendered pedagogies can be unveiled and used in different grade levels at school.

The most meaningful insight that this research process can provide to the academic community both pre-service and in-service teachers, is the awareness that it can generate in regards to the role that gender plays in our daily practices. This
research informs teachers of the need to be more aware of the interactions, the roles they play as gendered teachers in a gendered classroom, the blurry line that exits when a system like the one presented here can reproduce stereotypes in search of pedagogical strategies to cater students’ needs from a gender perspective.

This research invites teachers to be aware of how they establish practices that may for instance, privilege agency in one gender, (Ivinson and Murphy, 2007, Pavlenko & Piller 2008 and Gordon 2008), or how their students are investing in language learning from their gendered subjectivity. (Pavlenko & Piller 2008, Gordon 2008 and Lu and Luk, 2014).

With the present research teachers are questioned about the kinds of masculinities that they face in this environment. The fact that this kind of masculinity can be firstly understood and subsequently addressed will generate environments where learning occurs and our teaching practices can be facilitated.

Finally, it has always been Colegio New Hampshire's desire to document the experience of single-sex classes in coeducational settings. Thus, the present study will contribute to such documentation providing more insights about the daily practices carried out inside the institution.
Chapter 2

Literature review

The exploration of teachers’ gender-related beliefs and pedagogical practices in the context where this study takes place needs the examination of important concepts such as gender, beliefs and pedagogical practices. Therefore, I will firstly give an account of the relationship between gender and language; within this frame, the way single-sex classrooms policies have been implemented will be examined. Finally, I will provide ideas on what teachers' beliefs are and how they contribute to decision-making processes and classroom practices.

Gender and Language

This section provides the reader with a definition of gender, as well as an explanation of the approaches historically used to understand the relationship between gender and language. Subsequently, a categorization of studies about gender and language learning will be presented. In the same line of thought, a brief discussion about gender and literacy will be shown in order to incorporate the experiences of single-sex classrooms. The section concludes with an exploration to gender and stereotyping.

In the context of this research, gender plays an important role. As a starting point, it is important to define what gender is and how it relates to language. Whereas the concept of “sex” refers to a biological distinction, the one of “gender” is used to describe socially constructed categories according to the sex. (Coates, 2009)

The relationship between language and gender has been studied from four different theories: deficit approach, dominance approach, difference approach and
dynamic or social construction approach. (Coates, 2009; Davis & Skilton-Sylvester, 2004; Pavlenko & Piller, 2008).

The deficit approach, considered female language inferior to male's language; in linguistic terms it was defined as weak or deficient. (Coates, 2009). In the dominance framework, “women-as-a-group” were seen as linguistically oppressed and dominated by “men-as-a-group.” In the study of linguistic diversity, this view led to an argument that women lag behind because they are linguistically oppressed by men (Pavlenko & Piller, 2008). The difference framework suggests that girls and boys are socialized into different ways of relating to one another in their predominately same-sex interactions and, thus, acquire different communicative styles. (Davis & Skilton-Sylvester, 2004). For the dynamic approach, gender identity is seen as a social construct rather than an established social category. (Coates, 2009)

Although the present study is set at a specific context in which boys and girls study in different classrooms, and teachers' perspectives will be seen from that specific context, I will assume a dynamic point of view, gender will be considered a social construct that is built from other variables, such as culture, history, socioeconomic conditions, etc. It is a complex system of social relations and discursive practices, differentially constructed in local contexts. (Norton & Pavlenko, 2004)

In this line of thought, Gordon (2008) reminds us of the complexity of the teaching and learning of a second language. “More than just learning a structure for communication, learners are acquiring social, cultural and gendered norms along with procedures for interpretation within a new cultural landscape.(p.231)”. This vision of language learning goes beyond the mere structure, and takes into account the social
context where it takes place. Accordingly, this social context is mediated by culture and gender. Thus, it is important to see the role that gender plays within the language class.

Gordon (2008) and Pavlenko and Piller (2008) categorize the studies about this issue into four important groups. Studies about gendered access, studies about gendered interactions, studies about gendered agency and ideologies and studies about gender in the curriculum. (Pavlenko & Piller, 2008), gendered interactions in the classroom (Durán, 2006; Sunderland, 2004), and gender in the curriculum (Pavlenko, 2004; Davis & Skilton-Sylvester, 2004).

In terms of gendered access, Gordon (2008) alludes to the fact that gender identity affects the access to L2 socialization. This is due to the fact that the communities of practices in which individuals socialize are also influenced by gender identities. In other words, being a man or a woman can affect your opportunities to access a second language or activities related to its acquisition, framed within cultural practices of the context where learning takes place. This situation is mostly seen in ESL contexts where for instance being a woman could represent having less opportunity to learning a second language. To illustrate this situation, Rockhill (1993) reports that Latino women in the USA, often have less access to L2 socialization in workplace settings than men. This perspective aligns with the dominance approach previously described in the sense that a group prevails linguistically speaking over the other due to their gender.

Another study that found insightful ideas about how learners' access to second language can be mediated by gender was carried out by Hruska (2004). The study demonstrated how relationships and interaction mediated through local gender constructions support and constrain English language learners' classroom participation.
Based on these results, the author concluded that local gender ideologies operating in second language (L2) learning contexts affect students’ access to the interactions that they need to develop a second language. Hruska’s (2004) study not only portrays the question of gendered access to L2 but also incorporates the role of interaction in this intricate net of connections in the language classroom.

Gender and classroom interaction studies have shown precisely how gender shapes interaction in the classroom, in other words gender may be a determiner about which participants have the right to speak, to define meaning and to stay invisible in different classroom settings (Pavlenko and Piller, 2008). Hence, the idea of positioning plays and important role here, since gender, among other different factors influence positioning and thus opportunities for L2 socialization (Gordon, 2008). Sunderland, (2004) in this aspect comments on the apparent assertiveness and academic approach of the girls and the differential teacher treatment by gender in which boys may have received more attention but girls more academically useful attention.

Durán (2006) in a study carried out in a Colombian High School, explored teacher and students’ conceptions about gender in an EFL setting and the way they were manifested in their discourse patterns. She concluded that there were imbalances in relation to boys’ and girls’ participation during interaction, made manifest by verbal and nonverbal attitudes. There was also evidence of girls' low self-esteem in response to the lack of value and respect granted to their opinions by their male peers. In her study, stereotypes were part of teachers’ and students’ conceptions regarding gender and thus they were maintained to a great extent.

Rojas (2012) in a study at a Colombian University with a group of pre-service women-teachers found that emergent femininities construct gender identities and power
relations inside the EFL classroom setting through interaction discourses. She concluded that language learners cannot be perceived as abstract entities but as individuals that perform different identities in specific settings and contexts. She also recognized the presence of power in the discourses that students perform and how teachers should be conscious of such when planning or delivering instruction. For Rojas, the discovery of gender identities allows students and teachers to know how they are perceived by others and even by themselves and therefore teachers can shape pedagogical practices differently.

Lahelma et al. (2014) explored the concept of caring and teaching. Hence, they present the idea that female teachers are frequently believed to be more involved than men, therefore caring is a cultural belief that is seen as suitable for women in a given place and time. For the authors, teacherhood means a constant negotiation between teaching and taking care of students. Teachers strive to focus on their teaching role and perceive care as something extra, but unavoidable. So, taking distance from caring is easier for male teachers than for female teachers.

Correspondingly, Castañeda (2012) carried out a study with the idea of tracing the discourses through which a group of women learners subject-positioned in online interaction and how the construction of discourses could inform language as a socialization process. The author discovered that in the EFL context where the experience took place, women perceived each other as worth to be listened as there was what she calls a “co-management of the power relations” (p.177) that allowed language learners to socialize language more easily and without harm.

Castañeda-Peña (2008) explored the gendered discourses available for preschoolers in the English language classroom. Among his findings, he reported the
importance of the Teacher-Approval discourse as this shows traces of constant identity construction of girls as language learners. Castañeda-Peña showed as well that these gendered discourses impact on language learner identity. This time that it was “within the 'Peer Approval' discourse where girls could find, at times, positions in which their femininities are empowered interactionally. This happens because both boys and girls see each other as (English) language learners” (p.123).

These experiences show the importance of gender in classroom interactions and how this mediates to establish power relationships, to position an individual as a language learner with a gendered identity within a specific discourse. This overlaps to some extend with the studies about gendered agencies and ideologies. In terms of gendered agency in language learning, it has been shown how gendered ideologies about L2 and practices shape learners’ desires, investments in or resistance to learning. (Pavlenko & Piller 2008, Gordon 2008).

In this regard, ideas such as the fact that women incline to study L2 and outperform in relation to boys are present (Sunderland 2000). Gender hence plays the role of determining the ways learners invest or disinvest to learn a second language. This has been shown in the experiences of women inclined to study a second language in a very specific context in order to have opportunities for jobs or changes in power relationships established with men. Nevertheless, this relationship needs to be cautiously understood since “it is not the essential nature of femininity and masculinity that shapes language learning trajectories of particular individuals, but rather the nature of gendered social and economic relations, culture specific ideologies of language.” (Pavlenko and Piller, 2008 p.61). This idea promotes the understanding of gender from
a dynamic point of view, where the surrounding factors are the ones that also determine gender.

Lu and Luk (2014) studied subjectivity and investment and how they were related to the fact that reading was related to the feminine domain. They found out that it was easier for female students to engage in EFL reading because the subject positions in the informants’ discourse of EFL reading are more compatible with the subject positions available to females. They concluded that the feminization of EFL reading and patriarchal values in societies offer male students excuse to distance from EFL reading.

The last group of studies of language learning and gender deals with gender and curriculum. Pavlenko and Piller (2008) remark on experiences where gender and sexuality have been included in the curriculum of ELT. Thus, the discussions about sexual harassment, gay and lesbian communities, gendered vocabulary, sexism in books, among others, are incorporated in the teaching practices of L2 settings. Posada (2004) shows an experience in which the curriculum becomes a tool to incorporate these issues into the ELT classroom. Her project at a private university in Bogotá with undergraduate students consisted of finding out what students' oral discourse informed about their beliefs regarding gender and ethnicity. To do so she incorporated the discussions of non-canonical texts written by women from different ethnicities and discovered that students showed that there is an internalization of the values that characterize the Western society. A society ruled by dichotomies such as male/female, white/black and rich/poor, who perpetuate power relations that favor certain groups over others. The relationship that can be established between gender and language can be seen from innumerable perspectives, however all of them
interrelate; thus studies of curriculum involve, identities ideologies and even access. These relations will be seen when gender is studied in relation to literacy practices.

Moss (2008) explains how studies about gender and literacy have addressed the issue of access, as mentioned before, but also the underachievement that boys in general show. According to the author, the situation is caused by the dissonance between aspects of masculinity and aspects of schooling. Those aspects could be among, others, the genre preferences of boys that are not actually portrayed in the curriculum and the way that reading is perceived by boys.

Millard (1997) points out that certain kinds of narrative and character and personal response are not part of boys' interests and this has reduced full participation within the language curriculum. The author also found that boys perceive reading as a female activity and when they like it, they tend not to share it with their peers. The author proposes that English curriculum should be rebalanced and should provide wider range of material.

In this regard, Bristol (2015) studied gender relevant pedagogy and defined it as the teaching practice that requires practitioners to examine how they have formed learning conditions that enable or constrain boys’ learning, specifically through unconscious beliefs about gender manifested in curriculum development and responses to students perceived misbehavior. In his findings, Bristol (2015) discovered that pedagogy relevant for boys would have to include elements of experiential learning where boys can acquire and apply knowledge in a setting outside the traditional classroom. He emphasized on the fact that punitive responses to boys’ disengagement could not facilitate learning.
We can see here how this idea of literacy performance and gender is closely related to the difference framework previously mentioned due to the fact that it considers boys' and girls' performance different and suggests it should be addressed particularly according to the genders students are ascribed to. This vision of students led some English-speaking countries such as Australia, The United Kingdom, Canada and The United States to create “Raising Boys Achievement” policies due to the fact that boys were underachieving during their school years (Younger & Warrington, 2006).

Among the different decisions adopted, there was the inclusion of boys-friendly pedagogies, which included more male teachers in the classrooms, changes in curriculum and the incorporation of single-sex classes in coeducational settings. Research carried out in regards to single-sex classes suggests that:

Single-sex classes can contribute to raising achievement levels in schools and enhancing the self-esteem and social attributes of girls and boys only when they are implemented within a gender-relational context, with the support of teachers at all levels of the school, and within a positive framework rationalized clearly through the school community (staff, students, and parents and caregivers. (Younger & Warrington, 2006, p. 614).

Gender relational contexts imply teachers making informed decisions when having boys and girls in separate classrooms; decisions that imply a deeper understanding of what gender implies and a constant reflection about their practices.

In the Australian context, Martino et al. (2005) reported as an important outcome, in terms of single-sex classes experiences that “teacher threshold knowledges about gender impact significantly on the execution of pedagogy, often with the effect of reinforcing taken for granted assumptions about the way boys as a group learn, behave
Threshold knowledges are the different understandings that teachers have of the context where they work. Figure 2 presents the way Martino et al, (2004) understand this concept of “threshold knowledges”.

Figure 2.

Threshold Knowledges

Source: Graph designed with information from Martino et al (2004)

In this regard, teachers’ knowledges about gender and schooling are based on the problematic normalizing assumption about boys as a group, which emphasizes that boys are predisposed to behaving, thinking and learning in different ways.

Ivinson and Murphy (2007) explored single-sex education and the conception of enduring beliefs about gender. For these authors it is clear that throughout history there has been a dominant cultural belief that understands gender from cultural binaries: what one is the other is not. These binary conceptions of gender can be observed in table 1.
Table 1. Binary conceptions of gender explored by Ivinson and Murphy (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>Passivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy to emphasize discipline</td>
<td>Discipline is not an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilized behavior</td>
<td>Civilizing influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller of nature (aggression)</td>
<td>Protection/ Stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Domain</td>
<td>Private setting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, a binary conception of gender in single-sex contexts has contributed to ideas such as masculinities that are oppositional to an academic culture, and the fact that learning and achievement are perceived as not cool by boys-students. Thus, behaviors such as humor and absurdity are present in male groups in order to get a position in the peer culture.

Ivinson and Murphy studies of single-sex education confirmed that teachers can unwittingly revitalize such binary conceptions through their practices when they are confronted with a need to respond to gender as an emergent aspect in their setting and when they have no other resources to draw on to inform their actions.

In their results, they found that pedagogic practices and instruction addressed to boys gave them more autonomy than girls, their ideas were validated more explicitly and their right to play was tolerated more than girls. In this line of thoughts, boys were treated more agentive than girls.

In the exploration of those behaviors that teachers perceived different in “boys as a group”, Jackson (2010) explored the concept of Laddish Culture. Thus,
underachievement was linked to this culture and in her study she explored teachers’ perceptions of ladishness amongst boys. Teachers identified as key traits of this culture the fact that laddish behaviors were group, seeking attention behaviors. These behaviors were related to showiness and competition that prioritize sport over academic work. Additionally, teachers perceived laddish behaviors to be disruptive, especially from a sexual or even sexist perspective. The last characteristic attributed to the laddish culture was the lack of respect for authority.

In her study, she reported that among teachers there was a blurry line between the idea that ladishness was problematic or not. Jackson (2010) found that some men teachers encounter less problematic laddish behavior because they understand it better. Men teachers speak their language and have masculine styles that do not problematize with this culture. With these attitudes, it can be stated that male teachers in that particular context, perpetuate the idea of laddish culture.

In this sense, it is important to see the role of stereotyping when talking about gender. Schmenk (2004) points out the danger of oversimplifying gender and having therefore a stereotyping vision of it. She defines stereotypes as shared beliefs about personality traits and behaviors of group members; according to her, by stereotyping we overlook individuality. She points out how beliefs and practices interact at local sites and how they affect learners and teachers. She suggests that such beliefs are to a large extent based on commonsense conceptions of gender and of language learning resulting from particular instances of stereotyping.

Lynch (2014) explored how kindergarten teachers reinforced gender attitudes and thus, they portrayed their own gender prejudices. In that specific context, the author points out that in the classroom, kids learn about gender roles in unforgettable ways. In
her study, teachers promoted stereotypes such as the idea that dramatic play is for girls and that specific settings suit gender. She found whereas some teachers perpetuated stereotypes, other resisted them by not restringing settings and activities to according to their gender.

From this perspective, we see the connection between gender and beliefs in educational settings. Thus, it is important to clarify how beliefs can be defined and how they can be meaningful tools to gain insights about certain phenomena. For the present study, teachers' beliefs will be addressed.

