TÜRKÇE ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN ERKEK VE KIZ ÖĞRENCİLERİNE YÖNELİK TOPLUMSAL CİNSİYET KİMLİĞİ MERKEZLİ BEKLENTİLERİ, ALGILARI VE TUTUMLARI

GENDER-BASED EXPECTATIONS, PERCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES OF TURKISH TEACHERS TOWARD THEIR MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS

M. Ruhi KÖSE
Gözde BAÇ
Department of Educational Sciences
Middle East Technical University

ÖZET

Bu çalışmada, Ankara metropoliten kent sınırları içinde yer alan, biri anadolu, biri süper ve ikisi de normal devlet lisesi olmak üzere, orta düzeydeki dört liseden rastlantısal bir yöntemle seçilmiş 100 kişiden oluşan bir öğretmen örnekleminin kız ve erkek öğrencilerine dönük cinsiyetçi beklenti, tutum ve algıları araştırıldı. Araştırma bulguları, öğretmenler tarafından kız ve erkek öğrencilere uygun görülen meslekler, kız ve erkek öğrencilere atfedilen sıfat ve özellikler, kız ve erkek öğrencilere uygun görülen akademik çalışma alanları ile kız ve erkek öğrencilerin başarı ve başarısızlıklarının nedenleri olarak tanımlanan faktörler arasında önemli farklılıklar olduğunu göstermektedir. Daha da önemlisi, araştırma bulguları, öğretmenlerin kız ve erkek öğrencilerine dönük beklenti, algı ve tutumlarının önemli ölçüde geleneksel cinsiyet ayırımcılığının özelliklerini yansıttığını göstermektedir.

ABSTRACT

This study was aimed at investigating the gender-based expectations, perceptions, and attitudes of a sample of 100 teachers randomly selected from four middle-status anatolian, super, and normal public lycees located in the metropolitan region of Ankara, the capital of Turkey. Results of the study indicated that there are significant differences between the occupations that the teachers considered to be appropriate for their male and female students, betweeen and adjectives that the teachers attributed to their male and female students, between the academic areas that the teachers considered their male and female students have an ability in, and between the factors that the teachers identified as the causes for failure and success of their male and female students. More importantly the results of this study indicated that the teachers' expectations, perceptions, and attitudes toward their male and female students significantly reflect the underlying features of traditional gender discrimination.

INTRODUCTION

The term 'gender', as ceaselessly defined and redefined in Western scholarship, sums up all the social, psychological, and cultural differences between the two sexes. One's subjective feelings of being a male or a female which s/he developed on the basis of social, cultural and psychological values explain his or her 'gender identity'. As indicated by Bassow (1992), a society's evaluation of behaviour as masculine or feminine is called 'gender role'. In the collective memory of the members of a specific society there are some commonly established beliefs about the characteristics of being a men or a woman. These commonly established beliefs are called 'gender stereotypes'. Gender stereotypes arise from the different social roles typically held by men and women in the society. Therefore it is the division of labour between the sexes and tasks between men and women that accounts for the content of gender stereotypes. Hence, division of labour between the sexes in different areas of social life is the key to gender inequality. Researchers emphasise the role of socialisation institutions as being of prime importance in the definitions, production, and legitimastion of gender identity, roles, and stereotypes. Family, school, peer group and mass media are the main socialisation institutions in which gender identities, roles and stereotypes are produced and legimitised. Family is indicated to be the first primary institution in which the

