

Conflicting Rhetoric between Male and Female English Teachers: The Case of Pedagogically Related Discourse Models

Reza Biria

Department of English, Khorasgan (Isfahan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

Nafiseh Mirzaie

Department of English, Khorasgan (Isfahan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

Abstract—The Present study aimed to investigate the relationship between gender and English teaching and learning. For this purpose, from a population of six hundred English students and teachers in different institutes in Isfahan a sample of 87 were selected by using a convenient sampling method. An observation checklist and two questionnaires were used for collecting data. The results showed that the difference between male and female teachers with respect to their pedagogical rhetoric in L2 classrooms was indeed significant, with females gaining a higher mean score than male teachers. Although male and female teachers are not remarkably different in their attitudes, female teachers emulated male teachers when it came to teaching techniques and there were significant differences in classroom management. In addition, the students who had a teacher of the opposite sex tended to have a more positive attitude towards L2 learning. In fact, Male students who had a female teacher had the highest integrative motivation, while female students with male teachers had the lowest degree of integrative motivation.

Index Terms—conflicting rhetoric, male, female, English teacher, discourse models

I. INTRODUCTION

The role teachers in general and English language teachers in particular play in the way their students learn their academic courses is of most important. As Markley (2004) maintains, teachers and the activities they assign students are the main factors influencing students' efficient learning. There are many criteria that determine the way teachers behave and the methodologies they exploit, one of which is gender. Gender – the difference between masculine and feminine identities, believed to be a fluid category depending on the individuals' social, cultural, and situational contexts (Ehlich, 1997; Pavlenko, 2001; Kubota, 2003).

Traditionally speaking, it is believed that men are better performers in terms of visual tasks; while women are superior to men when it comes to, for example, verbal affairs. Although differences between men and women might be attributed to the differences in brain structures of men and women, it is also possible that in classroom context these differences stems from the fact that teachers with different genres tend to show different behaviors towards boys and girls.

It is therefore the purpose of this study to investigate conflicting rhetoric between male and female Iranian English language teachers. In this paper, it will be focused on rhetoric. No matter in what field of study, rhetoric is the principal component of effective education. The most significant criteria in leading a student to academic successfulness in any field are clear thinking, good argument, and logical discussion. Those who are more criticism and analyze what they come across to or study are said to be more successful in their learning process. Rhetoric doesn't help you avoid disagreements, because a world without disagreements would be a bad thing. Rhetoric can be described as the process in which one studies and make use of a language, be it oral or written. It is an investigation on the way a given language is used to organize and perpetuate a given community, establish distinctiveness, harmonize people's behavior, make change, and bring about knowledge. Considering language as cultural facts, contrastive rhetoric is a phenomenon which put an attempt to understand various ways that cultures arrange information and express ideas in writing (Kaplan1966; Leki1991 & Connor1996).

Robert Kaplan (1966) claims that much of the rhetorical difference in texts composed by "ESL" students from various cultures can be attributed to culture-specific rhetorical styles or to differences in thought patterns or Logic. As IlonaLeki (1991) notes: It is in L2 [second language] writing classes that contrastive rhetoric work has the greatest potential for practical application. It is worthwhile to study the perceptions of conflicting rhetoric between male and female English language teachers in Iranian context for two reasons: First, as Pajares (1992) puts it, what methods language instructors employ is fairly an indication of the way they construct in their mind an adequate teacher and these conceptualizations in turn reflect their actions in classroom. Because in Iranian educational setting the process of

language learning occurs in formal environments such as classroom, this issue receives more attention (Kariminia & Salehizadeh, 2007).

The next reason why such a study should be conducted relies on the fact that the processes of teaching and learning may be substantially influenced by understanding the perceptions of gender-specific. In addition, conducting such studies can be a sort of learners' needs analysis by virtue of the fact that, according to Noora (2008), in Iran the culture of teaching is primarily teacher-centered. As a consequence, such studies would supply learners with an opportunity to express clearly what they expect from an adequate teacher and, as such, help teachers to enhance the quality of their teaching to meet their students' needs.

Accordingly, this paper will examine how male and female English language teachers in L2 context teach differently. In addition I contrast different strategies and methodologies used by male and female English teachers. Finally I consider which one is better and what are the advantages and disadvantages.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews the literature concerning conflicting rhetoric between male and female English teachers affecting teaching/learning EFL. It deals with related studies, which may help us provide background knowledge to follow the research procedures. In fact, there are a few studies dealing with teachers' variables such as sex, among many variables. In Asian countries, this phenomenon becomes worse because most of the related investigations have been conducted in western countries (Cook, 2001; Rahman, 2005; Nunan, 2005).