**Teachers' Beliefs and Pedagogical Practices**

Before analyzing what teachers' beliefs imply, it is important to mention what it is understood by this term. In psychological terms, its definition is complex and different terms have been used to refer to similar ideas: values, judgments, axioms, opinions, ideology, perceptions, conceptions, conceptual systems, preconceptions, dispositions, implicit theories, explicit theories, personal theories, internal mental processes, action strategies, rules of practice, practical principles, perspectives, repertories of understanding, and social strategy, to name but a few can be found in the literature (Pajares, 1992). In this sense it is better, then to attribute characteristics to them and see the role they play in educational settings.

Because of the complicated nature of beliefs, some researchers have talked about beliefs as a system (Block & Hazelip, 1995; Pajares, 1992). Beliefs are formed early and tend to self-perpetuate, persevering even against contradictions caused by reason, time, schooling, or experience (Ginsburg & Newman, 1985). Pajares (1992) points out how individuals develop a belief system that houses all the beliefs acquired
through the process of cultural transmission. According to him, the belief system has an adaptive function in helping individuals define and understand the world and themselves. Knowledge and beliefs are inextricably intertwined, but the affective, evaluative, and episodic nature of beliefs makes them a filter through which new phenomena are interpreted (Nespor, 1987). In this sense, belief substructures, such as educational beliefs, should be understood in terms of their connections not only to each other but also to other, perhaps more central, beliefs in the system. Psychologists usually refer to these substructures as attitudes and values. (Pajares, 1992)

Beliefs are instrumental in defining tasks and selecting the cognitive tools with which to interpret, plan, and make decisions regarding such tasks; hence, they play a critical role in defining behavior and organizing knowledge and information (Schommer, 1990). This decision-making feature allows beliefs to strongly influence perception hence, affecting people's behavior. (Nespor, 1987)

The research task is not easy when dealing with beliefs, as they must be inferred, this inference must take into account the congruence among individuals' belief statements, the intentionality to behave in a predisposed manner, and the behavior related to the belief in question (Goodman, 1988).

The complexity of beliefs has been presented, then seeing how those features are present in educational settings is needed to support this research proposal. According to Nespor (1987), beliefs about teaching are well established by the time a student gets to college, which supports the idea of beliefs having a long term existence in people's life. In the present study, teachers' beliefs will be analyzed and this implies taking into account their background knowledge and life histories.
Davis (2003) declares, "That people's beliefs are instrumental in influencing their behavior is a truism: people act on the basis of perceptions and their 'definition of the situation'" (p. 207). The author continues by stating that if people perceive some situation to be a reality, then they will behave as if that were the case regardless of whether or not it is true. This is also true in teaching and learning. If teachers believe that languages are learned a certain way, their behavior will reflect that way of thinking in spite of possible research and training to the contrary. (Thompson, 2009).

According to Richardson (1996), “teachers' beliefs are interactive with their practices. Beliefs are thought to drive actions; however, experiences and reflection on action may lead to changes in and/or additions to beliefs” (p. 104). Thompson (2009) also states that the relationship between beliefs and practices is dialectic, not a simple cause-effect relationship, and suggests that studies should seek to elucidate the dialectic between teachers' beliefs and practices.

Teachers' beliefs in regards to language and gender will be central in the present research proposal and will be inferred through the pedagogical practices carried out by teachers in the very specific context of single-gender classrooms.

Understanding the relationship between teachers' beliefs and their pedagogical practices necessarily involves understanding what the concept of pedagogy is and what it is implied by the term pedagogical practice. In this regard, Zuluaga (1999) defines pedagogy as the “discipline that conceptualizes, applies and experiments the knowledge related to the teaching of specific “knowledges”, in different cultures”\(^2\) (p. 11). This concept of pedagogy is polemic because it goes beyond the idea of pedagogy as a teaching method; hence it involves a multiplicity of methods that are related to the

\(^2\) Translation provided by the author.
historical moment and the cultural and social scenarios where the knowledge takes place. The idea that Zuluaga (1999) proposes envisions pedagogy beyond theory and gives a special place to the pedagogical practices. This idea is understood as Pedagogical Knowledge since not only does it involve theory, but also the reflections about the school, the teacher and, in general terms, what the teacher does in their daily practices.

Zuluaga (1999) understands the notion of pedagogical practices as a comprising concept, where many other ideas converge. Thus, as explained in figure 3, the concept of pedagogical practices involves pedagogical models, multiplicity of concepts, ways in which discourses work and social characteristics acquired in those pedagogical practices.

Figure 3.

Notion of Pedagogical Practices provided by Olga Lucía Zuluaga

Source: Own. Adapted and designed from Zuluaga (1999)
From this perspective, Zuluaga (1999) conceives that the pedagogical practice is ruled by the discursive practice, which comprises the institution, the subject and the pedagogical discourse itself.

In the present study, the idea of pedagogical practices align with the way teachers are conceived as subjects that face a particular situation given by the institution where they work in which gender is mediating their daily practices and the particular situation makes them behave in particular ways and acquire specific discourses as it will be shown in the forthcoming chapters where results are discussed.
Chapter 3

Research Design

The purpose of this study is to examine the way EFL teachers’ gender-related beliefs shape their pedagogical practices in gender-differentiated classrooms. In this chapter I will give an account of the type of study, the context where the study took place, the participants, and the instruments used to collect data, the ethical considerations taken into account and my role as a researcher.

Type of study

The type of study corresponds to a qualitative interpretative study. According to Strauss and Corbin (1990), qualitative research requires an interpretative approach about the events that occur in natural contexts. In this approach, we explore people's lives, their behaviors, their ways of organization, their social movements and interactions. This qualitative study can be framed as well within a social constructionist approach in the sense that it captures multiple perspectives from different social agents. According to Patton (2002), the interest of constructivism is to explore how people in a particular setting construct reality, what their perceptions, explanations, beliefs and world-views are and what are the consequences of their constructions for those with whom they interact. As the present study explores teachers’ gender-related beliefs and the way they shape their pedagogical practices in single-gender classrooms, a constructivism approach corresponds to the nature of the phenomenon to be studied.
Context

The present study took place at Colegio New Hampshire, which is a private, bilingual (Spanish-English) school in Bogota. Colegio New Hampshire has a population of 1577 students distributed in three sections: preschool, elementary and high school. There is a total group of 120 teachers.

Colegio New Hampshire was originally founded in 1945 and was an only-girls school. In 1994, the school changed its name to Colegio New Hampshire and established a partnership agreement with Saint Michael's College, in Vermont State, U.S. to teach English as a second language. In 1997, the first group of boys was admitted and its female-based educational system became known as a model for coeducation with a gender perspective, which consists of designing gender-based pedagogic strategies. Boys and girls study in separate classrooms, but share the rest of the common areas for cultural, sports and social events.

Colegio New Hampshire’s mission is “To efficiently contribute to the ethical and intellectual education and training of competent men and women, with a humanist focus that respects individual differences and takes advantage of the potential of each gender group (masculine / feminine), through pedagogic strategies and spaces appropriate to each that are developed through a bilingual (Spanish English) educative program (Spanish English) where humanities, science, art, technology and sports make for a base of excellence.” (Colegio New Hampshire, n.d., para.1)

Colegio New Hampshire’s bilingual program includes four phases: the first allows children in Pre-Kinder, Kindergarten and Transition grade to acquire English in the same way that they did their native Spanish. This stage is called: Early Total Immersion in which children begin their reading and writing processes in English.
The second phase, called Bilingual BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills), begins the bilingual process from first to fifth grade of primary. It stimulates the development of interpersonal communication skills and uses English as a teaching instrument since subjects such as math, science, art, learning tools, IT and Mandarin are taught in English. English teachers in first and second grade teach math, science, Learning Tools and English to one single group of students whereas teachers from third grade on, are specialized in one subject and have the possibility to teach three classes each.

The third phase, Bilingual CALP, (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency) from sixth to ninth grade, strengthens students' cognitive academic language in order to allow them to deal with the formal demands of university.

The last phase for tenth and eleventh grade consolidates the education and training of students to allow them to access the “International Baccalaureate Program”.

**Participants**

As my interest in this study was to examine middle school teachers’ beliefs and their pedagogical practices in EFL single-sex classrooms, the participants of my study were four English middle school teachers of sixth to ninth grade at Colegio New Hampshire, who have the possibility to teach both boys and girls. According to Merriam (1998) this methodological decision is understood as purposeful sampling in the sense that the researcher is interested in discovering, understanding and gaining insights on a specific group or situation.

The participants were middle school teachers, three Colombian, one American with a different range of teaching experiences at Colegio New Hampshire. Two are
women and two are men. Table 2 presents important information regarding teachers' experience and classes observed.

Table 2. Information of teachers participating in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher 3</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Level taught</th>
<th>Hours taught in a seven-day week</th>
<th>Level/Classes observed</th>
<th>Hours observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jorge</td>
<td>20 years, 6 at CNH</td>
<td>6th: 2 male groups 7th: 2 female groups</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6A: Boys 7C: Girls</td>
<td>6A: 4h 7C: 4h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>1 year (Practice for undergraduate program) First year at CNH</td>
<td>6th: 2 female groups 7th: 2 male groups</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6C: girls 7A: Boys</td>
<td>6C: 4h 7A: 4h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessie</td>
<td>1 year (Master's practice) First year at CNH</td>
<td>8th: 2 female groups, 1 male group</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8B: Boys 8C: Girls</td>
<td>8B: 4h 8C: 4h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>33 years 12 at CNH</td>
<td>8th-9th 8th: 1 male group 9th: 1 female, 2 male groups</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8A: Boys 9C: Girls</td>
<td>8A: 3h 9C: 3h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instruments

As my interest was to gain insights on teachers' beliefs and their pedagogical practices, there are two techniques that were used to collect data to inform me on this matter: observations and interviews.

Observation is understood as a systematic process of recording descriptive information on a particular phenomenon and that addresses a specific research question (Patton, 2002). In the present study, teachers were observed regularly during an academic term at school in two of their classes, one of girls and one of boys. Visits were

---

3 The names provided are fictitious to protect teachers’ identity.
carried out on a weekly basis, so I could observe each teacher on the same day with each class. In total, eight observations were carried out per teacher, four per class.

This observation was carried out through the use field notes understood as written descriptions or accounts of events in the research context (Merriam, 1998). Annex 2 presents an example of the field notes used. The classes were also video recorded. Hence, I subsequently watched them again and completed the initial notes I had taken. Observation allowed me as a researcher to have an account of the pedagogical practices that teachers carried out when teaching English in gender-differentiated classrooms.

In regards to the other instrument to collect data, Merriam (2009) defines an interview as “a process in which a researcher and participant engage in conversation focused on questions related to research study” (p. 57). According to this author, interviews are carried out when we cannot observe behavior, feelings, or how people interpret the world around them or when past events are impossible to replicate. In this sense, an interview was carried with each one of the participants after observations took place. Annex 3 shows the protocol followed in the interview. The interview was designed to provide information about teachers' beliefs and their interpretations about their experiences when teaching English in gender differentiated classrooms.

The interviews were audio recorded and transcribed to preserve information gotten for the analysis. Annex 4 shows an excerpt of one of the interviews transcribed. In terms of validity of this instrument, research colleagues reviewed the instrument and it was piloted with two participant teachers in order to validate the fact that this instrument was really gathering information that would answer the research question.
The use of these two techniques constitutes triangulation in the sense that the information does not rely just on one kind of data, but on diverse ways of looking at the same phenomenon (Patton, 2002). Hence, triangulation occurred as observations were compared with interviews. Thus, both observations and interviews analyzed teachers' beliefs and pedagogical practices, and as it will be shown in chapter four, although results were not consistent in both sources, that was illuminative for the findings of this study.

**Researcher's role**

Following Merriam's (2009) typology, my role in this study was the one of observer as participant, since I was part of the community being studied when being a teacher at Gimansio Vermont but I studied other teachers' beliefs and practices. My activities were known to the group, in this case teachers, but participation in the group was secondary to my role of information gatherer. My observation and interaction with participants allowed me to explore the phenomenon without participating in the activities done by the participants.

**Ethical issues**

The present study followed the ethical principles presented by the American Psychological Association (APA) in regards to the professional work of psychology-related fields. As the present study dealt with human beings as participants, such principles were applicable for the research job.

The first principle has to do with Beneficence and Nonmaleficence of the study; in the sense that the research should benefit those with whom the study will be working and take care to do no harm. (American Psychological Association, 2010). The study
sought to document the experience at Colegio New Hampshire from teachers' perspective in regards to gender-differentiated classrooms. The insights from the study did not harm participants and provided Colegio New Hampshire with documented experiences that could benefit the institution in the construction of its PEI.

The second and third principles refer to fidelity and responsibility. In this sense, the researcher has to “establish relationships of trust with those with whom they work” (American Psychological Association, 2010) (para.3) and integrity since it seeks to promote accuracy, honesty and truthfulness. I informed participants about the nature and objectives of the study. The results of this project must accurately represent what I observed or what the participants informed. Information was not taken out of context.

The fourth principle refers to justice. This is understood as the researcher “recognizing that fairness and justice entitle all persons to access to and benefit from the contributions of the study” (American Psychological Association, 2010) (para. 4) Therefore, results from this study are accessible to all participants and there was not be any differential treatment.

Finally, the fifth principle that refers to respect for people's rights and dignity deals with the fact the study should “respect the dignity and worth of all people, and the rights of individuals to privacy, confidentiality, and self-determination” (American Psychological Association, 2010) (para. 5). In that sense, information gathered from interviews and observations was handled confidentially and through the consent form participants expressed their will to use the information coming from their participation in the study. Annex 5 shows the consent form used with the participants of the study.
Chapter 4

Data Analysis

After the process of data collection, I will present the framework I used to analyze the data gathered, how data were managed, the process I used to analyze the information and the categories that arose from the analysis in order to answer the research question that intended to explore how teachers’ gender-related beliefs shaped teachers’ pedagogical practices in single-sex classrooms in coeducational settings.

Thus, an explanation regarding the use of techniques of the grounded theory as a methodological approach to analyze data will be provided. Consequently, I will introduce the reader to a computer software for qualitative research called TAMS analyzer used in the data management and analysis stages of the process. Finally, the findings of the study will be shown through the emerging categories from the analysis undertaken.

Data Analysis Framework

As mentioned in the research design, this is a qualitative interpretative study in the sense that it deals with naturally-occurring data. My interest as a researcher is to inquire about teachers' beliefs and pedagogical practices in their school contexts from a gender-based perspective. Framed within a constructivist approach, it is important to emphasize on my role as a researcher, which is not the one of generating theory per se, but analyzing a phenomenon in a very specific context. In this sense, Patton (2002) presents a clear understanding of the researcher roles when he states: “The constructionist evaluator would attempt to capture these different perspectives through open-ended interviews and observations, and then would examine the implications of different perceptions (or multiple “realities”) but would not pronounce which set of
perceptions was “right” or more “true” or more “real.” p.98. This constructionist perspective implies relativism, in other words: knowledge is relative to time and place and it is never absolute, which does not leave room for generalizations (Patton, 2002).

However, the nature of the study required elements of a grounded theory approach (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). Grounded theory focuses on the process of generating theory that emerges from systematic comparative analysis so as to explain and observed phenomenon. (Patton, 2002). Although this is not the end of this study, the mechanics for data analysis offered by grounded theory resulted useful. Using the interviews and field notes collected, grounded theory proposes a systematized way to analyze data. Thus, data is reviewed so repeated ideas or concepts become apparent, data therefore is tagged with codes extracted from the data. The process is cyclic as data is re-reviewed and codes can be grouped into concepts, and then into categories. Categories can subsequently become new theory or findings as in the case of this study. In this sense, theory arises from the data gathered and it is not a pre-established theory the one that guides the analysis (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). Even though I will not generate theory, the methodological steps used by grounded theory were really helpful to give an answer to the research question, which implied the multiple perspectives of teachers participating in this study.

The forthcoming sections will show this systematic process undertaken by explaining how data were managed and analyzed.

Data Management

In order to carry out a systematic analysis, I used a computer program called TAMS analyzer 4.0 that allowed me to store, label, code and sort the data gathered for
this process. “TAMS Analyzer (TA) is a software program for coding and analyzing qualitative, textual and audiovisual information such as interviews, observations/field notes.” (Weinstein, 2010, p.1). The program is free and available on-line to be downloaded. It is especially designed to be used for Macintosh OS X which was the kind of computer where the analysis took place.

Before using the program, I video recorded the classes in MP4 files, a name was assigned to each audio file indicating the kind of data, the participant and date in which it was carried. The field notes were recorded in situ in a Word document called “journal”, each entry had the date, time, class and teacher observed. Page and line numbers were given to facilitate further report. Subsequently, the video files were watched again and more notes were added to the existing journal.

The interviews were audio recorded in MP3 files, transcribed and saved in Word documents. Each of the files was saved using the names of the teacher and the word “Interview”. The transcriptions contained information about the date when interviews were carried out and each page and line were numbered to facilitate further report.