children are born and begin to learn their gender identities and roles. From birth, parents' attitudes, expectations, and behaviours show variance relative to the sex of their children. Next to the family, the school is the most significant institution wherein the children form their identities because it consists of multiple agents such as peers, teachers and administrators, multiple academic subjects, such as mathematics, science and literature, different instructional materials, and many curricular and extra-curricular activities. Each of these agents, subjects and activities provide children with explicit or implicit messages to develop their gender identity, the foundations of which have already been laid down in the family. In this regard, school provides a good background to observe and learn about how children acquire such gender identities and roles. First of all, the organisation of the school exhibits a gender-baised hierarchy. For instance, principals, those who occupy authority positions, are primarily selected from the men, and the majority of teachers who obey this authority and its rules are women. Furthermore, as indicated by Bassow (1992), such courses as literature, foreign languages, home economics and social sciences are entrusted to women, but mathematics, science and technical courses are usually left to the disposal of men. When a child comes face to face with this picture, s/he may get the following message about the gender stereotypes: Men are better suited for authority positions, and they presumably have natural abilities in mathematics, science and technical areas; but, women are dominated-beings with no power to administer or manage. They are good and qualified only in non-technical fields. Children's observation and experience of the gender-based hierarchal organisation of school may easily affect their self-images and future academic and vocational orientations. Moreover, instructional materials that are used in schools are not free from gender-bias. Women in textbooks are usually depicted in domestic roles and limited to the household. On the other hand the men almost always have important and dominant positions in the social, economic and political world. In this way, children may easily learn that it is something normal for a woman to stay at home and for a man to be powerful and work outside. Finally, women are rarely mentioned when the subject is about important historical, political, economic and scientific events are being drawn. All these factors may discourage girls to orient themselves to certain fields in the future. In this way, as indicated by Measor and Sikes, girls are not encouraged to do something about themselves like "... study science, or get a degree or slog in a factory to make a living; they are made to think that their beauty and goodness will ensure and save them" (1992; 57).

Children learn gender stereotypes not only from the style of school organisation, the written curricula, and the instructional materials of school, but also from peer interaction patterns, from the things that are read between the lines in the course books, and from their relations with their teachers. As a result of that kind of 'incidental contact" with the school environment, a "Hidden Curriculum" emerges, which is not written anywhere but has a great impact on children's acquirement of gender stereotypes. In this regard, in every classroom setting there is a 'hidden curriculum', which constitutes a significant part of the learning experiences of students in the school. A part of this hidden curriculum consists of teachers' attitudes, expectations and behaviours toward their students. As indicated by Serbin, teachers' attitudes and expectations reinforce conformity to sex-role stereotypes and encourage the development of quite different academic abilities and behaviours in their male and female students' (1983; 18). Generally, teachers do not consiously intend to transmit gender stereotyped messages to their students. And, probably, they are not aware of the negative effects of their gender-bounded verbal and nonverbal interactions on their students. But, since the teacher is the ultimate role model for the students s/he expectedly represents a charismatic authority in the classroom. His/her influence on students is enormous, and possibly is greater than the influence of parents. Hence, any response of the teacher to his/her students may provide strong messages abot the type of behaviour and ways of working that are most valued in the society. Even a light touch, an eye contact, a voice tone, or a facial expression reflects significant messages about the child's position in the classroom and society.

A brief review of the Western literature on the subject indicates that there are significant differences in teachers's attitudes, expectations, and behaviours toward their male and female students. As stated by Frazier and Sadker (1973), different kinds of behaviours are expected from girls and boys at school, and each sex is entitled to a different set of rewards, privileges, and punishment. Stanworth (1983), on the other hand, in her study on the sexual divisions in the classroom, argues that teachers expect their female students to take up subordinate and feminine occupations such as secretary, nurse, or teacher-even the ones who have outstanding academic records. moreover, she states that "even girls who are performing more successfully than boys, appear to exist on the periphery of classroom life; their marginalisation in the classroom, and the lesser attention they receive from teachers, results in girls appearing to others-and, more importantly, to