Therefore, there is an urgent need to study conflicting rhetoric between male and female teachers affecting TEFL among Iranian students. In order to provide successful TEFL instructions, teachers need to identify and understand their students' individual differences. This is necessary for the educational policy makers, syllabus designers and English textbooks writers in Iran to learn more about the teachers' individual differences, as well (Kiany, 1997; Oxford, 1997, Ok, 2003). These differences can be assessed through many instruments and questioners.

In this study, we will limit our research to the English institute students in Isfahan who are learning English as a foreign language using American English File books. The results could be conductive to both university and high school settings in which TEFL is dealt with.

Taking the sex of the teachers and learners into consideration, many earlier works have mainly focused on evaluations that male and female teachers have received from the students (Basow & Silberg, 1987; Feldman, 1992, 1993; Mason, Steagall, & Fabritiust, 1995; Wachtel, 1998). There have been some other studies conducted on the factors teachers consider so as to rate male and female students (e.g., Jaeger & Frcijo, 1975; Levine, 1977), or on the effect gender may have on the ways teachers evaluate their students' works (e.g., Carson, 2001). Few empirical studies, however, have concentrated on the conflicting between male and female English teachers. These studies have been carried out from the teachers' and learners' point of views. Thomas Dee (1988) finds that gender interactions between teachers and students have significant effects on these important educational outcomes.

The characteristics of the best and worst teachers as experienced by pre-service teachers were also estimated by some of the researchers of the field (e.g., Ogden et al, 1994; Aagaard and Skidmore, 2002). As an example, Ogden et al (1994) in their study tried to find out, from learners' perspectives, the reasons why some teachers are more effective than others. They concluded that male and female students had different views regarding behaviors and characteristics of their teachers. Most Females, for example, claimed that those teachers who had a creative mind, who were more eagerly teaching, and who were more organized, were more effective than other teachers. However, characteristics like being fair, responsible and humorous as well as communicating well with students were what majority of males believed will make a good and effective teacher.

Along the same line, Aagaard and Skidmore (2002) investigated the characteristics of outstanding university professors from the perspective of to-be teachers. They found out that male and female future teachers did not show a great difference describing the characteristics of best and worst teachers. Females, however, described good teachers as those who use an adequate teaching methodology more than males. On the other hand, most males stated that worst teachers suffered from a shortage of ethical behavior in their characteristics

As it can be seen, in all of these studies male and female teachers were analyzed from the students point of view and the main focus is students feeling and emotions toward male and female English teachers or vice versa while this paper investigate conflicting rhetoric between male and female English language teachers.

Although most of a teacher time is spent teaching students, instructors should not only focus on teaching matters, but rather, they should put in some time to investigate the ways for improving students' learning process. Participating in an action research project, for example, is one way to investigate this issue. In order for students to become successful in academic as well as social contexts, there needs many studies to be carried out regarding the characteristics of teachers based on their gender. Differences in the brain structure of male and female teachers as well as differences in teaching methodologies of male and female teachers are, but few, reasons why gender specific L2 context make sense.

In the present study, researchers put an attempt to investigate the conflicting rhetoric between males and females. As such, this study aims to find out whether or not they are different, and if yes, what is the extent to which they are different. The problem is that some students learn a foreign language easily and are completely satisfied with their teachers; on the contrary, some others have lots of problems with their teacher, and, although they work hard in the

class, they do not learn a foreign language or their knowledge is poor. Accordingly, the following questions have been raised: do the students' difficulties in learning a foreign language refer to teachers' genders and different strategies or methods they use? Are their methods specific? If yes, which methods are the best and lead to productive education? This paper, then, set to explore the extent to which male and female Iranian teachers use different rhetoric in L2 classroom context.

Gramely and Patzold (1992) studied learning English as a foreign language in Asia and noted that English would remain important for economic reasons. They argued that learning English in Asian countries is based on better educated people who know English for economic activities. In general, the level of English in Asian countries will remain relatively low and may even fall to the students of foreign language, rather than a second language.

Some researchers (e.g., Mosallanezhad, 1999; Ansary & Babaii, 2002; Eslami-Rasekh, Eslami-Rasekh and Fathi, 2004) investigated the variables affecting EFL teaching and learning including affective, cognitive, and social ones. They all came to a conclusion that an understanding of such variables can help EFL teachers and English textbook designers as well as English language researchers to arrive at influential teaching methods and appropriate techniques in TEFL in Iran.

III. RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

Considering the above-mentioned facts, the researchers of the present study seek to find adequate answers to following questions:

1. To what extent does gender differentiate language teachers' rhetoric in L2 classrooms?
2. What are the similarities and differences between male and female language teachers rhetoric?

Based on the aforementioned questions, the following null hypotheses were formulated:

1. Gender does not differentiate language teachers' rhetoric in L2 classrooms.
2. There are no differences between male and female language teachers' rhetoric.