TAMS analyzer was used to create a project called Gendered beliefs and practices in Single-sex classrooms. Figure 4 displays a screenshot that shows the interphase of the program and the project created.

Although the program allows using audiovisual material, just the Word documents were used because it made handling of the information easier and because they already contained the information in the audiovisual files. Consequently, files were converted to .rtf format so the program could use them and then they were added to the project. Figure 5 shows the five files used within the project created.
Figure 4. Project Created with TAMS analyzer

Source: Own

Figure 5. Files used in TAMS analyzer

Source: own
The program allowed the use of a tool called “metatags” which served to the purposes of data management. This tool consisted of telling the program what kind of information was going to be analyzed. Thus “metatags” referring to file name, date, time, class and teacher were added at the beginning of each entry in the journal and of each interview. Figure 6 visualizes the use of metatags in two files: an interview and the journal.

Figure 6. Metatags used in TAMS analyzer

Source: own

This process was highly useful in the further stages of analysis, as it allowed me to notice occurrences in boys or girls’ classrooms and in specific teachers. The
upcoming section presents the way data analysis was undertaken making use of the software previously presented with other techniques that enriched the process.

Data Analysis Process

Framed within the Grounded Theory approach, I followed Charmaz (2010) stages in grounded theory. I used initial coding understood as “categorizing short segments of data with a short name” (p. 43). Thus TAMS helped in this first stage of the process by allowing me to create the codes that emerged from the data and add them to specific passages in the files that were analyzed. Figure 7 shows a window with some of the codes that I created on the left side and how they were shown in the file that was being analyzed.

Figure 7. List of codes used in TAMS analyzer

Source: own
The program uses the symbol “>” to indicate hierarchy in codes. The program did not allow spacing, so hyphens had to be used to separate words. These features of the program are exemplified with this fragment from an interview that was coded: “Teacher_beliefs>boys>opposite_to_academic_culture”

{Teacher_belief>boys>opposite_to_academic_culture}and when it comes to sort of their behavior in the classroom, but they're totally apathetic about learning and about doing anything for greater life purpose. {/Teacher_belief>boys>opposite_to_academic_culture}

The fragment shows the initial code, which is “Teacher belief”. Since the teacher is talking specifically about boys, a sub code was created called “boys”. Her statement addressed how they are opposite to academic culture and that was the final code assigned to this fragment.

This way, from the very beginning of the coding stage and because of the nature of the data and the research question which intended to explore both teachers' practices and beliefs, three main codes were defined: Teachers practices, which referred to the actions that teachers performed in the classroom, students' behaviors, related to what students did in the classes observed, and teachers beliefs, which were the statements that teachers uttered referring to their students as gendered subjects. For this final code, it was necessary therefore, to create four sub codes that referred to beliefs about boys, girls, both of them and their separation. The codes that referred to teachers' practices and students' behaviors were found in the field notes (Journal) since the observations gave an account of what teachers actually did in the classroom, whereas the codes
referring to beliefs were found in the interviews, as those were the statements that expressed teachers' particular ways to understand their students.

In the initial stage ninety-one codes emerged. Twenty-six belonged to the category *teachers' practices*, sixteen to the category *students' behaviors* and forty-nine to *teachers' beliefs*. In this last category, as more sub codes had been defined, seventeen out of the forty-nine codes referred to beliefs about boys, fifteen codes referred to girls, eight referred to both and nine referred to their separation.

As Charmaz (2010) explains it, the initial coding stage is followed by a focused coding stage. This stage consists on directing the analysis on larger amounts of data based on the recurring codes. In order to do so, I used TAMS to create tables that grouped the codes according to the sorting criteria that I established. Thus, I asked the program to generate six tables based on the six codes that I have previously mentioned: *teachers' practices*, *students' behaviors*, *teachers' beliefs about boys*, *teachers' beliefs about girls*, *teachers' beliefs about both* and *teachers' beliefs about separation*.

Annex 6 shows a fragment of one of the tables that was generated. The table corresponds to Teachers' Practices and shows eight columns that contained information about the file name, the date, time, class, teacher, code and data. The table was generated in an Excel file and afterwards I counted the number of occurrences of each one of the codes found. This allowed me to find patterns. While carrying out this analysis I wrote memos, which Charmaz (2010) describes as an intermediate step between data collection and writing reports. Memos allowed me to analyze data by comprising thoughts and interpretations made after coding. Annex 7 shows the information jotted down when analyzing the first table about teachers’ practices, which constituted the initial memos. The memos allowed me to see for example, that information was no
relevant to conclude that there were actions that happened just in girls or boys’ classrooms. Memos at this stage also showed me that this huge number of codes needed to be regrouped to make analysis easier to handle.

By rereading the data, memos and the tables, the latter ones were reorganized, this time finding conceptual relationships among codes. Codes were grouped in bigger categories and with the information gotten from the column or metatag “class”, I could start analyzing if teachers' practices changed in female or male groups. Annex 8 shows the table of Teacher Practices where codes are grouped in more general codes. Additionally, the chart had information about the total number of records found in data and the number and percentage of records in girls' and boys' classes. Likewise, Annex 9 shows the re-aggregation of codes related to students' behaviors. The chart shows broader concepts that regrouped the initial codes. In this analysis quantitative analysis was also carried out as the number of occurrences of a specific behavior were counted and percentages were figured out so to analyze if there were behaviors particular to boys' or girls' groups.

For the tables that referred to beliefs, as they were originally sub coded keeping in mind gender distinction, there was no need of any kind of quantitative approach. Charts summarized teachers' perceptions about their students and codes were regrouped following a conceptual relationship. Annex 10 shows two charts about teacher' beliefs about boys and girls showing the way codes were regrouped.

Once data was revised again, these new codes became the categories and subcategories that gave an answer to the research question. The final six charts were compared by looking at coincidences and contradictions between what teachers said they believed and what actually happened in their classroom. This process understood
as axial coding (Charmaz, 2010) was the final stage to build the three main categories with their subcategories presented in Table 3.

### Table 3. Categories and Subcategories resulted from data analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers’ practices: A gender separation that does not clearly change their posture</th>
<th>Students Behavior: Beyond gender distinction</th>
<th>Teachers’ beliefs: binary conceptions of gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivering Content: No clear boys-girls distinction</td>
<td>Classroom environment: both boys and girls are noisy</td>
<td>Innate gender language abilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management: When gender requires a system</td>
<td>Students involvement: Engagement does not depend on gender</td>
<td>Teachers’ relationships with gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys and Girls and their appropriation of rules</td>
<td>Academic culture: a clear binary division students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Categories therefore were built using the initial codes and a statement that reflected what the grouped codes conveyed. Sub-categories resulted from the conceptual re-grouping of the codes and a statement that reflected as well the information provided in the codes that belonged to that group.

The following section explains and exemplifies what each one of the categories conveys, hence illustrating even more this data analysis process.

### Categories

As the purpose of this study was to explore the way teachers’ gender related beliefs shape their pedagogical practices in single sex classrooms in a coeducational school, the analysis of the class observations and the interviews done to the four teachers participants of the study allowed me to build three categories that give an answer to the research question posed at the beginning of this document.
Figure 8 presents the three main categories and the relationships that are generated among them.

**Figure 8. Main Categories and their relationships**

**Teachers’ gender-related beliefs and pedagogical practices: no clear-cut distinction**

- Teachers’ practices: A gender separation that does not change their posture
- Teachers’ beliefs: Binary conceptions of gender
- Students’ behaviors: beyond gender distinction

Source: own

To understand these relationships it is important to remember the theoretical background of a system differentiated by gender. One could naively expect that a physical separation mediated by gender would automatically generate a different approach by teachers. Martino et al. (2004) in their study about the implementation of “boy friendly” pedagogies in Australia that involved the physical separation by gender, reported that one of the reasons to do so was the idea that the separation would include the selection of curriculum content and resources that will apparently cater for the interests of boys and girls.

This understanding of boys and girls is undoubtedly a binary distinction where one gender implies the opposite to the other one. Ivinson and Murphy (2007) expound...
the dominant cultural belief that understands genders as binary divides: what one is the other is not. In the present study, teachers in fact, identified their students as binary divides and the separation system as a something that directly affected not only students' but also teachers' interests, needs or worries from a gender perspective. To exemplify this position let me use the voices of the teachers participating in the study. These were the immediate responses to the question “how would you describe your experience when teaching your students in single-gender classrooms?

“Eh... I can tell eh... girls take longer time to develop their tasks, they follow... well... in a higher percentage, girls follow instructions…”Int. Rosa. Lines 33-34

“...working in a split gender system where I get along really well with the girls and I have a great time with them and we work really well together and I find that they work hard, that they respect me and they like me and the boys have been a lot more of a challenge Int. Jessie lines 54-57

“I feel very comfortable when I am with boys actually I prefer to teach boys than girls because since I grew up in that environment like in that male world…” Int. Jorge. Lines 63-65

“Well, first having separated classrooms works, I think it works even though we have serious problems with behavior, I think it's pretty much easier for you to go into a classroom and be able to manage or to solve in a different way” Int. Luis. Lines 54-56
The four teachers used comparisons that included comparative adjectives, or explicit contrasts and preferences. In general terms, these teachers compared students from a positive or negative perspective, or expressed their preference because of their identification with a specific gender and even one of them identified separation as useful, since it allowed problems to be solved differently. The category: teachers' beliefs: binary concepts of gender will elaborate on these perceptions more in depth.

However, when compared with teachers' practices and students' behaviors, what was observed did not show a trend that could be understood as typical of a female or male behavior or a strategy that worked better in a group because of their gender. Annexes 8 and 9 show how teachers' roles and students' behaviors in general terms did not show a clear-cut distinction.

In teachers' practices although percentages show inclinations towards activities in boys or girls' classrooms, such generalizations cannot be drawn because those percentages are not highly different and because the number of records of some practices or behaviors is not enough to affirm there is a trend. Table 4 shows a percentage analysis carried out when exploring teachers' practices in two aspects: way to deliver content and classroom management.

Table 4. Percentage Analysis of teachers' practices observed in data analyzed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHERS' PRACTICES</th>
<th>Nº of records</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B%</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>G%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Way to deliver content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-centered-approach</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-centered-approach</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management Strategies</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table shows an inclination to teacher-centered approach in girls’ classes and classroom management strategies to boys. However, when each aspect is analyzed in depth as shown in the Annex 9, making a generalization becomes risky as there are not enough records to support a claim like that one.

The same situation happens when students' behaviors' are analyzed. As shown in Annex 9, the number of records is not enough to make generalizations. This time, the kinds of behaviors are very specific to the context of class and fewer records are found, a quantitative analysis does not provide a clear-cut distinction.

However, as it will be explained in the forthcoming sections, there were particular situations that could be analyzed from a gender perspective with very interesting insights, as classroom management and the appropriation of rules by students.

**Teachers' practices: A gender separation that does not change their posture**

It was previously pointed out that although teachers expressed an impact on instruction due to the gender-split system, once their practices were analyzed, a clear-cut distinction was not evidenced. In the voices of Jorge and Luis the system impacted them in their daily activities as teachers:

“...now working with the two sexes in different classrooms that really has an impact on the lesson plans and on the way you approach instruction, it is ABSOLUTELY, absolutely a fact that it impacts the way a teacher delivers instruction.” Int. Jorge Lines 85-88

“I mean, when I enter to a boys' classroom I'm a complete different person from the person I am when I go to girls' classroom. So for me it has been, it has been
productive because you learn about both sides in a clear way” Int. Luis Lines 57-59

Jorge and Luis express the way the separation per se makes them act differently with each group of students. However as a first finding, it can be said that instruction depended more on the style that each teacher adopted rather than on gender differences. Tables 5 to 8 show the kinds of practices that each teacher carried out in their classes.

**Table 5. Quantitative analysis of Teaching Practices in Rosa’s classes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Way to deliver content</th>
<th>Teacher-centered approach</th>
<th>Student-centered approach</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Vocabulary provider T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vocabulary provider T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Explanation provider T</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Explanation provider T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Pronunciation corrector T</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pronunciation corrector T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Question asker T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Question asker T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grammar corrector</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grammar corrector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Discussion promoter S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Discussion promoter S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Elicitor S</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Elicitor S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Using ss past experiences S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Using ss past experiences S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Using ss interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Using ss interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Varied activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Varied activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td>1 Discipline regulator</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Classroom management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with students</td>
<td>1 humour</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Relationship with students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6. Quantitative analysis of Teaching Practices in Jessie’s classes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Way to deliver content</th>
<th>Teacher-centered approach</th>
<th>Student-centered approach</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Vocabulary provider T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vocabulary provider T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Explanation provider T</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Explanation provider T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Feedback provider T</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Feedback provider T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Instruction provider T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instruction provider T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Model T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Model T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Narrator T</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Narrator T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Pronunciation corrector</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pronunciation corrector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Timed activities T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Timed activities T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Differentiated instruction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Differentiated instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Elicitor S</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Elicitor S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Using ss as models S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Using ss as models S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Using ss previous knowledge S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Using ss previous knowledge S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Varied activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Varied activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td>1 rewards *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Classroom management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Discipline regulator</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Discipline regulator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Discipline regulation system</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Discipline regulation system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totales</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Totales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with students</td>
<td>1 Expecting bad behaviour</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Relationship with students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7. Quantitative analysis of Teaching Practices in Jorge’s classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Way to deliver content</th>
<th>Jorge</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B%</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>G%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-centered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vocabulary provider T</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Explanation provider T</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Feedback provider T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Instruction provider T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Narrator T</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pronunciation corrector T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Question asker T</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Timed activities T</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Speech holder T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Allowing ss to choose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Elicitor S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Using ss as models S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Using ss past experiences S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Using ss interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Visual aids</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Totales</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-centered approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Allowing ss to choose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Elicitor S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Using ss as models S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Using ss past experiences S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Using ss interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Visual aids</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Totales</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Allowing ss to choose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Elicitor S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Discipline regulator</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Discipline regulation system</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Physical posture awareness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Totales</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with students</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Friendly nicknames for ss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Humour</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Totales</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Expecting bad behaviour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8. Quantitative analysis of Teaching Practices in Luis’ classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Way to deliver content</th>
<th>Luis</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B%</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>G%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-centered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Explanation provider T</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instruction provider T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Question asker T</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Speech holder T</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Elicitor S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Using ss past experiences S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Using ss previous knowledge S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Varied activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Totales</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-centered approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Asking the same student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Allowing ss to choose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Elicitor S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Discipline regulator</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ignoring bullying</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ignoring disruptive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Totales</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first column refers to the number of records found in the data; the other columns refer to the number and percentage of records found in boys' and girls' classes. Although colors highlight percentages that were higher in one class than the other, the number of records in each one of the actions was at times not enough to generalize. It also depended on the classes they were teaching and as three of the teachers had students from two different levels, classes were different in nature because contents were different for the two classes.

Each teacher performed practices that their partners did not. Rosa, for example was the kind of teacher who would provide explanations but would expect her students to come up with their own answers, as well. Jessie, as being the only teacher with the same level, could evidence a differential way to deliver instruction. Jorge was multifaceted and did many and varied activities in his classes and would include a variety of resources. Luis showed more challenges when it was about classroom management.

This lack of a clear-cut distinction could be explained, as teachers expressed it, by the fact that they lack the knowledge and time to face the challenges of this gender-split system. The voices of Jorge and Jessie show us their feelings in regards to the fact that their work from a gender perspective comes from intuition rather than from a very structured knowledge.

“Well, I have been working this very intuitively, I haven't read much about gender distinction, I know that, I know by my experience, there should be a difference in both, but I am not very, very familiar with that, we never touched that topic in college, not even during my masters’ studies, we just mentioned it once, but we didn't read, or we didn't have a lesson or a class. I
“I do activities with them that I don’t do with the girls. Ah… other than that though, I realize that I think that the only things that I do differently are instinctive, purely instinctive.” Int. Jessie Lines: 109-111

What Jorge and Jessie express reflects the importance of the cultural background and the personal conceptions of gender that each teacher may enact. Jorge and Jessie act instinctively and their instincts may have been built by different situations. As Ivinson and Murphy (2007) expressed it, teachers’ practice includes all the resources and cultural tools that they draw on to do their job. Teachers can unwittingly revitalized ideas such as the binary distinction when they are confronted with a need to respond to gender as an emergent aspect in their setting and when they have no other resources to draw on to inform their actions.

Likewise, teachers in the study also reported that the lack of a conscious or rigorous differential approach to gender was related to the lack of time. In the words of Rosa and Jorge does not allow them to plan differently.

“I… what I can say is that the activities that I plan, because eh… we teachers usually have a lot of work, and specially at school, the rhythm and all the, the planning that is full of activities doesn’t give us time to really prepare different activities for each group.” Int. Rosa Lines: 51-54

“I make some little changes, I try to have the same activities for both groups, cause I wouldn’t have time to prepare four different lesson plans about the same topic, that is utopic”. Jorge Lines: 141-143
Although the practices of each teacher depended on a personal style, it would be impossible to deny the particular situations in which practices were actually mediated by gender. The forthcoming subcategories will explain situations that were related to the delivery of content and classroom management.