themselves-as less capable than they really are" (1983; 52). In their trial to explain the causative factors that influence the gender-related differences in mathematics, Fennema and Peterson (1985) argue that science is perceived as difficult, requiring sacrifice and persistence. Scientists are perceived as objective, logical, emotionally neutral, and working alone. These perceptions are in conflict with the sex role of females. The results of Wolpe's study (1988), in which she tried to examine the adjectives that teachers most frequently used for their male and female students, show that there are significant differences between the adjectives attributed to male and female students by their teachers. The most frequently used adjectives for male students, are reported as troublesome, noisy, energetic, enthusiastic and more difficult. On the base of the empirical results of her study Wolpe concludes that teachers hold stereotypical views about their male and female students' traits and abilities. More importantly, Askew and Ross (1988) claim that masculine stereotypes such as, tough, strong, aggressive, brave, rational and independent, damage and prevent young men from developing their full potential, and also make them internalise extremely negative images of girls and women. In their study, teachers' expectations from their male and female students differ in such a way that they see girls as being more prepared to conform, ready to do what they are wanted to do, and more motivated than boys. Furthermore, research findings indicate that it is not only the teachers' attitudes, perceptions, and expectations that show variation with respect to the sex of their students, but the amount and type of their interaction with male and female students is also different. For example, results of an experimental study carried out by Ebbeck (1984) show that teachers have more interaction with boys compared to girls. Moreover, findings of this study enlighten the process through which sex roles are socialised, and show how teachers' relative perceptions of boys and girls lead them to be unconsciously biased. Results of another study carried out by Morse and Handley (1985) show that teachers interacted more with male than female students in classrooms. The findings of Morse and Hadley's study indicate that, in their interactions with students, teachers ask more questions, reinforce and reward more, and give more feedback to their male students. In her article entitled "Interactions of male and female students with male and female teachers", Brophy (1985) points out some differences in the interactions of students with teachers by concluding that teachers cause boys to socialise relatively more toward self-reliance and independent achievement striving, and cause girls to socialise relatively more toward conformity and responsibility. Findings of another study (Evans, 1988), in which the author records interactions between teachers and students, indicate that teachers discriminate in favour of boys by initiating twelve to sixteen percentage points more interaction with them than with girls and interact with girls more gently and with boys in a more robust way; teachers' voices tend to be louder and more directive with boys. Further, boys are disciplined for behaviour that is often ignored in girls" (1994; 50).

The conceptual and empirical literature summarised so far constitutes an important framework within which the teachers' influence and role on the formation of students' gender identity may be examined. With this background, the purpose of this study is to investigate the extent to which teachers' expectations, attitudes and perceptions show variations with respect to the sex of their students. More specifically, this study is aimed at investigating the gender-based attitudes, expectations and perceptions of Turkish teachers toward their male and female students.

METHOD

The subjects of this study consist of 100 teachers randomly selected from four high schools located in the metropolitan region of Ankara, the capital of Turkey. The sample included only the teachers who were employed in the middle-status public, super and Anatolian high schools. So, both the teachers of high-and low-status public, super, and Anatolian high schools along with those of the private, technical, and vocational high schools were beyand the concern of this study.

In the selection of the teachers a two-stage sampling procedure was employed. In the first stage, by utilising a stratified proportional sampling procedure, a sample of four middle-status high schools was selected from the middle stratum public, super, and Anatolian high schools of the Ankara metropolitan region. In the stratification process of the high schools, the School Social Status Index, which was developed by the ministry of Education, was utilised. In the second stage, by utilising a deliberate random sampling procedure, 25 teachers from each school were chosen to constitute the sample of 100 teacher subjects. Table 1 shows the distribution of 100 teacher subjects by the type and name of the high school.

Table 1. Distribution of the Surveyed Teachers by the Type and Name of High School.