IV. METHOD

A. *Participants*

The teachers, as one of the samples of this study, selected from among those who were teaching English language at different Iranian universities and private language institutes. The students were also university students majoring in different field of studies learning English as a foreign language in the private language institute. English was the foreign language for all the participants. All students were between 18 and 35 years old. The students were divided into four groups: FSFT (female students who had a female teacher), FSMT (female students who had a male teacher), MSFT (male students who had a female teacher), and MSMT (male students who had a male teacher).

All of the participants were in advanced level and they passed beginner and intermediate levels of American English File books so they were in last level of these books which is advanced level. The learners were 47 female and 40 male students.

The instructors were 11 male and 12 female instructors. They received their M.A in TEFL or they were PhD students and they have experienced 2 to 12 years of teaching EFL. The sample population of students and teachers were selected based on probability stratified random sampling which included both male and female instructors and learners.

B. *Design*

The sample population of students and teachers were selected based on probability stratified random sampling which included both male and female instructors and learners.

Cohen and Manion (1995) state that "Stratified sampling involves dividing the population into homogeneous groups, each group containing subjects with similar characteristics (e.g., male or females)." (p. 101) Kerlinger (1973) and Baker (1988) argue that if the samples are selected randomly, the large sample of equal size repeatedly drawn from any population, then the means of those samples will be approximately normally distributed. Participants of this study were selected based on the method of stratified random sampling (Baker, 1988; Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2001; & Koul, 1999).

C. *Material*

Research instruments in the present study were two sets of questionnaires designed by Arends (1998) and Gorsuch (2003), and an observation sheet¹ confirmed by university professors. (Appendices A, B & C) The students' questionnaire elicited the students' viewpoints concerning the learner's variables through self-rating scales. These scales included 25 items in 5-point Likert scales ranging from Agree Strongly to Disagree Strongly on a continuum for each item. The questioner included a series of items filled out by the subject whose responses showed their viewpoints. The reliability of these instruments was reported in Arends (1998). The reliability coefficients of these questionnaires in Arends was reported ($r=.81$). The concurrent validity of these research instruments was totally (.53)

¹ for accessing the full content of the checklist and the questionnaires contact the correspondent author at email: mirzaenafiseh@yahoo.com

The teacher’s questioners included 28 items in 5 point self rating scales. The reliability and validity coefficients of teachers’ questioners were reported in Arends (1998) and Gorsuch (2003).The total reliability of the questionnaires was (r = .95), and the concurrent validity coefficient was (.65).

D. Procedure

The main theme of the present research was to discover the magnitude of L2 teachers and learners’ beliefs concerning the research variables affecting foreign language teaching/learning and to see if those variables were under the influence of gender. Thus we dealt with two series of individual variables: (1) the L2 learners’ variables (i.e., motivation, attitudes, anxiety, and sex, and (2) the L2 teacher’s variables (i.e., motivation, attitudes, TTs and TVCM), and their relation with gender (teachers’ gender). Two types of questionnaires were administered on separate occasions regarding the same students as the sample of the pilot study. The data were analyzed and the results showed the appropriateness of reliability and validity coefficients of each questionnaire.

To focus on the objectives of the study, we selected relevant series of questions concerning the identified variables among teachers and learners. These series of questions or items were grouped into two general questionnaires: (1) Learners’ beliefs questionnaire with 25 (5-point Likert rating scale) items and (2) teachers’ beliefs questioner with 28(5-point rating scale) items.

The questionnaires were of two types: (1) the learners’ questionnaire contained five parts(a) integrative motivation (5 items), (b) instrumental motivation (4 items), (c) attitudes (9 items), (d) anxiety (6 items); and (2) the teachers’ questionnaire included four parts: (a) motivation and effort (4 items), (b) attitudes (5 items) (c) TVCM (10 items),and (d) TTs (9 items).

V. RESULTS

A. Null Hypothesis/H01

The first research hypothesis of the study stated gender doesn't differentiate language teachers' rhetoric in L2 classrooms.

TABLE 1.
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR COMPARING MALE & FEMALE TEACHERS WITH REGARDS TO RHETORIC

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
RS Female	12	27.3333	4.71619	1.36145
Male	11	23.0909	4.88783	1.47374

There definitely is a difference between male and female teachers in terms rhetoric, but whether this difference is statistically significant or not has to be determined in the t-test table.

TABLE 2.
T-TEST RESULTS SHOWING THE EFFECT OF GENDER ON RHETPRIC

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
								Lower	Upper	
RS	Equal variances assumed	.204	.656	2.118	21	.046	4.24242	2.00309	.07678	8.40807
	Equal variances not assumed			2.114	20.667	.047	4.24242	2.00635	.06590	8.41895

In this case, the relevant value is .04, which is less than .05, indicating that the difference between male and female teachers with respect to their rhetoric in L2 classrooms was indeed significant, with females gaining a higher mean score than male teachers.