**Delivering Content: No clear boys-girls distinction**

It has been established that a simple quantitative analysis does not give an account of what actually happened in classes. As they were different in nature, the ways to deliver content were different as well. In other words, as teachers were teaching different contents because their students belonged to different levels, the kinds of actions they performed were different.

However, it was interesting to see two roles that teachers performed more frequently: elicitors and explanation providers. The first one is understood as the kind of role in which teachers elicit answers from students, in other words, they expect students to contribute to the class. The latter one refers to the role in which teachers provide specific information about a topic, a word or an event.

The role of elicitor, in the case of the teachers observed, was performed when teachers wanted students to provide themselves vocabulary or when there was a topic that was being reviewed and students could contribute to the class. This role, from a “binary perspective” was more seen in girls' classes. Nonetheless, when analyzed in depth, it was possible to affirm that it depended on the class per se and not on the gender.

Rosa for example, had a class about poetry with her girls and she was remembering with them concepts they had learned before. So this role was highly
evident in that particular class. As an evidence of this, the field notes taken of the class reveal the particular role Rosa performed:

She asks questions about what they have just read….A girl volunteers to read, then Rosa reads the poem again. While reading she asks one student for the meaning of a word in the poem, then asks the whole class. A girl gives the meaning, while voices are heard. She asks students who the speaker is, then some voices are heard. One girl says that the speaker of the poem is a person that doesn't like birds, a person that is not happy with nature. Then Rosa asks students what the mood of the poem is. Journal. Class 9- Girls, Rosa. January 9, 2013 Lines: 229-233

As she taught boys in a different level, a class like the one of poetry was not observed, but there were moments in which she performed the role of elicitor as the one that is illustrated in this field note:

She asks the last guy to tell the last story. While he is talking, she asks about a synonym for woodcutter, and has students remembering the other word they learned in the class. Class 8- Boys, Rosa. January 18, 2013 Lines: 780-781

The class this time is focused on having students narrating stories they had read as homework. Rosa uses them as an excuse to teach or review vocabulary and students are the ones who provide the definitions and synonyms. This is a style that did not depend on the gender of her students, but on the kind of content she wanted her students to have.

The other role, the one of explanation provider was also performed due to the particular conditions of the class, rather than to the gender of her students. Numbers showed this was a role inclined to girls, however this can be explained due to the fact
that there were classes that needed more of this kind of role and coincided with the classes observed in girls. To exemplify this situation, Jessie who taught eighth grade to boys and girls was observed one day teaching two different classes as she was ahead in the program with one of her groups. Hence, with the girls she had a class about Martin Luther King and with the boys a writing class about narratives. The class of Martin Luther King involved more spaces for her to explain the historical background of the situation, while the class with boys was more about them receiving models and instructions to follow, so the teacher was not the provider of information.

This can be illustrated with the following excerpts from the field notes. The first one shows Jessie talking about Martin Luther King to the girls, an action frequently repeated in that class, and the second one shows the instruction provided to boys so they could write the task they were supposed to.

Jessie asks what the word *riot* means and while explaining, she talks about Martin Luther King's assassination and discusses about extremists. She then talks about another picture in which MLK is giving a speech. The other picture is about the Nobel prize MLK got. Journal. Class 8-Girls. Jessie. January 22, 2013. Lines: 1010-1013

She makes a short description of Titanic, the movie. And then she tells students they are going to do something similar. She shows a document through the video beam. The document she is showing is posted in the virtual room. It is a list of words. The list is divided into spatial, time, personality, synonyms for say and adverbs, vocabulary. She tells guys they are going to write a description of their favorite movie. She writes on the board what the description needs to include:

Jessie’s different roles were not mediated by the gender of their students, but by the objectives of her class, which were different.

Therefore, to understand that the way to deliver content was no mediated by gender but more by the teacher personal style, a brief description of each teacher will be provided in which evidence of their own style will be shown.

Jorge

Jorge keeps a style where connection with students is present. Teacher’s roles are consistent throughout the classes observed. He is an explanation provider and his use of humor and friendly language makes connection with students. He provides tools for students to plan their writing with the use of visual aids that had been used in previous classes with both boys and girls. He uses students as models and elicit from them the answers, knowledge that is being constructed in class. Students are engaged in class and the discipline system works as a way to bring students back on task.

Luis

Luis played the role of explanation and definition provider, “instruction giver” and elicitor in his classes. He was as teacher that showed progression in the classes observed. In the first classes, there was not a clear evidence of a behavioral rules system and this made both boys and girls very noisy students. In the last classes, he addressed discipline more straightforward and the dynamics of the classes changed. Students showed more engagement and this was due to the election of topics of discussion.
Rosa

Rosa combines her teacher-centered approach with a more student-centered approach. She is the provider of definitions, explanations and model for pronunciation. She also gives students the opportunity to share their experiences, memories, and feelings. When teaching she provides students with opportunities to provide definitions, examples and explanations, she is more an elicitor. Students volunteer to participate, to read and it is not imposed by the teacher.

Jessie

Her classes are characterized by a quiet environment. Jessie uses a very structured instruction. Her language is friendly with students and it is evident the use of rewarding expressions when students answer accurately. Jessie was the only one who was observed teaching exactly the same content to boys and girls, so activities were carried out differently. This was done due to the fact that students had a different level so she needed to reinforce, for example, reading skills with the groups of boys. In general terms, her classes follow question-answer sequences thus, Jessie plays the role of elicitor, explanation provider and her contribution from a cultural perspective was evident as she shared with her students the history and cultural context of an American character analyzed.

It has been shown that the delivery of content was not mediated by gender; nonetheless the study shows that when it is about classroom management gender does play an important role. The following section will explain and exemplify how it was evidenced in the group of teachers observed.
Classroom management: When gender requires a system

Besides delivering content, teachers face in their daily interactions with students the task of having them behave as expected. Classroom management, specifically related to the handling of discipline, is understood as those different actions conducted to remind students about behavioral expectations and/or stopping a behavior considered inappropriate for the classroom context. Gender did play an interesting role in this sense, as boys needed a different approach.

For the present study, the term “discipline regulator” was coined to actions in which teachers did as previously mentioned. Quantitatively speaking, more of these roles were seen in boys' classes than in girls' classes. Out of seventeen records in all data gathered, eleven belonged to male groups. The kinds of behaviors that generated this teachers' role were varied, such as not respecting the turn given to participate, teasing classmates, lack of punctuality, not respecting places assigned to be, carrying out parallel activities and not wearing uniform properly. The way teachers reacted to such behaviors was basically through direct speech, telling them not to do something considered wrong and through the use of the tools that school had for such purpose such as tickets or written records so parents were acquainted with the misbehavior. These excerpts from the field notes show some moments in which due to students' behaviors, teachers reacted as discipline regulators.

The four boys at the back keep on talking and playing, Jorge calls their attention Journal. Jorge- Class 6 Boys. January 10, 2013 Line: 383

In this moment students are discussing the characteristics of two fables they read in class and they need to find what the moral of the story is. A group of boys are doing something different which is disruptive for the class. Jorge, therefore, has to call them
back to order. In the following fragment of an observation of Rosa's class, we can see another moment in which the teacher had to remind students about a behavior she expected her students to have.

She starts the class by checking attendance, there are few students in the class, and then when the boys get to the classroom, she talks to them about the importance of being on time. Journal. Rosa. Class: 8 Boys. January 10, 2013: Lines: 747-748

In this class Rosa sees a behavior she considers inappropriate which is lateness and lack of punctuality and she devotes some time to reflect with students about the importance of respecting this rule. When these behaviors are contrasted with what teachers expressed as their beliefs, it is interesting to see that teachers are aware of this contrast of how hard it can be to handle boys as a group. In the words of Rosa, boys can be tough but it is important to have a balance:

“Eh… boys can be tough if you allow them to get away with misbehavior, but if you're strict with them, but… if you are friendly but strict at the same time, and they realize that you are teaching them, and that you are really preparing your classes and working, it's fine”. Int. Rosa. Lines: 94-97

Jessie also presents her concerns related to classroom management when it is about boys:

“Well, ah… it’s been very striking to me how I can have 29 girls in one class and 21 in the boys’ class and it feels there is 35 in that class of boys. They're so much harder to deal with and the discipline in the classroom, not just even just discipline but straight forward classroom management is so much harder, even though there are so many girls and I'd never taught in such big classrooms either,
then… the biggest class that I taught had nineteen students, so for me this was huge this difference.” Int. Jessie. Lines: 90-95

Ivinson and Murphy (2007) and Jackson (2010) particularly addressed these behaviors in boys as groups. It has been socially and culturally conceived that the masculine domain represents aggression, while the feminine represents passivity. In this line of thoughts, in single sex classrooms, it is common to find pedagogies that emphasize discipline for boys and where discipline is not an issue for girls (Ivinson and Murphy, 2007). Jackson (2010) in her study about laddish culture, informed us about the typical behaviors that would define boys as “lads”. Hence, disruptive attitudes in class, boys acting as attention seekers, lack of respect for authority, among others, were behaviors considered laddish for teachers in her study and that appear in this study as problematic for teachers.

Teachers as discipline regulators were also present in girls’ classes. However, the most substantial difference in this regard was that this role evolved in boys’ groups, as some teachers developed discipline regulation systems. These systems can be understood as actions that are consistently performed and that have clear consequences for students. Jessie and Jorge had to create these systems for their male groups.

Jorge had a “nomination” system that consisted in nominating students for tickets (official disciplinary reports at school) if they misbehaved in three different occasions. This can be better explained with this note from the journal in which the system is evidenced for the first time in my observations:

Once the explanation is given, he asks one guy to repeat what his classmate said.

He cannot give an answer and then Jorge tells him he was distracted. He says
something like “nomination” and some boys start singing “nomination time, c’mon". I got puzzled, so I ask one student what it means. He explains that teacher Jorge has a system of nomination in which if he calls somebody's attention, he's got a nomination. Three nominations make a ticket. Boys invented the song. Journal. Jorge. Class 6-boys. January 21, 2013 Lines: 929-933

This is a system with a very particular component: students' implicit participation. When students sing the song, they show that they, as students, approve it. The singing, which in another context could be understood as a disruptive behavior, becomes a tool to reinforce the system. Jorge is aware of how this system can generate precisely disruptive behaviors and in the following quote it is clear the way he executes authority:

Some guys are talking and playing, Jorge calls their attention and the rest of the class starts singing “nomination time”. Jorge tells guys that they are NOT nominated and he tells the guys that HE is the one who establishes nominations, not them. Jorge. Class 6-boys. February 8, 2013 Lines: 1779-1781

Jorge assumes a posture in which he lets students know that he controls the situation, he decides who was disruptive and who was not and he is not going to let students decide about his system.

When contrasted with his thoughts about boys, it was clear that he acted according to his personal beliefs. This can be evidenced in this quote from the interview:

“Okay with boys, you need to be definitely much more stricter, because as I said before, they try to jump over the rules, I mean that is something that is innate in us, we men, we… men (laughter) try to see the way to skip rules, to, to go along with any rule that we can and skip it and jump over it and that is something that is innate in us.”Int. Jorge. Lines: 228-231
Jorge's posture is an interesting idea of masculinity because although he acknowledges certain determinism for men when he says it is innate for them to break rules, he addresses the issue by understanding that teachers therefore need to be stricter with boys. In Jackson's (2010) study, male teachers encounter less problematic laddish behavior because they understand it better, they speak their language and at the end male teachers have a masculine style. In that study, due to their posture, male teachers perpetuated the idea of laddish culture. In Jorge's case, although he essentializes his students as “rule breakers”, he does not perpetuate this idea because he fights against these behaviors. In his practice, discipline is not authoritative as he includes boys themselves as part of the system but establishes clear teacher-students roles.

Jessie is the other teacher with a system that regulates discipline and seems to work exclusively for boys. Her system is specifically addressed to students speaking English at all times in her class, as school establishes. The following excerpt from a class observed shows a moment in which Jessie is reminding students about her system:

Jessie looks at a boy and tells him: a hundred lines. She goes to the board and tells the guys: hold on for a second, I already gave a person an amonestación because he wrote 300 lines for me, because he continuously spoke Spanish in this class. I will not hesitate to do that with each and everyone of you. If you get three times 100 lines, you get an amonestación, if you are late, by every single day, by five minutes, you will also get an amonestación. Does everyone understand this? We talked about the rules at the beginning of the year, the last term, at the beginning of this term, it should be real clear, you are allowed to say
one word in Spanish, when you are asking how do you say this word, but you shouldn’t be talking to each other in Spanish, you have plenty of time outside school if you want, outside my class even. Journal. Jessie. Class: 8 boys. January 22, 2013 Lines: 1087-1094

Jessie works also with warnings: three times and then students get the official sanction at school, which is called “amonestación”, in English “ticket”. What is particular with her system is that she asks her students to write a hundred lines saying I must speak English in my class for every warning. Jessie’s system was highly punitive and implied an action that was really tedious for boys to do when writing a hundred lines. The system that Jessie incorporated was consistent with her vision of boys and the way she handled discipline with them. In Jessie's words, the teacher needs to force them to do what is expected:

“…with the boys I tend to be much more strict because I feel that they need it. Because they are not getting work done when I don't force them to… sit still and get their work done.” Int. Jessie. Lines: 118-120

Bristol (2015) stated that a gender-relevant pedagogy requires practitioners to examine how they have formed learning conditions that enable or constrain boy's learning, especially through unconscious beliefs about gender manifested in curriculum development and responses to students' perceived misbehavior. Thus, discipline regulation is key and punitive responses to boys' misbehaviors produce disengagement that therefore could not facilitate learning.

Jessie's system was inclined to stopping a behavior that she considered inappropriate for her English class, what she probably did not expect was that this
response to that behavior was generating her students to be disengaged to the class and content per se as it will be explained in forthcoming sections.

These two examples showed us that the implementation of a system to handle discipline was exclusive for boys and that these ideas were aligned with a very specific vision of “boys as a group” by the teachers who implemented it. The subsequent sections will expand on what students did in their classrooms and the teachers’ beliefs about their students.

**Students' Behavior: Beyond gender distinction**

It has been shown that there was not a clear tendency in the way teachers delivered content to their students and that teachers handled discipline differently and gender was a mediator. In the same way, it can be stated that students' behavior did not show a clear-cut distinction as many behaviors occurred in both boys' and girls' classes, but rules' appropriation seem to be assumed differently in boys' classrooms. To illustrate how students behaved, table 9 shows the actions observed in the classes and the number and percentages of times they were performed in boys’ and girls' classes.

Therefore, it is evident that in terms of classroom environment and students' engagement, the kinds of behaviors did not depend on the gender but on the kind of group dynamics that were established in the classes, as it will be explained in the following sections.

There were three aspects that were analyzed as part of students' behavior: classroom environment, students' engagement and the way students appropriated the rules. In the first two aspects, the observations carried out did not show a clear
difference between boys and girls, however boys and girls appropriated rules in a different way, in concordance with the way teachers behaved as discipline regulators.

Table 9. Quantitative Analysis of Student’s behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B%</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>G%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Noisy Environment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Quiet Environment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students’ Involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Engagement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Volunteering To Participate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Few students Engaged</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Parallel Activities</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students’ Conversations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Gendered Discourse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Humor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Sexual Connotation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Soccer Conversations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Violent Connotation Speech</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rules’ Appropriation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Discipline Regulator</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No Turn Taking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Teasing Peers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Teacher Approval</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Classroom environment: both boys and girls are noisy**

For class environment the aspect that was observed was noise. This aspect was interestingly evidenced in both boys and girls. It is important to mention, that noise kept a relationship with the teacher and the kind of group dynamics of the moment. Thus, noisy environments were particularly evidenced in one teacher both in boys' and girls' classes.
Luis faced a challenge as a novice teacher as expressed in his words when talking about his previous teaching experiences:

“I… basically my teaching experience is here, I mean, I made my internship here, which was the first contact with a real classroom, I worked at… I have worked at a few other places, but tutoring not properly in a classroom, (Ok), so my classroom experience has been here.” Int. Luis- Lines: 9-11

It is clear that Luis does not have a previous reference to the work with teenagers, but his work at school. When he was asked what his students were like, he pointed out how both were difficult groups. In his words:

“My students like…. well. I would say teenagers, I don't know if they over do some things, I mean, because I haven't met any other teenagers group, from what I know they are very difficult groups, you know everybody here at school say… it's not something normal, all the years teenagers are like this, no. This year has been pretty difficult, with the girls, and with my boys. It's like I have the most difficult groups, in seventh and the most difficult groups in sixth, something like that. .” Int. Luis- Lines: 35-40

Luis faces a double-edge difficulty: working with teenagers in classroom environments for the first time and teaching what he considers “difficult” groups. This difficulty is evidenced in his classes when it is about class environment. Both boys and girls are constantly noisy throughout the class development. There were twenty records in the data found referring to noisy environments and eighteen belonged to Luis' classes. The following excerpts from the first class observed in both boys' and girls' groups show the background noisy environment:
I got to the classroom with Luis and boys are talking. After a while Luis greets and some stand up, boys keep on talking in Spanish. Luis asks for the absent boys and some answer but kids keep on talking. Journal. Luis. Class 6 Boys. January 14, 2013. Lines: 601-603

Luis starts his class by asking if they remember the last topic they have studied. Then he reminds students about a pending assignment for a group of students listed in the board. There is background noise. Girls talk among themselves. I can hear a shoo that comes from the girls. Journal. Luis. Class 7 Girls. January 14, 2013. Lines: 691-694

Luis found it hard to start a class in which students can quietly listen to the teacher. He does not tell students anything in regards to this behavior and he just continues with the class procedures he had established to carry out. There were classroom management strategies that Luis had not used to control this kind of behaviors.