Type and Name of the High School	Number of Teachers		
	Male	Female	Total
Incesu Lycee	10	15	25
Şehit Nuri Pamir Lycee	10	15	25
Yıldırım Beyazıt Super Lycee	10	15	25
Çağrıbey Anadolu Lycee	10	15	25
TOTAL	40	60	100

Data on the teachers' attitudes, expectations, and behaviour toward their male and female students were collected by a survey method. A Teacher Questionnaire, which consisted of five parts, was developed and administered to 100 teachers by the researchers during the Spring Semester of the 1995-1996 Academic Year. The first part of the questionnaire included questions that are aimed at gathering information about the teachers' demographic characteristics, such as sex, age, the area of teaching, and job experience. The second part consisted of questions to inquire about the future occupations proposed by the teachers for their male and female students. The third part included personality characteristics, given in the form of adjectives, which the teachers are asked to identify with their male and female students. In the fourth part the teachers were asked to choose among the given ten academic fields the three ones in which they thought their male and female students have more ability. In the fifth part of the survey the teachers were asked to describe the reasons for success and failure for their male and female students. Data on the teachers' expectations, perceptions and attitudes toward their male and female students were presented in terms of frequencies.

RESULTS

The first part of this section has been devoted to the presentation of the survey results regarding the teachers' occupational choices for their male and female students in five different fields; namely, medical, teaching, technical, social, and artistic fields. Frequency distributions of occupations in the four different fields as proposed by the teachers for their male and female students are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Frequency distributions of occupations in medical, teaching, technical, social, and artistic fields proposed for male and female students by the surveyed teachers.

OCCUPATIONS	Boys	Girls	Undecided
Dentist	40	54	6
Surgeon	83	13	4
Child Doctor	1	94	5
Veterinarian	88	7	5
Biology Teacher	12	82	6
Physics Teacher	62	31	7
Math Teacher	59	34	7
Turkish Teacher	8	86	6
German Teacher	25	70	5
English Teacher	5	90	5
Phy. Ed. Teacher	75	18	7
Forest Engineer	93	4	3
Geology Engineer	90	6	4
Electircal Engineer	86	10	4
Food Engineer	12	82	6
Civil Engineer	91	5	4
Chemical Engineer	43	52	5
Mechan. Engineer	95	3	2
Textile Engineer	25	67	8
Architect	36	55	9
Home Economist	8	87	5
Finance Inspector	78	18	4
Judge	66	28	6
Theologist	86	8	6
Merchant	83	8	9
Manager	59	32	9
Ambassador	72	23	5
Secretary	7	89	4
Police	82	13	7
TV Speaker	13	82	5
Sculptor	53	42	5
Opera Artist	10	83	7
Theatre Artist	12	80	8
Pianist	15	80	5

As can be seen from the Table 2, among the given four occupations in the field of medicine "Child Doctor" and "Dentist" were considered to be proper for female students, but "Surgeon" and "Veterinarian" were considered to be proper for male students. Out of 100, only one teacher considered "Child Doctor" as an occupation proper for boys. The remaining 94 teachers considered "Child Doctor" as an occupation proper for girls. In the case of "Veterinarian" an opposite trend is being observed. Out of 100, only seven teachers considered "Veterinarian" as an occupation proper for girls. The remaining 88 teachers considered

"Veterinarian" as an occupation proper for boys. The number of teachers who considered "Surgeon" as an occupation proper for boys was also significantly high. Out of 100, only 13 teachers considered "Surgeon" as an occupation proper for girls. The remaining 83 teachers considered "Surgeon" as an occupation proper for boys. The number of teachers who considered "Dentist" as an occupation proper for girls appeared to be greater than the number of teachers who considered "Dentist" as an occupation proper for girls. Out of 100, 54 teachers considered "Dentist" as an occupation proper for girls and 40 teachers considered "Dentist" as an occupation proper for boys.

A similar trend can be observed for the occupations in the field of teaching. Teaching of physical education, physics and mathematics were considered by a great majority of the surveyed teachers as occupations proper for boys. Teaching of English, Turkish, biology and German, on the other hand, were considered by a significantly large number of teachers as occupations proper for girls. Out of 100, only 18 teachers considered "Physical Education Teacher" as an occupation proper for girls. The remaining 75 teachers considered "Physical Education Teacher" as an occupation proper for boys. Out of 100, only 31 teachers considered "Physics Teacher" as an occupation proper for girls. The remaining 62 teachers considered "Physics Teacher" as an occupation proper for girls was 86, and the number of those who considered "Turkish Teacher" as an occupation proper for boys. 82 teachers considered "Biology Teacher" as an occupation proper for girls.