B. Null Hypothesis/H02

The second null hypothesis states that there is no difference between male and female English language teachers with regards to other factors such as teacher motivation, teacher attitude, classroom management, teaching techniques, student motivation, student anxiety, and student attitudes. As it was mentioned above, a questionnaire was distributed among the 11 male and 12 female teachers involved in this study.

TABLE 3.
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF THE RESULTS OF TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

	Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Motivation	Female	17.1667	1.64225	12
	Male	15.0000	1.94936	11
	Total	16.1304	2.07374	23
Attitude	Female	17.0833	2.60971	12
	Male	17.3636	2.11058	11
	Total	17.2174	2.33465	23
CM	Female	36.4167	5.58339	12
	Male	40.6364	2.57964	11
	Total	38.4348	4.82254	23
TT	Female	40.4167	2.42930	12
	Male	35.1818	2.08893	11
	Total	37.9130	3.47606	23

The motivation and TT scores of females are higher than those of male teachers, while male teachers gained higher scores than females in the traits of attitude and classroom management. To see if the observed differences between male and female teachers with regards to these four variables is statistically significant or not, one needs to look down the second row of Table 4.

TABLE 4.
MANOVA RESULTS FOR THE TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.997	1647.929 ^a	4.000	18.000	.000	.997
	Wilks' Lambda	.003	1647.929 ^a	4.000	18.000	.000	.997
	Hotelling's Trace	366.206	1647.929 ^a	4.000	18.000	.000	.997
	Roy's Largest Root	366.206	1647.929 ^a	4.000	18.000	.000	.997
Gender	Pillai's Trace	.765	14.658 ^a	4.000	18.000	.000	.765
	Wilks' Lambda	.235	14.658 ^a	4.000	18.000	.000	.765
	Hotelling's Trace	3.257	14.658 ^a	4.000	18.000	.000	.765
	Roy's Largest Root	3.257	14.658 ^a	4.000	18.000	.000	.765

a. Exact statistic

In this case, the Sig. value in front of Hotelling's Trace is less than the alpha level ($p = .000 < .05$). This would mean that male and female teachers are significantly different from each other with regards to the dependent variables under investigation.

TABLE 5.
RESULTS OF TESTS OF BETWEEN-SUBJECTS EFFECTS

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	Motivation	26.942 ^a	1	26.942	8.361	.009	.285
	Attitude	.451 ^b	1	.451	.079	.781	.004
	CM	102.190 ^c	1	102.190	5.241	.033	.200
	TT	157.273 ^d	1	157.273	30.425	.000	.592
Intercept	Motivation	5938.246	1	5938.246	1842.904	.000	.989
	Attitude	6810.016	1	6810.016	1197.119	.000	.983
	CM	34074.190	1	34074.190	1747.556	.000	.988
	TT	32799.882	1	32799.882	6345.263	.000	.997
Gender	Motivation	26.942	1	26.942	8.361	.009	.285
	Attitude	.451	1	.451	.079	.781	.004
	CM	102.190	1	102.190	5.241	.033	.200
	TT	157.273	1	157.273	30.425	.000	.592
Error	Motivation	67.667	21	3.222			
	Attitude	119.462	21	5.689			
	CM	409.462	21	19.498			
	TT	108.553	21	5.169			
Total	Motivation	6079.000	23				
	Attitude	6938.000	23				
	CM	34488.000	23				
	TT	33326.000	23				
Corrected Total	Motivation	94.609	22				
	Attitude	119.913	22				
	CM	511.652	22				
	TT	265.826	22				

- a. R Squared = .285 (Adjusted R Squared = .251)
- b. R Squared = .004 (Adjusted R Squared = -.044)
- c. R Squared = .200 (Adjusted R Squared = .162)
- d. R Squared = .592 (Adjusted R Squared = .572)

The Sig. value for motivation is .009 (which is less than .05), indicating that male and female teachers differ significantly in terms of motivation with females ($M = 17.16$) having a higher mean score than males ($M = 15.00$). The Sig. value for attitude ($p = .78$) is larger than the specified level of significance; hence, male and female teachers are not remarkably different in their attitudes. CM has a Sig. value of .033 (that is less than .05), suggesting a significant difference between male and females in this trait with males ($M = 40.63$) excelling females ($M = 36.41$). Finally, the Sig. value for TT is less than the alpha value ($p = .000 < .05$), implying that females ($M = 40.41$) emulated male teachers ($M = 35.18$) when it came to teaching techniques.