The behavior also evolved along time and three weeks after the first observation, the classroom environment in both groups was quieter. In this excerpt from the field notes, my perception of the class of boys is different:

Luis asks another boy to read. This time I feel the classroom much quieter than previous times. Boys are reading what is in the book. Journal. Luis. Class 6 Boys. February 1, 2013. Lines: 1575-1576

The answer is probably found in the girls' class, which was also quieter from that day on. The way Luis started his class addressed discipline in a very specific way:

Luis starts the class by talking to some girls individually, and then a girl starts screaming. *Nos quitan el descanso*, and another girl says *sí, recreo*. Luis tells
them to use English. Then he greets and the girls stand up and greet him. He calls the roll and asks who is going to present. Girls pull the screen down and they set a computer to be shown in the screen. Classroom is much quieter than previous classes. Journal. Luis. Class 7 Girls. February 1, 2013 Lines: 1616-1619

Luis started implementing strategies that showed consequences to students' misbehaviors and students reacted to that by keeping a quieter environment in their classroom and in general terms by following the rules established.

In this line of thoughts, the opposite behavior: a quiet environment was particularly evident in one teacher. Jessie's classes were characterized by a quiet environment. This quiet environment resulted from instructions that Jessie explicitly gave to students and because she favored individual work in classes, both in boys' and girls' groups, noise levels were really low.

The following excerpts from the field notes show the beginning of a class with the girls that was replicated with boys:

Jessie writes three things on the board while girls start getting ready.

1. **Re-read text silently**

2. **Answer reading comprehension questions independently**

3. **Complete time line in the notebook**


Lines: 407-4011
When I get to the classroom, class has already started. Boys are really quiet. The board is filled with the same information in the morning class with girls. Journal. Jessie. Class 8 girls. January 11, 2013. Lines: 514-518

Both boys and girls keep a quiet environment because instructions have been given and followed. Jessie structures her classes in a way in which she favors individual and silent work for all her students with no gender distinction.

Hence, it can be stated that the fact that students were noisy or quiet did not depend on their gender but on the way a specific teacher addressed these behaviors from a classroom management perspective and the kinds of students they were.

**Students’ involvement: Engagement does not depend on gender**

The second element analyzed as part of students’ appropriation of their classroom was their engagement. Engagement was understood as the behavior in which students were doing the assignments indicated by their teachers and the fact that they showed interest in such.

Engagement was evidenced in different moments: students attentively watching videos, students paying attention to their classmates’ presentations, actively participating in class discussions and working on the exercises of the class. There were seventeen records of students being engaged, nine for boys’ classes and seven for girls’ classes. This behavior depended on the kind of exercise that was being done at the moment rather than on the gender of students. These two excerpts of field notes exemplify how both boys and girls showed engagement in class.

When I get to the classroom, girls are working in a handout in teams or pairs, the handout is a vocabulary handout and girls constantly ask questions of how to say
something in English. They work for a while engaged on the exercise and then Rosa tells them they are going to have some oral presentations. Journal. Rosa. Class: 9-Girls. January 29, 2013. Lines: 1271-1274

For this particular situation, girls showed engagement by doing the exercise, asking questions to Rosa and answering the exercise of the handout. In this other excerpt of the field notes, boys showed engagement in a class discussion about drugs' legalization with Luis:

A guy talks about cigarettes and how dangerous they are and that they are legal. When he's talking one guy starts talking, and he says, hey! I'm talking. I can hear someone saying, teacher can I say something? Boys want to participate. And they raise their hands so they can participate. Journal. Luis. Class: 6-Boys. February 1, 2013 Lines: 1560-1563

The fact that many students were part of the conversation made this particular class a moment for students to participate and therefore to show engagement. Once again this behavior was no mediated by the gender of students but by class conditions and goals. Nonetheless, in the same way that students showed engagement, there were moments in which this situation did not happen.

This lack of engagement was not mediated by students' gender but by teachers' particular actions. Thus, parallel activities and very few students engaged were behaviors that happened especially with one teacher. Luis, who was already described as a novice teacher in search of classroom management strategies, was the teacher who evidenced these students' behaviors in class. The term “parallel activities" was coined to those actions that happened in the classroom while the learning or teaching activities were being executed and that did not have a learning connection. For example,
students’ talk or play that was not related to the explanation or activity given at the moment were considered parallel activities.

There were seventeen records related to this behavior and fourteen belonged to Luis. The following passages from the field notes show those kinds of actions in Luis' classes, both in boys’ and girls' classes.

Then Luis plays another video, this time is an interview to Obama made by a kid. The kid makes questions about education. While the video is shown, some girls are doing something different. When Luis pauses the video, he asks one girl, Sonia, to tell him what she understood, and then she says she did not pay attention. He plays the video again; fewer girls this time are distracted. Journal. Luis. Class: 7-girls. January 23, 2013. Lines: 1172-1177

Students' lack of engagement was evidenced when some students were not watching the video but doing a parallel activity that did not allow a student to report about the content of the video. This behavior is acknowledged by the student when she is confronted by the teacher. In boys' classes parallel activities also took place as illustrated in the following selection from the field notes:

While a boy is reading aloud, I can hear someone making a noise with papers. There is a boy lying on the desk to talk to his classmate next to him. Then he starts making sounds with his desk as if it was drums. Another boy is playing with coins. Journal. Luis. Class:6-Boys. January 14, 2013. Lines: 639-641

This class, which involved students reading and listening skills in a shared reading exercise, experienced the occurrence of different activities at the same time that were not related to the exercise nor the content of the reading passage. Students' level
of engagement was not related to their gender but to the events that were happening in the class and the way the teacher handled the situation.

**Boys and Girls and their appropriation of rules**

The appropriation of the classroom can also be explored from the way students appropriated the rules. In this particular setting, it is possible to affirm that there are behaviors that occurred more often in male classrooms than in female classrooms. There were three behaviors that illustrated the way students appropriated the classroom rules: students behaving as discipline regulators, the way they assumed turn taking to participate and behaviors that involved teasing peers.

To start with, it is important to understand that the role of students as discipline regulators was observed in moments when the discipline was not controlled by teachers themselves, but by students. Both boys and girls played the role of discipline regulators in the classrooms, but it was differently assumed. In the girls’ contexts when there were situations that students considered that affected the development of the class, such as noise, students used “shoo” sounds to have students be quiet. This can be exemplified with this extract from the field notes at the beginning of a girls’ class with Luis:

Luis reminds students about a pending assignment for a group of students listed in the board. There is background noise and girls talk among themselves. I can hear a shoo that comes from the girls. Journal. Luis. Class:7-Girls. January 14, 2013 Lines: 693-694

The role played by the students addressed the whole class. The “shoo” was directed to the whole group so that teacher's directions for the class could be heard. With boys the role of discipline regulator was more direct. Therefore there were one-on-
one interactions that claimed peers for the fulfillment of a class rule, for example, no interruptions when a student was speaking or talking about things that were not related to the class. The following excerpt of the field notes exemplifies one of these behaviors. Rosa is going to work with a pronunciation exercise with tong twisters. Boys had just received a newsletter with school's calendar and they were supposed to be reading some short stories.

All the boys are reading either school's calendar or short stories. Meanwhile Rosa writes on the board:

_I wish I were what I I was_  
_When I wished I were what I am_


The quote shows students using straightforward Spanish words to tell a student, who was doing something not related to the class, that it was not an approved action. This behavior evidenced in three more different situations, shows boys as students that claim their rights not always in the most assertive way but quite direct way. In the following passage from the field notes in Luis boys' class, it is shown how a student claims his right to speak without being interrupted:

There is a boy giving his opinion, and another guy starts talking at the same time, so he tells him, “cállase hermano”. Then Luis says, _in English!!!_ Journal. Luis. Class:6-Boys. February 1, 2013. Lines:1569-1570

Once again, this student is using a Spanish expression with the intention of claiming his right to speak. Luis approves the action when he does not say anything
about the content of the expression *per se*, but he requests the student to speak in English.

A second behavior that was exclusive of boys was the struggle they faced to take the floor and let other classmates to do so. This was interestingly evidenced just in male teachers' classes. Sometimes in Jorge and Luis classes boys participated in class with no clear order, thus there were moments in which everybody spoke at the same time, or students would spontaneously speak without raising their hands and the ones who would end up participating were the same or just some. In the following passage from a boys' class observed in Jorge's practice, it is evidenced that students volunteer without a system that guaranteed equal participation and respect.

They start working with the second part of the vocabulary. Jorge asks in a loud tone of voice to a boy, *Ortiz*, to give the answer. He gives it, then a second voice volunteers for the second question and gives the answer. They continue discussing the vocabulary. I can notice boys rarely raise their hands to participate.


The right to participate is given by the one who spoke first or was more visible or audible to the teacher. This was also evidenced in Luis' class, when students are discussing some questions related to a passage that they are reading and listening to:

Luis plays the CD again. Boys read along. Luis pauses the CD and boys are asked some questions. I realize the ones who speak first are the ones who have the floor to speak; there are no hands up to indicate which students want to participate. There are boys who actually don't speak during the class. Journal. Luis. Class: 6-Boys. February 12, 2013. Lines: 155-158
The fact that the ones who decide who speak first are sometimes students, shows a very agentive role in boys. This confirms the ideas how gender shapes interaction in the classroom, in other words gender may be a determiner about which participants have the right to speak, to define meaning and to stay invisible in different classroom settings. (Pavlenko and Piller, 2008). Ivinson and Murphy (2007) found in their study that pedagogic practices and instruction addressed to boys gave them more autonomy than girls. Their ideas were validated more explicitly. Hence, boys were treated more agentive than girls. When students decided who had the right to speak, they were treated more agentive than girls. In fact, this conception of boys coincides with the ideas presented by Jorge in the interview. Although, Jorge was not talking about the right to speak in the classroom and he was talking about the way students grouped, in his explanation, he defined boys as decision-makers.

“...With the boys I find it a little bit more difficult, they want to take those decisions, they want to make decisions, they want to be part of the decision-making, making of the decisions, they want to get involved in the dynamic of the class, they are not so passive, let's say it in a way to understand. Int. Jorge Lines: 154-158

Jorge in Ivinson and Murphy's words legitimized historical legacies of boys that defined them as autonomous, competitive and individual.

The last manifestation of the way students appropriated classroom rules was related to the behaviors that involved teasing peers. This was also a behavior present just in boys' classrooms. In the following excerpts from Rosa's class it can be seen a behavior that boys as a group have with one particular student.

The boy who is fixing the video beam cannot make it work and another guy stands up to help him. Then everybody starts calling him by his name quite aloud.

In this class students use their loud voices to pick on a student that volunteered to help the teacher. Thus, they portrayed a behavior that helped them position in the peer culture through humor and absurdity (Ivinson and Murphy, 2007). A behavior like this one can be framed within the Laddish Culture (Jackson 2010) that understands this as group attracting behaviors that seek attention and peer approval. In the example presented, when students tease their classmate, they do it publicly and that makes them receive the attention they want.

On the contrary, it was interesting to see that girls did tease their classmates but in a different way. With girls, the way to tease their partners did not happen in the public realm but it was a more private done. It is therefore, really probable that this happens and teachers do not realize. The evidence that supports this statement can be found in the following excerpt from Luis’ class. There is a moment in the middle of a class when students are discussing some vocabulary and I realize of a secret way to tease students that girls perform:

While he is trying to explain some words, there is a girl who is playing with a spray. Luis has to confiscate it. He puts it on top of his desk I can see the spray is wrapped with masking tape and it reads: “repele perras pro”. Journal. Luis. Class: 7-Girls. February 12, 2013. Lines: 1962-1964

Girls were not loud as boys were, but in fact this particular behavior could be considered really offensive. It is not the purpose of the present study to investigate the differences between boys and girls from this perspective, but it was an interesting
finding to see the kinds of hidden behaviors in the classroom that some girls may perform and that are no visible to the eyes of teachers.

This behavior coincides with the binary conception and cultural belief of males acting in a public realm where females do it in the private one (Ivinson and Murphy, 2007). Interestingly, the private domain here is used to hide a very offensive behavior of girls towards their own classmates.

To sum up, students' appropriation of the classroom showed that the classroom environment and students' engagement depended on the strategies that each teacher used rather than in the gender their students were ascribed to. However, it was evident to see that students appropriation of rules was different from a gender perspective in which boys acted more agentive and framed within the laddish culture and girls performed a private way of teasing their peers. The subsequent section will address the way teachers conceived their students, thus it will give an account of the research question in regards to teachers' beliefs.

**Teachers' beliefs: binary conceptions of gender**

It has been addressed how teachers' practices and students' behaviors did not show a clear-cut distinction. However, teachers perceived and defined their students from a binary perspective where what one gender represented was the opposite of the other (Ivinson and Murphy, 2007). This section presents how language communication abilities were perceived to be better in girls. Moreover, it will explain the way teachers perceived their relations to their students as gendered subjects. And finally, how they perceived a clear difference in terms of the way boys and girls face the academic world.
Innate gender language abilities?

This section presents how teachers perceived the language abilities of their students in the context of the EFL classroom and how gender played a role in this characterization. To start with, it is important to mention that three out of the four participants of this study informed that there were differences in the language skills of their students given by their gender. Thus, Jorge, Jessie and Luis considered that there were differences in the speaking and/or writing production of their students. From this perspective, teachers considered their girls better communicators as exemplified in the words of the three teachers:

“Yeah, the girls' oral language skills are just far away better than boys', they practice speaking a lot more. There are more times in which I've heard them in a hallway, a few of them speaking in English with each other. I never, ever, ever, ever, hear the boys speaking English with each other as well as the written skills which I think translates as well, you know the girls have a much stronger ability to write and to write correctly with the correct mechanics as well as expressing their opinions.” Int. Jessie. Lines: 151-156

“Writing part is way better for girls, just beginning by the handwriting which you can read it. They try to organize ideas, for boys, let's get rid of this.... they do it just to complete the exam, while girls, they try to do something good.” Int. Luis. Lines: 99-101

“There is also evidence that girls have better communication skills than boys. The left hand side of their brains develops faster than the boys' and for that reason girls tend to be more communicative, more talkative and as language teachers we
Although the three of them considered their girls better speakers or writers when compared with boys, the reasons they gave were understood from two different perspectives. Whereas Jessie and Luis justified this difference from an academic perspective, Jorge did it form a biological one. Henceforward, Jessie explained that girls’ oral skills were better as they practiced them more and Luis emphasized on the organization and the fact that girls make an effort to do things in the right way. In contrast, Jorge attributed the difference to a biological determinism that dictates that due to brain differences, girls’ language abilities are better.

Teachers’ beliefs aligned with the idea that Sunderland, (2004) presents on the apparent assertiveness and academic approach of the girls and the differential teacher treatment by gender in which boys may have received more attention but girls more academically useful attention. Lu and Luk (2014) also explored the idea of language learning as a feminine domain. In their study they pointed out how the fact that girls tend to enjoy reading more, practice more and perform better is problematic as it perpetuates the division.

As a result, the binary division is clearly evidenced when teachers say: *I never, ever, ever, ever, hear the boys speaking English... for boys, let's get rid of this... their brains develops faster than the boys'*. However, when contrasted with their practices, there is no clear evidence of this binary division. Firstly, observations did not give any account of students' written production since observations were done to the classroom's procedures and students' behaviors. Secondly, when students' oral production was analyzed, data could not determine if they were better or not. Nevertheless, there was
an interesting tendency in girls' classes where students volunteered to participate more, as a result, their speaking abilities were witnessed more than in boys' classes. Five out of the eight records that referred to these behaviors corresponded to girls' classes. The following excerpts from the field notes in two different girls' classes exemplify this tendency:


Then Jessie tells the girls they are going to read paragraph by paragraph and they will have to summarize each. Girls raise their hands to read and summarize each paragraph. Journal. Jessie. Class: 8-Girls. January 31, 2013. Lines: 1452-1454

In both classes girls seem to feel comfortable with the action of speaking in public to read and participate in class discussions and this could be considered an indicator of their speaking skills.