The survey results indicated the extent of gender-based occupational discrimination made by the teachers in the technical fields. Four of the occupations in the technical field were considered by a majority of the teachers as proper for boys. "Mechanical Engineer", "Forest Engineer", "Civil Engineer" and Geology Engineer" were considered by more than 90 percent of the teachers as mainly proper for boys. Out of 100, only three teachers considered "Mechanical Engineer" as an occupation proper for girls. 95 teachers considered "Mechanical Engineer" as an occupation proper for boys. Out of 100, only four teachers considered "Forest Engineer" as an occupation proper for girls. 93 teachers considered "Forest Engineer" as an occupation proper for boys. In a similar way, the number of teachers who considered "Civil Engineer" as an occupation proper for girls was only five. 91 teachers considered "Civil Engineer" as an occupation proper for boys. Out of 100, only 10 teachers considered "Electrical Engineer" as an occupation proper for girls. 86 teachers considered "Electrical Engineer" as an occupation proper for boys. Four of the occupations in the technical field, on the other hand, were considered by more than half of the teachers as proper for girls. "Food Engineer", "Textile Engineer", "Architect" and "Chemical Engineer", were considered by the majority of teachers as occupations proper for girls. Only 12 teachers considered "Food Engineer" as an occupation proper for boys. 82 teachers considered "Food Engineer" as an occupation proper for girls. 25 teachers considered "Textile Engineer" as an occupation proper for boys, and 67 teachers considered "Textile Engineer" as an occupation proper for girls. The number of teachers who considered "Architect" as an occupation proper for boys was 36, and the number of those who considered "Architect" as an occupation proper for girls was 55.

The survey results indicated that the teachers discriminate between their male and female students in considering the appropriateness of occupations in the social field also. Seven of the occupations in the social social field, namely "Theologist", "Merchant", "Police", "Finance Inspector", "Ambassador", "Öudge" and "Manager", were considered by majority of the teachers as proper for their male students. On the other hand, three of the occupations in the social field, namely "Secretary", "Home Economist" and "TV Speaker" were considered by majority of the teachers as proper for their female students. The number of teachers who considered "Theologist" as an occupation proper for girls was 8. In the same way, out of 100, only 8 teachers considered "Merchant" as an occupation proper for girls. 83 teachers considered "Merchant" as an occupation proper for boys.

The number of teachers who considered "Police" as an occupation proper for girls was only 13. 82 teachers considered "Police" as an occupation proper for boys. Relatively low but similar considerations can be observed for "Finance Inspector", "Ambassador", and "Manager". The number of teachers who considered "Finance Inspector" as an occupation proper for boys was 78, and the number of those who considered "Finance Inspector" as an occupation proper for girls was 18.72 teachers considered "Ambassador" as an occupation proper for boys, and 23 teachers considered "Ambassador" as an occupation proper for girls. The number of teachers who considered "Manager" as an occupation proper for boys was 59, and the number of those who considered "Manager" as an occupation proper for girls was 32. An excessively great number of teachers, on the other hand, considered "Secretary", "Home Economist", and "TV Speaker" as occupations proper for their female students. Out of 100, only 7 teachers considered "Secretary" as an occupation proper for boys. 89 teachers considered "Secretary" as an

occupation proper for girls. In a similar way, the number of teachers who considered "Home Economist" as an occupation proper for boys was only 8.87 teachers considered "home Economist" as an occupation proper for girls. The number of teachers who considered "TV Speaker" as an occupation proper for boys was 13, and the number of those who considered "TV Speaker" as an occupation proper for girls was 82.