TABLE 6.
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF THE STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

	Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Attitude	FSFT	29.4348	4.00938	23
	FSMT	31.7917	3.55062	24
	MSFT	35.5714	2.22646	21
	MSMT	27.8947	3.90007	19
	Total	31.2299	4.45312	87
IntgMotivation	FSFT	16.5217	2.15047	23
	FSMT	15.8750	2.17321	24
	MSFT	18.0476	2.43877	21
	MSMT	16.6842	1.60044	19
	Total	16.7471	2.23720	87
InstMotivation	FSFT	15.5217	2.12922	23
	FSMT	15.8333	1.73623	24
	MSFT	15.7143	1.79284	21
	MSMT	14.3158	1.60044	19
	Total	15.3908	1.89465	87
Anxiety	FSFT	23.5217	3.36924	23
	FSMT	27.5417	3.53835	24
	MSFT	27.6190	1.77415	21
	MSMT	18.2105	4.62576	19
	Total	24.4598	5.04124	87

As for attitude, MSFT had the highest mean score ($M = 35.57$), followed by FSMT ($M = 31.79$), FSFT ($M = 29.43$), and MSMT ($M = 27.89$), respectively. Integrative motivation of MSFT ($M = 18.04$) was more than MSMT ($M = 16.68$)

which in turn was higher than that of FSFT ($M = 16.52$). FSMT ($M = 15.87$) had the lowest integrative motivation. With regards to instrumental motivation, the four groups from the highest to the lowest are FSMT ($M = 15.83$), MSFT ($M = 15.71$), FSFT ($M = 15.52$), and MSMT ($M = 14.31$). Finally, the anxiety mean scores of the groups from the lowest to the highest are (note that the less the anxiety in a classroom, the more favorable the environment is): MSMT ($M = 18.21$), FSFT ($M = 23.52$), FSMT ($M = 27.54$), and MSFT ($M = 27.61$).

TABLE 7.
MANOVA RESULTS FOR THE STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.995	4394.464 ^a	4.000	80.000	.000	.995
	Wilks' Lambda	.005	4394.464 ^a	4.000	80.000	.000	.995
	Hotelling's Trace	219.723	4394.464 ^a	4.000	80.000	.000	.995
	Roy's Largest Root	219.723	4394.464 ^a	4.000	80.000	.000	.995
Gender	Pillai's Trace	.850	8.105	12.000	246.000	.000	.283
	Wilks' Lambda	.291	10.492	12.000	211.952	.000	.337
	Hotelling's Trace	1.956	12.823	12.000	236.000	.000	.395
	Roy's Largest Root	1.678	34.408 ^b	4.000	82.000	.000	.627

a. Exact statistic

b. The statistic is an upper bound on F that yields a lower bound on the significance level.

In the lower row of Table 7., the Sig. value in front of Wilk's Lambda is less than the specified level of significance ($p = .000 < .05$); hence, it could be construed that the differences between the groups with regards to the variables under investigation are statistically meaningful.

TABLE 8.
RESULTS OF TESTS OF BETWEEN-SUBJECTS EFFECTS

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	Attitude	688.859 ^a	3	229.620	18.748	.000	.404
	IntgMotivation	55.015 ^b	3	18.338	4.054	.010	.128
	InstMotivation	29.249 ^c	3	9.750	2.896	.040	.095
	Anxiety	1199.801 ^d	3	399.934	33.672	.000	.549
Intercept	Attitude	83865.270	1	83865.270	6847.540	.000	.988
	IntgMotivation	24306.110	1	24306.110	5373.708	.000	.985
	InstMotivation	20324.847	1	20324.847	6036.433	.000	.986
	Anxiety	50639.022	1	50639.022	4263.548	.000	.981
Gender	Attitude	688.859	3	229.620	18.748	.000	.404
	IntgMotivation	55.015	3	18.338	4.054	.010	.128
	InstMotivation	29.249	3	9.750	2.896	.040	.095
	Anxiety	1199.801	3	399.934	33.672	.000	.549
Error	Attitude	1016.543	83	12.248			
	IntgMotivation	375.422	83	4.523			
	InstMotivation	279.463	83	3.367			
	Anxiety	985.808	83	11.877			
Total	Attitude	86557.000	87				
	IntgMotivation	24831.000	87				
	InstMotivation	20917.000	87				
	Anxiety	54236.000	87				
Corrected Total	Attitude	1705.402	86				
	IntgMotivation	430.437	86				
	InstMotivation	308.713	86				
	Anxiety	2185.609	86				

a. R Squared = .404 (Adjusted R Squared = .382)

b. R Squared = .128 (Adjusted R Squared = .096)

c. R Squared = .095 (Adjusted R Squared = .062)

d. R Squared = .549 (Adjusted R Squared = .533)

Hitherto, it has been figured out that attitude, integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, and anxiety differ among male and female students with male and female teachers, but which groups have the highest levels of which variable is not known unless we consult Table 9.