However, it is important to point out that one teacher did not consider that the differences in language skills in her students were given by their gender but from individual specific characteristics. Rosa's words illustrate her vision:

“I would say that the differences can be identified more on individual basis within a group, ah.. And because in the same way, I can find students with a very low level in boys' and girls' classes and sometimes those are students that care, but still they don't manage to overcome those difficulties.” Int. Rosa. Lines: 82-85
Hence, it can be stated that teachers' understandings of their students' communicative skills were mainly addressed from The Difference Framework (Davis & Skilton-Sylvester, 2004). This framework suggests that girls and boys are socialized into different ways of relating to one another in their predominately same-sex interactions and, thus, acquire different communicative styles. This added to a biological determinism that understands gender-differences from brain differences. Conversely, Rosa's view can be framed within the dynamic approach, in which gender identity is seen as a social construct rather than an established social category.

Besides students' language skills, teachers also characterized the relationships that they established with their students and how they were mediated by their gender. The subsequent section will present those perceptions.

Teachers' relationships with gender

This section presents teachers' beliefs in regards to the way they relate to their students as gendered subjects. Therefore, it will be shown how teachers expressed their preference to teaching a gender in particular and the way that factors such as personal background, physical proximity, personality and academic characteristics influenced those preferences.

Three teachers expressed their preference to teaching boys. Reasons, however, were varied. Rosa, Jorge and Luis expressed in the interviews their preference or the comfort that generated the work with that specific group.

Rosa's preference for boys was given due to her personality and the role that humor played in her classes. When she was characterizing her students, she mentioned
how humor could be performed more safely in boys' classes. This quote from the interview exemplifies it:

“You can even joke more, eh..., kid and tease the boys, and make them have fun, and laugh and they don't care about jokes or pranks or things. While with the girls you have to be more careful because they are more sensitive and you have to be very careful about what you say, not to make them feel bad.” Int. Rosa. Lines: 57-61

When she was asked if she preferred one group to the other her answer was:

“I would say I like working with boys, because of my personality, I like to tease them...” Int. Rosa. Lines: 112-113

This belief matches with her actions in the classroom, evidenced just in her boys' classes. The following excerpt from one of her classes shows her use of humor. This is the first class after a Christmas break and Rosa takes advantage of one of the actions in her class to display humor.

A student raises his hands. Rosa asks him if he has a question, he replies he was just stretching his arms. Rosa says she understands that, to come back from vacation. She asks the student if he had a good vacation. The student answers he couldn't. Rosa asks why?, Why not? She asks the student if the Christmas father didn't bring him gifts. Rosa tells him he was a bad boy, and that everything has consequences. Journal. Rosa. Class: 8-Boys. January 9, 2013. Lines: 149-152

In this regard, it had already been stated that humor and absurdity can be understood as a behavior in which boys intend to get a position in the peer culture (Ivinson and Murphy, 2017). However, Rosa uses it to get a connection with her
students. This does not happen with her group of girls, because probably, the experiences that she had in the past led her to consider them sensitive and susceptible to be offended through the same use of humor.

Jorge, who was also an experienced teacher, directly expressed his preference to teaching boys, however his reasons had to do with his personal background and the way he was educated.

“I feel very comfortable when I am with boys, actually I prefer to teach boys than girls because since I grew up in that environment like in that male world, is not that I am a macho man or something like that, I understand very well, I, I can lower to their level and be at their psychological level, because that gives me like a memory of when I was that age” Int. Jorge. Lines: 63- 67

Jorge is a teacher whose primary and secondary education took place in an only-boys school. What it is interesting about him is that he acknowledges and uses his personal experience to understand, define and get identified with a specific gender. In this respect, Ivinson and Murphy (2007) point out about historical legacies and how they likely “influence a teacher gaze and ensure that some aspects of behaviors will stand out and other will appear as natural according to the cultural legacy of the subject” (p.175). His own experience as a male student in a male environment at school is guiding his way to proceed in class.

Evidence of this relies on some specific moments of his classes with boys in which there was “gender complicity”, a term I coined to the situation in which there was a topic that in the class was understood as masculine. The first situation occurred when boys were talking about the benefits of sun just before watching a video about it, as illustrated in the following excerpt from the field notes:

This is a second moment, in a later class when this “gender complicity” is also experienced:


Jorge uses a gendered discourse in which he interacts with students from a “masculine” perspective. This happens because Jorge understands his students as teenagers who are in search of their identity, and gender plays an important role in these ages. His voice illustrates this idea:

“… *boys are much more prevented against their sex, I mean, no against, they’re more careful with the kind of activities that you propose, they watch that a little bit more… especially at this age, because they are finding their identity, they’re, they are, they’re becoming men and anything that would hurt that identification, that will kind of be seen as dangerous, as not appropriate maybe.*” Int. Jorge. Lines: 132-135

With his gendered discourse in class, he is helping students create identity as boys. It is evident that Jorge reproduces the kind of masculinity he experienced when he was young and this becomes his resource and strategy to interact with boys. Is it then a masculinity that reproduces hegemonic ideas such as sexism? (Ivinson and Murphy,
Can this be considered a “laddish” tackling “ladishness” (Jackson, 2010)? To answer the question, then context plays an important role. The fact that he interacts with girls separately, does not give room to sexism. His relationship is different as he acts from a parenthood perspective. This was evidenced both in his interview and in some class observed with girls. The following excerpt refers to his thoughts about how he related to girls.

“…even though with the girls I tend to be a little bit more lenient, a little bit more father-like, a little bit more flexible” Int. Jorge. Lines: 68-69

His father-like approach is evidenced in one of the classes with the girls. This excerpt from the field notes clearly reveals that position. Jorge is discussing with the girls about the persuasion techniques:

He says: let’s begin: appeal by association. Castillo read. The girl reads and the Jorge gives an example with shoes. He says that he wont say that a chubby guy man uses it, he will say that an athlete uses them. He says: a churrito, papasito. Girls laugh. He asks girls who else. Girls answer: a football player, a famous person. Then he says: these are the tennis shoes that your English teacher uses. Who’s going to buy that? Some girls laugh. A student says: me. Girls say ahh….(in a cute tone) And Jorge goes and hugs the girl while he says: that is why she is who she is. Girls laugh. Journal. Jorge. Class: 7-Girls. January 10, 2013. Lines: 279-285

The quote shows that he relates with her girls from the friendly and humorous atmosphere he has created where physical contact and caring and loving speech play an important role. Jorge understands that in his teaching practice gender plays a role as a mediator. Thus, Jorge behaves and connects with his students through his idea of
masculinity or parenthood. Lahelma et al (2014) inform us about the role of maternalistic approaches and their connection with the ethics of care. Traditionally, it has been linked with women. In Jorge's case it is quite interesting to see that although he assumes a “parent-like” approach, he does it just with the girls. Although he plays the role of caregiver, it is just with the girls. This is possible in a context that makes gender explicit where differences are visible or assumed differently by teachers.

Another teacher that expressed his comfort to work with boys was Luis. For Luis, his preference is given by the fact that he feels more comfortable with the physical contact that he feels he can have with boys. He establishes his relationship by being hard on them and not feeling at risk when doing so. This is exemplified with this quote from the interview:

“For me it's easier to handle the boys, because I can, you know. I feel more comfortable by having physical contact and call them and tell them be quiet, and I push them and this gentle way, that they feel you're close to them, and you're not just that figure just talking by the board”. Int. Luis. Lines: 120-122

Luis feels he can establish a relationship with boys and that he can exercise power from his teacher position because boys allow that “harsh” thrust. Consequently, this generates the proximity with his students that Luis finds comfortable. Thus, he finds that in his position, probably because he is a young male teacher, he cannot establish that physical proximity and that does not allow him to establish comfortable relationships with girls. As in Rosa's case he finds girls susceptible to be offended as expressed in his words:

“With the girls I don't feel comfortable, you know, going to them, and… besides it's like they can, I don't know, you always have the perception the girls can get
upset more easily than men. So boys are relaxed, whatever you do, whatever happens in a class, it stays in a class, they are not going to go and tell everybody. So for me it has been easier to deal with behavior because you know, I can act a little bit more with the boys. With the girls I feel I cannot do much. Only what I can say, my voice you know. For me handling boys is easier than girls.” Int. Luis. Lines: 122-129

For Luis, exercising authority is a difficult task with girls, and it was previously presented how he struggled with classroom management. From his perspective, as a male teacher, he feels there are threats he faces when he tries to correct wrong behaviors in girls, it seems his power is undermined by the fact that he is dealing with girls' possible complaints and bad consequences are for the teacher and not for the girls. In class observations, I noticed three moments in which Luis ignored disruptive behaviors and one in which he clarified students that he was not going to invade students' privacy when interrupting a behavior that was disruptive in class. The following excerpt exemplifies such situation:

I can see that some girls pass notebooks with written messages on those. Luis finally realizes and takes the notebook and says I'm not gonna read it, and he puts the notebook on the desk and keeps on working on the handout… At the end of the class, the girls, whose notebook was confiscated, get to the desk, take the notebook and go. Luis is talking to some other girls meanwhile. Class is over. Journal. Luis. Class: 7-Girls. February 1, 2013. Lines: 1639-1656

Luis seems to be prevented of invading girls' privacy and he is preventive in the sense he clarifies he is not going to read. Girls do not face any kind of consequence, nor even a talk to make them aware of the disruptive behavior. At the end, as he expressed
it, he did not do much to prevent an action that was disrespectful. It could have, as previously explained, been a possible hidden disrespectful action among their own classmates. The interesting insight that comes from this analysis is that classroom management decisions were mediated by the relationship that Luis established with his students as gendered subjects.

Lastly, Jessie was the only teacher who manifested her preference for girls. Interestingly, it was given from the academic characteristics of her students. This quote in which she characterizes her students evidences her preference:

“Yeah, my girls are really friendly, they're very warm, they're very intellectually curious, so they have a lot of natural interest in school and I find that it's true in almost across the board of my two girls classes, so out of fifty of my girls, I would say that probably forty of them have a natural interest in learning and in school, which makes it obviously more pleasant to be their teacher because I'm excited to teach and they're excited to learn and that's a good combination.” Int. Jessie.

Lines: 65-70

Jessie's connection with students is established from certain characteristics in the social relationships as being friendly and warm, but her emphasis is on the academia. Her female students are eager to learn and that is how she can make connections with them. Her boys do not share these qualities and her relationship with them is not as good as with the girls. In this line of thoughts, it was evidenced in the way Jessie handled discipline exclusively with boys that her posture was radical and it was probably the result of disruptive behaviors that although were not evidenced in the classes observed, did have an impact on the way Jessie related to them. To exemplify this, let me use an excerpt from the field notes of one her classes with boys:
A few students are talking and Jessie raises the tone of her voice and says: *if you're not listening right now, you won't know what you will be doing and I won't repeat directions again. I repeated directions so many times yesterday because you were not paying attention.* Journal. Jessie. Class: 8-Boys. January 22, 2013. Lines: 1085-1088

Her language is direct and emphatic because the behaviors of her students drove her to that. Whereas in the girls' class a friendly environment is evidenced through the conversations she establishes with her students as illustrated in the following observation:


Jessie connects with her students through the contents of the class, in other words, through the academic culture typical of a classroom and as her boys seem not to have it, then her relationship is not perceived as good as with the girls. The subsequent section will address the most common difference perceived by teachers which is precisely the way boys and girls are opposite in terms of academic culture.

**Academic culture: a clear binary conception of students**

This section discusses how teachers perceived their students in the academic world and how this understanding was mediated by the gender of their students. The ideas of responsibility, investment and stereotypical topics will be discussed.

To start with, three teachers perceived their students as doing better in terms of academic results. Rosa, Jorge and Jessie considered that characteristics inner to their
gender allowed them to do well. And although Luis perceived that his boys did better, he acknowledged certain characteristics to girls that would fit with the ones of the academic culture. In this regard we can see how teachers’ perceptions of their male students reflects the dissonance between aspects of masculinity and aspects of schooling (Moss, 2008).

As explained in the theoretical framework of the present study, one characteristic that was established in certain types of masculinity are oppositional to the academic culture, as learning and achievement are perceived as not cool. (Ivinson and Murphy, 2007). Similarly, the same behavior was understood as part of the laddish culture (Jackson, 2010) as sport was prioritized over academic work in order to achieve popularity. Although it is not the specific case of this study, because sport was not the only thing that was prioritized, it is evident that there are characteristics of the boys that are perceived as apposite to the academic culture. One of them has to do with the responsibility with the tasks at school and how that has an impact in their academic results. Table 10 shows teachers' statements about their students' responsibility that resulted from the interviews carried out.

Table 10. Teachers' Perceptions about Students' Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jessie</td>
<td>“…they don’t turn any work, their responsibility is really like through the floor”.</td>
<td>“Ah.. the girls tend to be extremely responsible, they’re very upset if they don’t do very well academically, the girls seem to have a lot more sense of personal responsibility for their own learning and they do achieve much better”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“…they’re totally apathetic about learning and about doing anything for greater life purpose.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…the boys get upset when their parents get upset”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Luis | “In my case boys do better than girls, mainly because, what I feel is that boys do not put so much effort on it, and still they do well.” “…for boys, let's get rid of this…. they do it just to complete the exam…” | “While girls even though, they try sometimes even harder, for them it has been even more difficult. “…They try to organize idea … they try to do something good…” |
Rosa | “…during the term boys are less committed” | “Girls are more steady, they work, they want to show you their corrections, they are very committed and study and they work all the term...” |
Jorge | “…boys on the other hand are less responsible, they're fresh, they are less responsible, careless, so that has an impact on their grades.” | “This is teenage, pre-teenage girls tend to be much more responsible than boys… they tend to be a little bit more ah… more responsible more proactive, more diligent…” |

Teachers’ perceptions clearly set girls in positions where they take more responsibility for the act of studying. And although the four teachers acknowledge that they strive to do their work committedly, Luis expresses that this is not enough to get good results. This can translate in a posture where Rosa, Jessie and Jorge do consider responsibility part of academic success, while Luis considers results in tests as academic success.

In his interview Luis expands on this “contradictory” situation by explaining that boys’ instinctive skills allow them to get the results, despite the lack of effort they portray:

“I would say reading, boys have a better reading comprehension in terms, let's say, of language skills. Reading, vocabulary, the ability to use those words in different contexts for them is pretty much… I wouldn't know how to say it, they don’t… they have like an instinct, should I say it? They just use it, while girls want to know if it is a noun or an adverb, or this or that, and sometimes that turns everything to be more confusing for them. Int. Luis. Lines: 106-111
The classes observed did not give an account of the level of responsibility by students or the levels of hard work that boys and girls displayed. It is important to point out that four classes observed per teacher cannot be considered the overall world of their teaching practices. Teachers' voices become therefore the input to see that students as gendered subjects build identities as students.

The presence or lack of responsibility clearly relates with the concept investment. Thus, gender hence plays the role of determining the ways learners invest or disinvest to learn a second language (Sunderland 2000). Nevertheless, this relationship needs to be cautiously understood since “it is not the essential nature of femininity and masculinity that shapes language learning trajectories of particular individuals, but rather the nature of gendered social and economic relations, culture specific ideologies of language.” (Pavlenko and Piller, 2008 p.61). This idea promotes the understanding of gender from a dynamic point of view, where the surrounding factors are the ones also determine gender. Lu and Luk (2014) also explored the concept of investment in EFL students. Certainly, as in their study, investment in a foreign language can be considered gendered. It is not the purpose of this study to establish the gender subjectivities and investment of students, but it is interesting to find that teachers do perceive that students, from a gender position, invest in certain actions, probably to get a position as students, or as women and men. It is just Jessie the one who can give an account of this investment from her perspective.

*The girls, it seems to me, when they talk about why they're learning English, and why they're trying so hard, they know that it's gonna be useful to them later. The boys are not thinking so far ahead, so when I tell them, you know it's gonna be*
really helpful for you to speak fluent English to get a job here and they say: yeah… well. So less interest. Int Jessie. Lines: 80-84

The reality for these teachers is that their boys are less committed and this has an impact on the academic results. However, as it was mentioned throughout this chapter, there is no evidence of actions that are intended to change this situation or that directly tackle the problem. Once again, the differentiation is clearly perceived, but the actions in the classroom do not show differentiation.