Finally, the survey results indicated that among the given four occupations in the field of arts the three were considered by the surveyed teachers as proper for girls and one as proper for boys. A significantly great number of the teachers considered "Opera Artist", "Theatre Artist", and "Pianist" as occupations proper for their female students. Out of 100, only 10 teachers considered "Opera Artist" as an occupation proper for boys. 83 teachers considered "Opera Artist" as an occupation proper for girls. The number of teachers who considered "Theatre Artist" as an occupation proper for boys was only 12.80 teachers considered "Theatre Artist" as an occupation proper for girls. In the same way, out of 100, only 15 teachers considered "Pianist" as an occupation proper for boys. 80 teachers considered "Pianist" as an occupation proper for girls. On the other hand, the number of teachers who considered "Sculptor" as an occupation proper for boys appeared to be greater than the number of teachers who considered "Sculptor" as an occupation proper for girls. Out of 100, 53 teachers considered "Sculptor" as an occupation proper for boys, and 42 teachers considered "Sculptor" as an occupation proper for girls.

As stated in the previous section, in the Third Part of the Questionnaire the teachers were asked to select and mark among a list of the 29 adjectives for their male and female students. Results of the survey analysis, regarding frequency distributions of the 29 adjectives as attributed by the teachers to their male and female students are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Frequency distributions of the adjectives attributed to male and female students by the surveyed teachers.

ADJECTVES	Boys	Girls	Undecided
Adventurous	93	6	1
Noisy	82	17	1
Quiet	9	91	0
Sensitive	5	94	1
Rude	96	3	1
Active	73	24	3
Passive	28	69	3
Brave	81	17	2
Coward	16	80	4
Adaptive	3	95	2
Tidy	4	95	1
Shy	9	89	2
Aggressive	95	5	0
Anxious	15	76	9
Inadaptive	87	8	5
Respectful	13	84	3
Modest	23	76	1
Untidy	95	4	1
Naughty	98	1	1
Independent	92	8	0
Dependent	17	76	3
Nervous	87	12	1
Obedient	7	87	6
Lazy	94	5	1
Ambitious	67	25	8
Timid	15	84	1
Careful	8	90	2
Emotional	10	89	1
Reckless	80	18	2

As can be seen from the Table, there are quite significant differences between the frequencies of the adjectives attributed to male and female students by the teachers. The adjectives attributed to male students are significantly different from those attributed to female students. There is a gender-based polarisation between attribution of the teachers. The adjectives, such as adventurous, noisy, rude, active, brave, aggressive, inadaptive, untidy, naughty, independent, nervous,

lazy, ambitious and reckless, are excessively attributed to male students by the teachers. On the other hand, the adectives such as quit, sensitive, passive, coward, adaptive, tidy, shy, anxious, respectful, modest, dependent, obedient, timid, careful and emotional, are excessively attributed to female students by the teachers. 6 teachers identified girls and 93 teachers identified boys as adventurous. 17 teachers identified girls and 82 teachers identified boys as noisy. 9 teachers identified boys and 91 teachers identified girls as quit. 5 teachers identified boys and 94 teachers identified girls as sensitive. 3 teachers identified girls and 96 teachers identified boys as rude. 24 teachers identified girls and 73 teachers identified boys as active. 28 teachers identified boys and 69 teachers identified girls as passive. 17 teachers identified girls and 81 teachers identified boys as brave. 3 teachers identified boys and 95 teachers identified girls as coward. 3 teachers identified boys and 95 teachers identified girls as tidy. 9 teachers identified boys and 89 teachers identified girls as shy. 95 teachers identifiied boys and 5 teachers identified boys and 76 teachers identified girls as anxious. 87 teachers identified boys and 8 teachers identified girls as inadaptive. 13 teachers identified boys and 84 teachers identified girls as respectful. 23 teachers identified boys and 76 teachers identified girls as modest. 95 teachers identified boys and 4 teachers identified girls as untidy. 98 teachers identified boys and one teacher identified girls as naughty. 92 teachers identified boys and 8 teachers identified girls as independent. 17 teachers identified boys and 76 teachers identified girls as dependent. 87 teachers identified boys and 12 teachers identified girls as nervous. 7 teachers identified boys and 87 teachers identified girls as obedient. 94 teachers identified boys and 5 teachers identified girls as lazy. 67 teachers identified boys and 25 teachers identified irls as ambitious. 15 teachers identified boys and 84 teachers identified girls as timid. 8 teachers identified boys and 90 teachers identified girls as careful. 10 teachers identified boys and 89 teachers identified girls as emotional. 80 teachers identified boys and 18 teachers identified girls as reckless. A closer look into the Table shows that the two sexes are identified in an oppositional way. Adjectives attributed to boys reflect the underlying features of a "masculine-instrumental" personality dimension, and adjectives attributed to girls, on the other hand, reflect the underlying features of a "feminine-affectional" personality dimension.