TABLE 9.
RESULTS OF THE SCHEFFE POST HOC TESTS FOR THE STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Scheffe							
Dependent Variable	(I) Gender	(J) Gender	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Attitude	FSFT	FSMT	-2.3569	1.02118	.158	-5.2710	.5573
		MSFT	-6.1366*	1.05627	.000	-9.1510	-3.1223
		MSMT	1.5400	1.08495	.572	-1.5561	4.6362
	FSMT	FSFT	2.3569	1.02118	.158	-.5573	5.2710
		MSFT	-3.7798*	1.04572	.007	-6.7639	-.7956
		MSMT	3.8969*	1.07467	.006	.8301	6.9637
	MSFT	FSFT	6.1366*	1.05627	.000	3.1223	9.1510
		FSMT	3.7798*	1.04572	.007	.7956	6.7639
		MSMT	7.6767*	1.10807	.000	4.5146	10.8388
	MSMT	FSFT	-1.5400	1.08495	.572	-4.6362	1.5561
		FSMT	-3.8969*	1.07467	.006	-6.9637	-.8301
		MSFT	-7.6767*	1.10807	.000	-10.8388	-4.5146
IntgMotivation	FSFT	FSMT	.6467	.62058	.781	-1.1242	2.4177
		MSFT	-1.5259	.64191	.139	-3.3577	.3059
		MSMT	-.1625	.65933	.996	-2.0440	1.7191
	FSMT	FSFT	-.6467	.62058	.781	-2.4177	1.1242
		MSFT	-2.1726*	.63549	.012	-3.9861	-.3591
		MSMT	-.8092	.65309	.675	-2.6729	1.0545
	MSFT	FSFT	1.5259	.64191	.139	-.3059	3.3577
		FSMT	2.1726*	.63549	.012	.3591	3.9861
		MSMT	1.3634	.67339	.259	-.5582	3.2851
	MSMT	FSFT	.1625	.65933	.996	-1.7191	2.0440
		FSMT	.8092	.65309	.675	-1.0545	2.6729
		MSFT	-1.3634	.67339	.259	-3.2851	-.5582
InstMotivation	FSFT	FSMT	-.3116	.53543	.952	-1.8396	1.2164
		MSFT	-.1925	.55383	.989	-1.7730	1.3879
		MSMT	1.2059	.56886	.221	-.4174	2.8293
	FSMT	FSFT	.3116	.53543	.952	-1.2164	1.8396
		MSFT	.1190	.54830	.997	-1.4456	1.6837
		MSMT	1.5175	.56348	.072	-.0905	3.1255
	MSFT	FSFT	.1925	.55383	.989	-1.3879	1.7730
		FSMT	-.1190	.54830	.997	-1.6837	1.4456
		MSMT	1.3985	.58099	.131	-.2595	3.0565
	MSMT	FSFT	-1.2059	.56886	.221	-2.8293	.4174
		FSMT	-1.5175	.56348	.072	-3.1255	.0905
		MSFT	-1.3985	.58099	.131	-3.0565	.2595
Anxiety	FSFT	FSMT	-4.0199*	1.00563	.002	-6.8897	-1.1502
		MSFT	-4.0973*	1.04018	.003	-7.0657	-1.1289
		MSMT	5.3112*	1.06842	.000	2.2623	8.3602
	FSMT	FSFT	4.0199*	1.00563	.002	1.1502	6.8897
		MSFT	-.0774	1.02979	1.000	-3.0161	2.8613
		MSMT	9.3311*	1.05830	.000	6.3111	12.3512
	MSFT	FSFT	4.0973*	1.04018	.003	1.1289	7.0657
		FSMT	.0774	1.02979	1.000	-2.8613	3.0161
		MSMT	9.4085*	1.09119	.000	6.2946	12.5225
	MSMT	FSFT	-5.3112*	1.06842	.000	-8.3602	-2.2623
		FSMT	-9.3311*	1.05830	.000	-12.3512	-6.3111
		MSFT	-9.4085*	1.09119	.000	-12.5225	-6.2946

Based on observed means.

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Compared to other groups, male students with female teachers held more positive attitudes towards their experience of L2 learning. Female students with male teachers also had strikingly more positive attitudes than male students with male teachers. The difference between FSMT and FSFT however was not meaningful. So was the difference between FSFS and MSMS. All this implies that students who have a teacher of the opposite sex tend to have more positive attitudes towards L2 learning.

Male students who had a female teacher had the highest integrative motivation, while female students with male teachers had the lowest degree of integrative motivation.

For the measure of instrumental motivation, although FSMT surpassed MSFT who in turn exceeded FSFT who had a better mean score than MSMT, the differences between no two groups were found to be statistically meaningful.

Finally, this would indicate that students who had a teacher of the same sex felt more at ease in their classes and had less anxiety. On the other hand, a teacher of the opposite sex is likely to increase the level of anxiety among his/her students.