Another aspect that teachers reported as different in terms of gender was how certain topics cater the interests of their students from a gender perspective. Thus, Jessie and Luis reported how they chose topics according to the gender of their students:

“…I can work, let’s say, a big area, like persuasion with both groups, but the topics I give them to develop their ideas have to be different. So for example with boys you talk about drugs legalization, things like that, they love it, you know. With girls, you need to talk about different things. They are not, sometimes they don’t care about many things. With boys you talk about sports, soccer, things like that, you know, they will produce whatever amount of things you tell them. With girls, when they have to present their orals, they like to talk about One Direction, Michael Jackson and things like that. Those topics are the ones I refer to. Int. Luis Lines: 76-84

“I thing, the only things that I do consciously differently are, I would pick topics that I find, that I think they’ll find interesting. The boys versus the girls. I pick different books because I’m trying to cater to their interests but that’s based on
what I know about the classes as people, not necessarily as boys versus girls, I just… I've done interviews, sort of survey questions with the boys, I know what their interests are, they are very stereotypical boys interest though, so it is easy to categorize them, sports, other sports, (laughter) , movies, action movies, they don't like to read, they don't like to write so getting them to do something else. They like music, they like listening to music. Int. Jessie. Lines: 101-108

Understanding the likes and interests of students from their gender can become stereotypical. In fact, Jessie expresses it in her words but still, instead of fighting the stereotype; she uses it for her classes. Luis does not seem to understand those characteristics as stereotypical and he seems to privilege boys' topics, because with the topic, comes their good language production. I his words: “girls do not care” therefore topics are simply opposite and they do not interfere with their production.

These two visions of their students coincide with Schmenk's (2004) understanding of stereotypes as shared beliefs about personality traits and behaviors of group members, overlooking individuality. Similarly it aligns with the idea that Martino et al, 2004 presented about teacher threshold knowledges and how gender impact significantly on the execution of pedagogy, often with the effect of reinforcing taken for granted assumptions about the way boys as a group learn, behave and respond". (Martino et al, 2004 (p.251). It seems that teachers find it hard to challenge a stereotype where differentiation is present. The reproduction of stereotypes therefore coincides with the findings of Lynch (2014) in which teachers reproduced their conceptions of gender restricting and /or empowering their students in class practices.

All in all, teachers showed that the beliefs they hold play an important role in the way they conceived their students and subsequently interacted with them in very
specific ways. This happens due to the historical legacies that each teacher has and therefore reproduces and that are more evident in a system where gender becomes explicit as it happens with single-sex classrooms.

Nonetheless, teachers face tensions and contradictions when they encounter classrooms mediated by gender. It is possible to state that teachers did not behave to cater gendered learning styles of their students, because there was not a clear-cut distinction in their students’ behaviors and that such practices and behaviors are mediated by other and more complex factors that go beyond a “sex differentiation”.
Chapter 5

Conclusions

As the purpose of this study was to explore the way teachers' gender-related beliefs shaped their pedagogical practices in single-sex classrooms, the findings showed that although the four teachers participating in this study perceived their students from a gender binary perspective, their practices and their students' behaviors did not show a clear-cut distinction. Thus, teachers' practices, students' behaviors and teachers' beliefs were analyzed and contrasted to give an answer to the research question.

Firstly, it was noticed that the way teachers delivered instruction did not depend on the gender of their students but on the personal teacher styles each one performed. Thus, the roles of elicitor and explanation provider, among others, were examples of roles that appeared in both groups responding to the learning and teaching objectives of each class and not to the gender characteristics of each group. It was pointed out however, that this lack of a clear-cut distinction could have been related to the lack of knowledge of the system where teachers face gender physical separation. The lack of time was also reported by teachers as constraints to develop a system where gender becomes more explicit. In this regard, Ivinson and Murphy (2007) informed that this situation could lead teachers to unwittingly revitalized ideas such as the binary distinction when they are confronted with a need to respond to gender as an emergent aspect in their setting.

As a second finding, it was established that there were differences in the way teachers handled discipline. The role of discipline regulator was evidenced more in boys'
groups. Furthermore, two out of the four teachers had to create discipline regulation systems to tackle disruptive behaviors in boys' groups. The disruptive behaviors shared characteristics with the laddish culture (Jackson, 2010) as they were intended to seek attention and interrupt the class dynamics. Jessie and Jorge, the teachers who implemented the systems acknowledged that they needed to be stricter with boys since they would not follow the rules. The two examples found in this study showed two approaches to discipline. Both penalized the actions, but one had a component of peer-approval that made it less authoritarian and socially accepted, whereas the second one was highly punitive and incorporated writing as a punishment. This last resource to discipline could lead to the disengagement of boys and therefore not facilitate learning. (Bristol, 2015).

Students' behaviors were also analyzed and, as it happened with teachers' practices, they did not depend on the gender of the students but on the way teachers adopted specific postures and in general terms about the class dynamics. Thus, it was evidenced that classroom environment, specifically noisy and quiet atmospheres, were evidenced in two teachers' practices. For Luis it was problematic, but this happened due to his novelty with teenagers and the particular characteristics of his students. For Jessie, her quiet classrooms were product of the way she favored individual and silent work.

Students' engagement did not have a clear relation with the gender of students. Both presence and lack of engagement were evidenced in boys' and girls' groups. Engagement was related more to the particular class exercise, such as the projection of a video or an interesting topic for class discussion. On the contrary, disengagement was related to the way teacher handled classroom management. Thus, parallel activities that
did not show students’ interest in the class were more frequent in one particular teacher, who, as mentioned before, faced challenges in his position as a novice teacher. One behavior that could be understood as different from a gender perspective was the way students appropriated class rules. Firstly, although both boys and girls played the role of discipline regulators, they played it differently. Girls would use speech a little bit closer to teachers’ language when telling the whole class to be quiet and listen, whereas boys had one-on-one interactions with the students who had the disruptive behaviors, usually in Spanish and with impolite language. Interestingly, teachers accepted these forms of discipline regulation.

Another behavior that was different between boys and girls was the way boys took the floor. It was noticed that in the male classes, with male teachers, there were moments in which students would participate in class discussions with no clear order and instead of being led by the teacher, students decided who had the right to speak. This was understood as a very agentive role that boys performed more than girls and coincided with ideas of Ivinson and Murphy (2007) in regards to legitimize historical legacies of masculinity as autonomous and competitive.

As a last finding in regards to students’ behaviors, an interesting difference in the way boys and girls teased their peers was noticed. Whereas boys had moments in which humor and absurdity were publicly expressed, aligned with the idea of Laddish culture (Jackson, 2010), girls had hidden and offensive behaviors against their classmates. This was another way to see the culturally held belief of the public realm for men and the private for women. (Ivinson and Murphy, 2007)

Teachers’ beliefs did show a binary division between boys and girls. Binary concepts were understood as opposite ideas: one gender was what the other was not.
Thus teachers' perceived their students as “gender-different” in terms of their language skills, the relationships they established with their teachers and their academic characteristics.

In terms of language skills, three out of four teachers considered their girls better communicators in writing and speaking skills. The reasons attributed to this difference were given to academic characteristics of students, such as hard work and commitment and biological differences in girls' brains. The idea of language learning as a feminine domain was evidenced through these perceptions (Lu and Luk, 2014). However, when contrasted with their practices, there was no evidence of better communication skills. Instead, what was noticed was that the fact that students volunteered to participate was evidenced more in girls' classrooms. These conceptions aligned with the difference framework (Davis & Skilton-Sylvester, 2004), which suggests that girls and boys are socialized into different ways of relating to one another in their predominately same-sex interactions and, thus, acquire different communicative styles.

Teachers stated that there was mediation of gender in the relationships they established with their students. Hence, all the teachers manifested their preference to a specific gender. Interestingly, three preferred teaching boys. Such relations were established due to the personal and educational background of the teacher, personality traits, physical proximity and students' academic characteristics.

Jorge preferred teaching boys because he had been raised in a “male world”. Due to his educational background, Jorge felt he understood his students as boys. Jorge was a clear example of the reproduction of the masculinities he had constructed in his life. (Ivinson and Murphy, 2007) Thus, when contrasted with his practices, certain “gender complicity” was detected in some “masculine” conversations he established with
his male students. With his behaviors, Jorge established a blurry line between the perpetuation of a hegemonic idea of masculinity and a strategy to handle his boys in class. Remarkably, with the girls, he established a father-like relationship, which was evidenced in his practices and beliefs. This posture although challenged the traditional vision that the ethics of caring is often linked to female teachers, (Lahelma et al, 2014) just occurred precisely in girls' classrooms.

Rosa attributed certain characteristics to her male students such as humor and the tolerance to jokes and pranks that for her, appeared to be the opposite for the girls. Thus, as Rosa considered joking and humor part of her personality, she expressed she established better relationships with boys. In fact, in her classes, the presence of humor was just evidenced in those groups, showing coherence between her beliefs and practices.

Luis revealed an interesting insight in the way he related with gender. In his position as a novice young male teacher, he felt he could not have physical proximity to girls and he considered they could get angry and complain with an outsider. So he felt could not demand much from girls and in his words, he felt he could not do much with them. This tension, made him feel more comfortable in his boys’ groups. As a matter of fact, in his classes with girls, there were moments in which he ignored disruptive behaviors and he showed preventive attitudes so they were not misinterpreted as invading girls' privacy.

Jessie, who was the only teacher who manifested her preference to girls, established those relationships from an academic front. Thus, she considered her students eager and passionate to learn opposite to her “apathetic boys”. This belief coincides with her practices because, as it was previously mentioned, she had to
establish a strict discipline regulation system with boys, whereas with girls she established friendly relationships that resulted from the class topics and the natural interest of her students to learn.

The last binary conception presented in teachers' beliefs was the notion that boys and girls are opposite in terms of the academic culture. The analysis shows that the four teachers attributed positive academic characteristics to girls such as responsibility and hard work, whereas boys were considered completely the opposite. Interestingly, one teacher acknowledged that despite their hard work, girls did not get good results and he attributed an instinctive feature to boys that allowed them to do well, despite the fact of not being responsible. The classes observed did not give an account of this presence or lack of responsibility due to the kind of data that was observed. The conceptions that teachers portrayed of their students' responsibility and hard work were clearly linked with the idea of investment in language learning (Lu and Luk, 2014). Although it was not the purpose of this study to explore students' gendered subjectivities, it was interesting to see that teachers do perceive their students, who as gendered subjects, invest in certain actions, to get a position as students, or as women and men in the classroom arena.

Within the academic world where boys and girls were perceived as opposite, (Ivinson and Murphy, 2007, Jackson 2010, Martino et al, 2005) there was an approach that two teachers assumed which was the selection of topics that would cater the specific interests of boys and girls. Such assumption was understood as stereotypical because it assumed that there were characteristics inner to the gender of students that would lead them to prefer certain topics to others, overlooking individuality (Schmenk, 2004).
This last finding wrapped up the analysis carried out that concluded that all in all, teachers showed that the beliefs they hold play an important role in the way they conceive their students and subsequently interact with them in very specific ways. This happens due to the historical legacies that each teacher has and therefore reproduces and that are more evident in a system where gender becomes explicit as it happens with single-sex classrooms.

Nonetheless, teachers face tensions and contradictions when they encounter classrooms mediated by gender. It is possible to state that teachers did not behave to cater gendered learning styles of their students, because there was not a clear-cut distinction in their students’ behaviors and that such practices and behaviors are mediated by other and more complex factors that go beyond a “sex differentiation”.

Limitations

Framed within an interpretative, qualitative, constructionist study (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, Patton, 2002 and Charmaz, 2010), it is important to acknowledge the possible limitations that the study faced as it allows clarity, and transparency of the results reported. Consequently, the limitations faced in the present study were related to the stages of data collection, data management and data analysis.

In terms of data collection, the first limitation had to do with the number of classes observed in one teacher: Rosa. Originally, the plan was to observe four classes per gender, as it occurred with the other teachers, but in two different occasions, there were school activities that overlapped with her classes, so she could not teach her classes as normally but had to attend to community events. Observations could not be rescheduled
because in my role as a teacher of school, it was impossible to find another space that did not overlap my schedule and my duties as a teacher. However, the other six classes observed, gave enough insights about her practices in relation to her beliefs.

In terms of data management, the limitation that this study presented was the delayed that this stage generated in the overall process. This happened due to the way it was originally planned. Thus, once classes were observed and video recorded, I decided to transcribe the totality of them. This procedure ended up being excessively time-consuming, as one class (50 minutes long) out of the thirty that had been recorded, took me on average one month to process. After nine months devoted just to transcription, this process was not actually finished. In order to be able to move to the other stages, I decided to observe classes again and add more notes to the existing field notes created in situ without transcribing the totality of the videos.

This delay and some other personal and professional reasons made the process longer than expected and the analysis stage took place for a year, so by the time this report was written, two of the participant teachers were not at school. To overcome the difficulty, I aligned to the principles fidelity and responsibility in the work with human sciences (American Psychological Association, 2010). Hence, the results of this project accurately represented what I observed or what the participants informed so information was not taken out of context.

**Pedagogical implications**

After having undertaken this research process, the pedagogical implications can be summarized in this statement: not to deny a reality that naturally responds to a
system in which gender becomes explicit. To explain such statement let me take you back to the antecedents of this study.

It was noticed, as it was presented in the statement of the problem, that teachers lived a tension between what they faced in their daily practices with their single-sex classrooms and what school promulgated. The tension still exists, but the “moral” of this research exercise consists on embracing, instead of rejecting a system that occurs regardless the fact that teachers accept it or not. This research did not find a solution to the tensions, instead understood some of the reasons behind those tensions. Therefore, this research informs teachers of the need to be more aware of the interactions, the roles they play as gendered teachers in a gendered classroom, the blurry line exits when a system like this reproduces stereotypes in search of pedagogical strategies to cater students’ needs from a gender perspective.

Teachers, hence need to be aware of how they establish practices that may for instance, privilege agency in one gender, (Ivinson and Murphy, 2007, Pavlenko & Piller 2008 and Gordon 2008), particularly, in male groups, where historical legacies and culturally held beliefs conceive men more autonomous and competitive.

Embracing a system with single-sex classrooms does not mean the reproduction of stereotypes that overlook individuality and perpetuate hegemonic ideas (Schmenk, 2004 and Lynch, 2014)). When teachers are aware of the implications that gender has in their context, they can challenge stereotypes. For instance, they can try typically female or male “topics” in both classes and work with students about the concepts of feminine and masculine and thus get a better understanding of their students’ masculinities and femininities.
Teachers’ practices in this context where gender becomes explicit cannot overlook the way their students are investing in language learning from their gendered subjectivity. (Pavlenko & Piller 2008, Gordon 2008 and Lu and Luk, 2014). In other words, if it is evident that girls are investing more in the learning of English, strategies that allow boys to invest in this field need to be studied and found so both can have access and gender does not become a barrier in their process.

Finally, teachers need to be aware of the kinds of masculinities that they face in this environment. For instance, laddish behaviors (Jackson, 2010) that can be present in our contexts and they can become really challenging in our daily practices. The fact that this culture can be firstly understood and subsequently addressed will generate environments where learning occurs and our teaching practices can be facilitated.

Further Research

After having carried out this process, there are many aspects that were not addressed in the present study because they did not intend to answer the research question but that can undoubtedly be the starting point of other researches. Colegio New Hampshire is the perfect scenario to inquire about the mediation that gender can perform in different educational contexts. Thus, possible further research can inquire about students’ own perspectives about the model, the way interaction T-S and S-S can particularly occur in this specific context and the way teachers’ knowledge can contribute to diminish the tension that the model generates.

Students’ behaviors were analyzed as part of the practices teachers carried out in their classrooms; however, they were not analyzed from the students’ perspectives.
Hence, researchers can inquire about the ways students perform, interact, learn, feel and experience their school in this very particular context. These insights could understand the impact of a pedagogical practice like this in the students, who are, at the end, the ones who live the model on a daily basis during a long period of their lives.

While observing teachers’ classes, it was evident that interactions between the teacher and their students and among students are mediated by this gender separation as mentioned before when girls’ and boys’ ways to tease their peers were different. Nevertheless, as it was not the purpose of this research, this can potentially become a new research topic. Most of the research has taken place in coeducational or single-sex schools. However, it would be interesting to find out about the way interaction takes place in the specific context of the present research.

Finally, as expressed in the pedagogical implications of this research, the tension is still present at school, however teachers’, not only English teachers, can provide meaningful insights about the way they experience the model and how tensions can be reduced. Teachers can become the researchers of their own context and thus find the best ways to reduce the tension that this model produces.
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# ANNEXES

## Annex 1: Sample of Lesson Plan for Ninth grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Language Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Ninth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>2013-08-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Sessions</td>
<td>Planned 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implemented 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit: Words and Pictures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar: identifying and discriminating adverbs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Standard

### 2. Benchmark

### 3. Developmental descriptors: 1, 2

### 4. Key Words (Glossary): Adverbs of manner

### 5. Thinking Skills: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16

### Procedure

#### 6.1 Housekeeping

- Calling the roll
- Return quiz
- Oral presentation

#### 6.2 Warm-up

1. Teacher will ask students what type of music they enjoy listening to and what their favorite songs are. Then, they will listen to a song that is intended to introduce adverbs of manner.
2. Students will be asked to highlight the characteristics in the game of some outstanding athletes, soccer players for example. Students will be encouraged to use adverbs of manner.