In the Fourth Part of the Oquestionnaire, a list of ten academic areas, including maths, physics, chemistry, biology, Turkish, foreign language, history, geography, sports, and music, was presented to the teachers, and they were asked to select from the list and write in an ordered form the name of the three academic areas in which their male and female students are supposed to have an ability. The survey results indicated in which academic areas in which boys were supposed to have an ability are different from those in which girls were supposed to have an ability. Frequencies of the first, second, and third order academic areas in which boys and girls were supposed to have an ability are different from those girls were supposed to have an ability. Frequencies of the first, second, and third order academic areas in which boys and girls were supposed to have an ability by the teachers are presented in Table 4 and Table 5.

Table 4. Frequencies of the three academic areas in which boys were supposed to have an ability by the surveyed teachers.

ACADEMIC AREAS	Frequency
1st Mathematics	45
2nd Physics	30
3rd Sports	22

As can be seen from the Table 4, the most frequently cited first order academic area for boys is mathematics. Out of 100, 45 teachers cited mathematics as the first order academic are in which boys were supposed to have an ability. Physics appeared to be the most frequently cited second order academic area for boys. Out of 100, 30 teachers cited physics as the second order academic area in which boys were supposed to have an ability. Sports appeared to be the most frequently cited third order academic area for boys. 22 teachers cited sports as a third order academic area in which boys were supposed to have an ability.

Table 5. Frequencies of the three academic areas in which girls were supposed to have an ability by the surveyed teachers

ACADEMIC AREAS	Frequency
1st Turkish	40
2nd Foreign Language	30
3rd Music	24

A look in the Table 5, on the other hand, shows that the most frequently cited first, second, and third order academic areas for girls are Turkish, foreign language, and music. Out of 100, 40 teachers cited Turkish as the first order academic area in which girls were supposed to have an ability. 30 teachers cited foreign language as the second order academic area in

which girls were supposed to have an ability. 24 teachers cited music as the third order academic area in which girls were supposed to have an ability.

In the Fifth Part of the Questionnaire the surveyed teachers were asked to identify the possible reasons for "failure" and "success" of both their male and female students. Frequencies of the identified seven reasons for failure of male and female students are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Frequencies of reasons for failure of male and female students as identified by the teachers.

REASONS	Boys	Girls	Undecided
1. Can't succeed despite hard work	23	70	7
2. Doesn't pay attention to the lessons	94	3	3
3. Smart but doesn't study enough	80	17	3
4. Due to lack of ability can't succeed despite working hard	39	52	9
5. Doesn't participate to the classes enough	62	31	7
6. Not interested in lessons due to his/her friends	80	17	3
7. Not interested in lessons due to family problems	23	69	8

As can be seen from the Table 6, failure of male and female students were attributed to different factors by the teachers. Lack of interest, attention, and participation into the classes and lessons as associated with low level of work and study were identified by the teachers as the possible reasons of boys' failure. Girls' failure, on the other hand, was attributed by the teachers to certain uncontrollable factors, such as lack of intelligence and ability, and family problems.

A similar trend can be observed in reasons identified for success of male and female students by the teachers. Frequencies of four reasons for success of both male and female students as identified by the teachers are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Frequencies of reasons for success of male and female students as identified by the teachers.