VI. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The first research hypothesis of the study stated gender does not differentiate language teachers' rhetoric in L2 classrooms. In order to measure the rhetoric of male and female teachers, an observation checklist was utilized. The answers to this checklist were codified and made into interval scores which ranged from 0 to 40. To compare male and female teachers with respect to rhetoric, an independent-samples t-test was conducted.

The results showed, there is a difference between male and female teachers in terms of rhetoric. In this case, the relevant value is .04, which is less than .05, indicating that the difference between male and female teachers with respect to their rhetoric in L2 classrooms was indeed significant, with females gaining a higher mean score than male teachers.

The second null hypothesis states that there is no difference between male and female English language teachers with regards to other factors such as teacher motivation, teacher attitude, classroom management, teaching techniques, student motivation, student anxiety, and student attitudes. Rejecting or accepting of this hypothesis determined by analyzing the data were gathered by questionnaires in th Results showed the motivation and TT scores of females are higher than those of male teachers, while male teachers gained higher scores than females in the traits of attitude and classroom management.

This would mean that male and female teachers are significantly different from each other with regards to the dependent variables under investigation. Although, male and female teachers are not remarkably different in their attitudes, males excelling females in class management. The results revealed that; females emulated male teachers when it came to teaching techniques.

One of the main issues to be taken into consideration in a foreign language class is gender (Sunderland, 1994; Graham & Rees, 1995) especially when it comes to speaking skills in which differences between males and females are particularly striking (Azuma & Ogura, 1984; Flood, 1995; Sunderland, 1994; Wareing, 1994).

Male students with female teachers held more positive attitudes towards their experience of L2 learning. Female students with male teachers also had strikingly more positive attitudes than male students with male teachers. All this implies that students who have a teacher of the opposite sex tend to have more positive attitudes towards L2 learning.

Although the mean scores of male students outweighed the mean scores of female students, the difference between male and female students, by and large, was not significant. Male students who had a female teacher had the highest integrative motivation, while female students with male teachers had the lowest degree of integrative motivation.

However students who had a teacher of the same sex felt more at ease in their classes and had less anxiety. On the other hand, a teacher of the opposite sex is likely to increase the level of anxiety among his/her students.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aagaard, L., & Skidmore, R. (2002). Preservice teacher perceptions of their best and worst K-12 teachers. Paper presented at the 29th annual meeting of the mid-south educational research association, Chattanooga, TN.
- [2] Ansary, H., & Babaii, E. (2002). Universal characteristics of EFL/ESL textbooks. A step towards systematic textbook evaluation. *The Internet TESL journal*, 8 (2), 1-9.
- [3] Arends, R.I. (1998). Learning to teach. New York: McGraw-Hill Book company. 24-28, 24-75, 97, 100-176, 248.
- [4] Azuma, K., & Ogura, C. (1984). Sei-sa no yurai. Tokyo: Dai Nihon Tosho.
- [5] Baker, T. L. (1998). Doing social research. London: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- [6] Basow, S. A. & Silberg, N. T. (1987). Student evaluations of college professors: Are female and male professors rated differently? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 79(3), 308-314.
- [7] Carson, L. (2001). Gender relations in higher education: Exploring lecturers' perceptions of student evaluations of teaching. *Research Papers in Education*. 16(4). pp. 337-358.
- [8] Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1995). Research methods in education. London: Routledge.
- [9] Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, M. (2001). Research methods in Education. London: Routledge. 101-106.
- [10] Connor, Ulla. (1996). Contrastive Rhetoric: Cross-Cultural Aspects of Second Language Writing. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [11] Cook, V. (2001). Second language learning and language teaching. London: Arnold. 39, 115-194.
- [12] Dee, T. S. (2006). How a teacher's gender affects boys and girls. *Education Next*, 6(4), 68-75.
- [13] Ehrlich, S. (1997). Gender as social practice: Implications for second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Learning*, 19, 421-446.
- [14] Eslami-Rasekh, A., & Fathi, A. (2004). The effects of explicit metapragmatic instruction on the speech act awareness of advanced EFL students. *TESL English Journal*, 8(2), 1-12.