#### 6.3 Presentation

Students will be told they are going to listen to the song named 'Logical', and as they listen, they will have to complete the blanks in the lyrics of the song.

#### 6.4 Practice

Teacher and students will go over the song identifying adverbs of manner. There will be a contest. Students will be split into groups. The will be told words and depending on the part of speech of the word, adjective or adverb, they will have to stand next to the corresponding heading.

- Students will receive a handout in order to study and learn the correct comparative and superlative forms of adverbs.

#### 6.5 Wrap-up

Students will be shown cards and they have to make new sentences using adverbs correctly.

#### 6.6 Assessment

- Quiz No. 8
- Exam No. 8
- Product
- Recovering

#### 6.7 Extra-activities

As work on their CD Rom at Home. Unit 1: Lesson B Reading Comprehension.

#### 6.8 Extra support

N/A
When I got to the classroom, Jorge is asking girls to give him homework. Girls take a while in getting ready, he tells them that being ready is not just having their books on top of their desks but to be quiet so class can start. Then he tells girls that they are going to write a persuasive essay. He tells them a story about a girl who’s been attacked by a dog so she is going to write to convince people that dogs should be on a leash. Then he tells the girls to read a page of their book with key traits on persuasive essays. He gives two example of a good thesis statement. Then he tells one girl to read one section of the book. He tells the girls to take out their blocks of papers and take a piece of paper. He tells the girls to be a little bit visual. He draws on the board a triangle and tells the girls they are going to write their thesis statements inside the triangle.

Some girls ask what steroids are. He gives the examples of Armstrong to explain what that is. He tells the girls that they are going to work on their own chart. With their own ideas. Some girls have problems thinking of a topic. He tells the girls to remember the list of topics he had given them. They can choose one of those. And remind the girls there are three things you cannot talk about at school: religion, politics and sex.

While girls are working, some raise their hands to ask questions to Jorge. He tells the girls they cannot write a question, and that they have to be white or black. So they cannot be in between.

Then she tells the girls he is going to use Vanessa’s Williams’ example (Vanessa is a girl in the class who is called that way by Jorge)

He reads the example about abortion. There are six hands raised and girls talk to each other while Jorge answers some questions. Jorge announces there are two minutes left.

I can hear a conversation between Jorge and a girl whose thesis statement is not to have parental control. And Jorge tells her: that is so you … and at some point he tells her that he cannot influence her thoughts.
Todays’ class Jorge has been calling girls: guys.
He stops the class to tell the girls that there are not more intelligent opinions, that he is not going to influence anybody’s opinion.
I can see more hands raised, at some point a girl tells Jorge, llevo como una hora llamandote, he says sorry baby, then another girl screams and says no!!! yo estaba primero. Some girls scream teacher!!! So he can get to their desk and I can hear: Hey teacher I’m here!!!!
A girl gets to the classroom, she’s carrying her school back and tells him something. After leaving her staff in her desk, she approaches Jorge and waits for him for a while.
Suddenly, Jorge is surrounded by girls who want to show them their papers.
He tells the girls they need to stop there because of time restrictions.
Then he tells the girls that this is the first step to their final draft. Then he tells one girl, Bernie (because of Bernal) to read.
He tells the girls they are going to convert the chart into a five paragraph essays. He advises the girls to do it step by step.
The first step is the introduction. It can be a personal anecdote, or a question, or presenting some data, figures.
A girl asks, if it’s ok, to write some else’s story.
So using the information on the board he gives an example of what to include in the paragraph, talking about Lance Armstrong
He writes on the board:

- anecdotes
- interesting stories.
Shocking
-data/ number
Moving question

One girl asks if they can invent the story.
He hesitates and then he says it’s ok for the exercise, but not for the persuasive essay.
Someone asks, can we take notes in our notebooks?
Jorge doesn’t answer.
He tells the girls they have some minutes to write the first two/three lines of their introduction.
Three girls stand up to talk to Jorge. There are questions all around about vocabulary, how do you say...?
I can hear some background noise. Girls talk to each other
Jorge uses a girl’s example to show what’s required. Girls listen attentively and some clap at the end.
ANNEX 3: Protocol Used for Interviews

1. Background information: Where/what did you study? What has been your teaching experience? What has been your teaching experience at Colegio New Hampshire?

2. What are your students like?

3. How could you describe your experience when teaching your students in single-gender classrooms?

4. Do you consider there are teaching practices you carry out differently in girls’ or boys’ classrooms?

5. Is there any difference in terms of academic results? Language skills? Classroom management? between your girls or boys?
ANNEX 4: SAMPLE OF TRANSCRIBED INTERVIEW

Teacher: Rosa  
Date: September 17, 2013

Laura: I would like to start asking you about your background information, what... where did you study and what has been your teaching experience?... in general.

Rosa: I studied language ahh... modern languages at Universidad de los Andes, that was about 33 years ago, after that I studied eh... eh... a specialization, what we call a specialization that is, that... at the Nariño university, I have been teaching for 33 years, mainly in middle school. I have also taught some class at college with adults and eh... basically that. Some little children also at the Javeriana university in a program for children that we put together, eh... and that was te... like for five years and that was like four years ago.

Laura: And here at school, what classes have you taught?

Rosa: At school I have always taught in high school, from sixth grade to ninth grade, so middle school basically.

Laura: Ok, good. Mm... this question is basically describing your students, what are your students like? How would you describe them?

Rosa: Eh... like very intelligent and also very committed. I can tell, because, I have always thought that because of the..., because of their family background, let's say her parents, or their parents are educated so these students have high expectations, eh... they usually do a good job, they are intelligent, they have travelled and that has broadened their minds, so I can tell that eh... a god job can be done with them because of those factors.

Laura: Eh... Rosa, how would you describe your experience when teaching your students in single-gender classrooms?

Rosa: Eh I can tell eh... girls take longer time to develop their tasks, they follow... well... in a higher percentage, girls follow instructions, pay attention to instructions and directions and they try to do the work as indicated. Boys tend to be more... mm... not really disorganized, but they sometimes don't follow instructions that well, their production is shorter, I would say, than the girls’, in very few cases, maybe two students in a group of fifteen, twenty, that make very long productions, if it's written, and but in their oral production, they put together very good presentations, they research a lot, the topics also...

Laura: You are talking about boys?

Rosa: Yes, about boys. In the case of boys when they have to make presentations, they prefer to talk about, they yes, they rather talk about sports, music, while girls choose from wide variety of topics.
ANNEX 5: Consent Form


CONSENTIMIENTO INFORMADO

Apreciado(a) Profesor(a) de inglés:

En la actualidad estoy desarrollando el proyecto de investigación titulado “Teachers' Gender-Related Beliefs and Pedagogical Practices: experiences in single-sex EFL classrooms.” Dicho proyecto se realiza en el marco de la Maestría en Lingüística Aplicada a la Enseñanza del Inglés como Lengua Extranjera de la Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas.

En este estudio me propongo indagar acerca de las creencias de los docentes de bachillerato con respecto a sus creencias y prácticas de clase en el contexto de separación por género en el aula. En particular me interesa documentar las experiencias de los docentes de inglés en el contexto de coeducación en el Colegio New Hampshire.

Con el fin de reunir información sobre la temática en mención, se recopilarán notas de campo a partir de la observación y videograbación de clases de los profesores participantes y entrevistas individuales con los docentes que a su vez serán audiograbadas. Los hallazgos de la investigación se recopilarán en un informe final que se presentará a la Maestría en Lingüística aplicada de la Universidad Distrital. También se socializarán los resultados en conferencias y en un artículo que se espera publicar.

En todos los casos, se tratará la información que provenga de usted de manera confidencial, para lo cual se usarán nombres ficticios, a menos que usted indique lo contrario.

Atentamente, solicito su autorización para observar algunas de sus clases, así como para realizar con usted las entrevistas. En caso afirmativo, favor completar la información que encuentra en el formato adjunto y remitírmela a la mayor brevedad.

Finalmente, le recuerdo que usted tiene la libertad de retirarse como participante del proyecto si así lo desea. En tal caso, le agradezco informarme al respecto.

Por favor no dude en contactarme en caso de tener alguna inquietud o de requerir aclaración acerca de los procesos propios de mi proyecto.

Agradezco su gentil atención.
Investigadora: Laura Malagón Cotrino

AUTORIZACIÓN

Por la presente manifiesto mi voluntad de colaborar en el desarrollo del proyecto de investigación “Teachers’ Gender-Related Beliefs and Pedagogical Practices: experiences in single-sex EFL classrooms.”, por lo cual autorizo a Laura Malagón Cotrino para reunir la información requerida.

Manifiesto que conozco y comprendo la naturaleza y el propósito de la investigación en mención, así como el uso que se dará a la información por mí suministrada, con base en los principios éticos propios de las Ciencias Sociales.

Aclaro que tengo la libertad de retirarme como participante de la investigación, si así lo deseo, y que se me ha dado la oportunidad de preguntar acerca del mismo, cuando lo considere necesario. Para ello cuento con la voluntad expresa Laura Malagón, investigadora, quien estará dispuesta a responder mis interrogantes.

Manifiesto que he leído y comprendido perfectamente lo anterior y que todos los espacios en blanco han sido completados antes de mi firma y me encuentro en capacidad de expresar mi consentimiento.

Nombre del (la) profesor (a): ____________________________________
Firma del (la) profesor (a): ____________________________________
CC. No _________________ Expedida en _________________
Nombre que sugiero se emplee en el reporte final, cuando se use información por mí suministrada ______________________
Teléfono: _____________ Correo electrónico: ____________________________
Fecha de diligenciamiento: _________________
## ANNEX 6: Initial Coding: A fragment of Teachers’ Practices table generated by TAMS analyzer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Filename</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Journal.rtf</td>
<td>January 30, 2013</td>
<td>7:40-8:30</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Jorge</td>
<td>Teacher_practice&gt;allowing_ss_to_choose</td>
<td>{Teacher_practice&gt;allowing_ss_to_choose}He stops the class to tell the girls that there are not more intelligent opinions, that he is not going to influence anybody’s opinion./{Teacher_practice&gt;allowing_ss_to_choose}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Journal.rtf</td>
<td>February 1, 2013</td>
<td>7:30-8:40</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Teacher_practice&gt;asking_the_same_student</td>
<td>{Teacher_practice&gt;asking_the_same_student}He asks Pabon to start reading aloud from the book. Luis explains what he has said. I see three more boys had their hands up, but Luis asks Pabon again to keep on reading. Most boys follow the reading in the book./{Teacher_practice&gt;asking_the_same_student}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Journal.rtf</td>
<td>January 22, 2013</td>
<td>7:40-8:30</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Jessie</td>
<td>Teacher_practice&gt;culture_transmitter</td>
<td>{Teacher_practice&gt;culture_transmitter}She talks about the special tone of the speech as a pastor and talks about racism in the States./{Teacher_practice&gt;culture_transmitter}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Journal.rtf</td>
<td>January 11, 2013</td>
<td>11:20-12:10</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Jessie</td>
<td>Teacher_practice&gt;differenciated_instruction</td>
<td>{Teacher_practice&gt;differenciated_instruction}I notice the additional questions seem to be written by students as she asks another student to lend her his notebook, so she can write the question and options on the notebook./{Teacher_practice&gt;differenciated_instruction}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Journal.rtf</td>
<td>January 11, 2013</td>
<td>11:20-12:10</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Jessie</td>
<td>Teacher_practice&gt;differenciated_instruction</td>
<td>{Teacher_practice&gt;differenciated_instruction}I notice the additional questions seem to be written by students as she asks another student to lend her his notebook, so she can write the question and options on the notebook./{Teacher_practice&gt;differenciated_instruction}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Journal.rtf</td>
<td>January 11, 2013</td>
<td>11:20-12:10</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Jessie</td>
<td>Teacher_practice&gt;differenciated_instruction</td>
<td>{Teacher_practice&gt;differenciated_instruction}When completing the time line, she does it herself./{Teacher_practice&gt;differenciated_instruction}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Journal.rtf</td>
<td>January 31, 2013</td>
<td>11:20-12:10</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Jessie</td>
<td>Teacher_practice&gt;differenciated_instruction</td>
<td>{Teacher_practice&gt;differenciated_instruction}In this class Jessie did not ask students to talk about an important picture as happened with the girls, that is why there is an extra time./{Teacher_practice&gt;differenciated_instruction}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Journal.rtf</td>
<td>January 9, 2013</td>
<td>2:40-3:30</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>Teacher_practice&gt;discipline_regulator</td>
<td>{Teacher_practice&gt;discipline_regulator}While explaining, three girls start talking, then she stops explanation and tells them to stop and separate them./{Teacher_practice&gt;discipline_regulator}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Journal.rtf</td>
<td>January 10, 2013</td>
<td>12:50-1:40</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Jorge</td>
<td>Teacher_practice&gt;discipline_regulator</td>
<td>{Teacher_practice&gt;discipline_regulator}The four boys at the back, keep on talking and playing, Jorge calls their attention./{Teacher_practice&gt;discipline_regulator}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Journal.rtf</td>
<td>January 14, 2013</td>
<td>7:40-8:30</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Teacher_practice&gt;discipline_regulator</td>
<td>{Teacher_practice&gt;discipline_regulator}Luis calls the attention to the guy who was not sitting properly./{Teacher_practice&gt;discipline_regulator}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 7: Sample of Memo used to analyse first table about Teachers’ beliefs

1. Teachers’ roles: The most seen in all teachers
   a. Discipline regulator 17
   b. Elicitor 16
   c. Explanation provider 34

2. From those three roles:
   a. Discipline regulator Boys: 11/17 65%
   b. Elicitor Girls 13/16 81%
   c. Explanation provider 34 Girls 22/34 65%

3. ONLY in Girls:
   No relevant information
   • Just one record:
     Allowing students to choose
     Culture transmitter
     Ignoring bullying
     • 2 records: using students interest

4. ONLY in boys:
   a. differentiated instruction by one teacher
   b. discipline regulation system
   No relevant info:
   • 1 record:
     Discussion promoter
     Modeling
   • 2 records:
     Expecting bad behavior/ grammar corrector/ varied activities/ physical posture

5. EVEN
   A. completely even: Friendly nicknames, speech holder, students past experiences
   B. Slight inclination: feedback provider B/gendered discourse G/humor G/ instruction providerG

6. Inclined to girls
   Rewards 75%
   Ss as models
   Visual aids 63%

7. Inclined to boys
   question asker 65%

The records do not show a clear pattern, records are not relevant as there are just very few occurrences. The analysis should include bigger categories and that way trends may appear.
### ANNEX 8: Teachers’ Practices. Codes regrouped using conceptual relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Way to deliver content</th>
<th>Teachers' practices</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B%</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>G%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher-centered approach</strong></td>
<td>1 Vocabulary provider</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Explanation provider</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Feedback provider</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Instruction provider</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Model</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Narrator</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Pronunciation corrector</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Question asker</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Timed activities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Speech holder</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student-centered approach</strong></td>
<td>1 Discussion promoter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Elicitor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Using students as models</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Using students past experiences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Using students previous knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Varied activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom management</strong></td>
<td>1 Rewards *</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Discipline regulator</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Discipline regulation system</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Ignoring bullying</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Ignoring disruptive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Physical posture awareness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship with students</strong></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1 Friendly nicknames for ss</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 humor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1 Expecting bad behavior</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Asking the same student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX 9: Students’ behaviors. Codes regrouped using conceptual relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Classroom Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Noisy environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Quiet environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Attentive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Volunteering to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Few students engaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Parallel activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gendered discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Humour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>sexual connotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>soccer conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>violent connotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Discipline regulator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>No turn taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Teasing Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Teacher approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX 10: Teachers’ beliefs. Code regrouped using conceptual relationships

### BOYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content of the subject related</th>
<th>Belief / # of records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shorter written production</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heterogeneous language level</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less communicative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom management</th>
<th>Belief / # of records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not follow instructions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher less patient</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching strategies balance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not disciplined</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rule breakers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Belief / # of records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Comfortable with</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical proximity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor allowed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gendered characteristics</th>
<th>Belief / # of records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision makers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More energy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular culture</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Culture</th>
<th>Belief / # of records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GIRLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content of the subject related</th>
<th>Belief / # of records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good speakers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>innate communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take longer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom management</th>
<th>Belief / # of records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disciplined</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docile</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow instructions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Belief / # of records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher as a parent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gendered characteristics</th>
<th>Belief / # of records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More mature</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No restriction in activities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Culture</th>
<th>Belief / # of records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belong to academic culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get stressed out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get confused</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>