- [15] Feldman, K. A. (1992). College students' view of male and female college teachers: Part I, evidence from the social laboratory and experiments. *Research in Higher Education*, 33(3), 317-375.
- [16] Feldman, K. A. (1993). College students. view of male and female college teachers: Part II, evidence from students. evaluations of their classroom teachers. *Research in Higher Education*, 34(2), 151-211.
- [17] Flood, J., Jenses, J. M., Lapp, D., & Squire, J. R. (1995). Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts. New York: Macmillan.
- [18] Gorsuch, G. J. (2003). The educational culture of international teaching assistants and U.S universities. *TEES-EJ*, 7(3), 1-22.
- [19] Graham, S., & Rees, F. (1995). Gender differences in language learning: The question of control. *Language Teaching Journal*, 11, 18-19.
- [20] Gramley, s., & Patzold, K.M. (1992). A survey of modern English. London: Routledge.
- [21] Jaeger, R. M. & Frcijo, T. D. (1975). Race and sex as concomitants of composite Halo in teachers' evaluative rating of pupils. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 7(2), 226-237.
- [22] Kaplan, Robert. (1966). "Cultural Thought Patterns in Inter-Cultural Education." (First published in *Language Learning* 16, 1-20.)
- [23] Croft, K. (Ed) (1972). Readings on English as a Second Language. Massachusetts: Winthrop Publishers.
- [24] Karimian, A. & Salehizadeh, S. (2007). Communication strangers: English language department in Iran. *Iranian Journal of Language Studies*, 1(4), 287-300.
- [25] Kerlinger, F.N. (1973). Foundations of behavioral research, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc. 378-379.
- [26] Kiany, G.R. (1997). Personality and language learning: the contradictions between psychologist and applied linguists. Review of applied linguistics. *Journal of Second language Teaching and Research*, 1 (1), P.116
- [27] Koul, L. (1999). Methodology of educational research. New Delhi: Vishal Printers. 140, 146-205, 353.
- [28] Kubota, R. (2003). New approaches to gender, class, and race in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 31-47.
- [29] Leki, Ilona. (1991). "Twenty-Five Years of Contrastive Rhetoric: Text Analysis and Writing Pedagogies." *TESOL Quarterly* 25.1: 123-43.
- [30] Levine, M. (1977). Sex differences in behavior ratings: Male and female teachers rate male and female pupils. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 5(3), 347-353.
- [31] Markely, T. (2004). Defining the effective teacher: Current arguments in education. *Essays in Education*, 11(3), 1-14.
- [32] Mason, P. M., Steagall, J. W. & Fabritiust, M. M. (1995). Student Evaluations of Faculty: A new procedure for using aggregate measures of performance. *Economics of Education Review*, 14(4), 403-416.
- [33] Mosallanezhad, P. (ed.). (1999). Methodology of teaching foreign languages. Tehran: ShahidMahdavi Educational Cultural and Charity institute.
- [34] Noora, A. (2008). Iranian undergraduate non-English majors' language learning preferences. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 8(2), 33-44.
- [35] Nunan, D. (2005). Important tasks of English education: Asia-wide and beyond. *Asian EFL journal*, 7(3), 1-5.
- [36] Ogden, D. H., Chapman, A. D. & Linward, D. (1994). Characteristics of good/effective teachers: Gender differences in student descriptors. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Nashville, TN.
- [37] Ok, L.K. (2003). The relationship of school year, sex and proficiency on the use of learning strategies in learning English of Korean junior high school students. *Asian EFL Journal*, 5 (3), 1-29.
- [38] Oxford, R.L. (1997). Personality type in the foreign or second language classroom: Theoretical and empirical perspectives. In A. S. Horning (ed.), *Personality preferences in rhetorical and psycholinguistic contexts*. Cresskill, NJ.: Hampton Pres Inc.
- [39] Pajares, F. M. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307-332.
- [40] Pavlenko, A. (2001). Language learning memoirs as a gendered genre. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(2), 213-240.
- [41] Rahman, S. (2005). Orientation and motivation in English language learning: A study of Bangladesh: Students at undergraduate level. *Asian EFL Journal*, 7 (1), 29-55
- [42] Sunderland, J. (Ed.) (1994). Exploring gender: Questions and implications for English language education. New York: Prentice Hall.
- [43] Swann, J. (1992). Language in education: girls, boys & language. Oxford: Blackwell.
- [44] Wachtel, H. (1998). Student evaluation of college teaching effectiveness: A brief review. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 23(2), 191-212.
- [45] Wareing, S. (1994). Gender differences in language use. In J. Sunderland, *Exploring gender: Questions and implications for English language education* (pp. 34- 38). New York: Prentice Hall.



Reza Biria, born in Isfahan, Iran, obtained his Ph.D. in teaching English as a Foreign Language from the University of Isfahan in 2001. He is an applied linguistics assistant professor working at Khorasgan Azad University, Isfahan, Iran. Dr. Biria has published papers in national and international conferences. His research interests include teaching English as a second and foreign language and ESP.



Nafiseh Mirzaie, born in Isfahan, Iran, received her B.A in English Language Teaching at University of Najaf Abad, Isfahan, Iran in 2008. She has got her M.A in Teaching English as a Foreign Language from Islamic Azad University of Khorasgan, Isfahan, Iran. She has been teaching English since 2011. Her main research interest lies in gender in language teaching.