REASONS	Boys	Girls	Undecided
1. Doesn't study hard enough, but succeeds due to his/her intelligence	77	22	1
2. Studies hard	6	92	2
3. Follows the lessons carefully	5	93	2
4. Has ability in subjects of study	59	38	3

A look into the Table 7 shows that boys' success is mainly attributed to their intelligence and ability by the teachers. The teachers believe in that boys' success is not influenced by their level of attention, care and work. Success of female students, on the other hand, was attributed by the teachers to hard work, attention, and care, rather than intelligence and ability.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study indicate that there are significant differences between the teachers' expectations, perceptions and attitudes of their male and female students. More particularly, findings of this study show that teachers make an occupational discrimination between their male and female students. The kind of occupations that were considered by the teachers to be appropriate for their male students appeared to be different from those considered to be appropriate for their female students. Findings indicated that the teachers have a two-dimensional image of occupations: masculine occupations, which were considered to be appropriate for male students; and feminine occupations, which were considered to be appropriate for female students. A similar duality was observed for the adjectives that were attributed by the teachers to their male and female students. Male students were identified with instrumental-masculine adjectives and characteristics. Female students, on the other hand were identified with affectional-feminine adjectives and characteristics. Moreover, it was observed that the teachers' images of their male and female students are constructed in such a way that the image of one sex excludes the characteristic features of the other sex. The teachers considered that their male and female students have abilities in different academic areas. Turkish, foreign language and music were indicated to be the major academic areas in which female students have an ability. Mathematics, physics and sports, on the other hand, were indicated as academic areas appropriate for the ability of male students. Finally, the findings indicated that the teachers attribute both the failure and success of their male and female students to different factors. Female students' failure was attributed to uncontrollable factors such as inefficient ability and intelligence, and family problems. Male students' failure, on the other hand, was attributed to the lack of attendance, attention, care and hard work. On the contrary, female students' success was attributed to their attendance, attention, care and hard work, but male students' success was attributed to their ability and intelligence.

REFERENCE

Askew, S. & Ross, C. (1988) *Boys Don't Cry, Boys and Sexism in Education,* Philedelphia: Open Univeristy Press.

Bassow, S.A. (1992) *Gender Stereotypes and Roles,* California: Cole Pub. Co.

Brophy, J. (1985) "Interactions of Male and female Students with Male and Female Teachers", in *Gender Influences in Classroom Interaction,* (ed.) L. C. Wilkinson & C. B. Marrett, New York: Academic Press.

Ebbeck, M. (1984) "Equity for Boys and Girls: Some Important Issues", *Early Child Development and Care,* 18; 121-132.

Evans, T. D. (1988) *A Gender Agenda: A Sociological Study of Teachers, Parents, and Pupils in Their Primary School,* Sydney: Allen and Unvin.

Fennema, J. F. & Peterson, P. (1985) "Autonomous Learning Behaviour: A Possible Explanation of Gender-Related Differences in Mathematics", in *Gender Influences in Classroom Interaction,* (ed.) L.C. Wilkinson & B. Marrett, New York: Academic Press.

Frazier, N. & Satker, M. (1973) *Sexism in School and Society,* San Fransisco: Harper and Row Publishers.

Measor, L. & Sikes, P. (1992) *Gender and Schools,* London: Cassell.

Morse, L. & Handley, H. M. (1985) "Listening to Adolescents: Gender Differences in Science Classroom Interactions", in *Gender Influences in Classroom Interactions,* (ed.) L. C. Wilkinson & C. B. Marrett, New York: Academic Press.

Serbin, A.L. (1983) "The Hidden Curruculum: academic consequences of teacher expectations", in *Sex Differentiation and Schooling,* (ed) M. Marland, London: Heinemann Educational Book.

Stanworth, M. (1983) *Gender and Schooling: A Study of Sexual Divisions in the Classroom,* London: W.R.R. Center.

Streitmatter, J. (1994) *Toward Gender Equality in the Classroom: Everyday Teachers' Beliefs and Practices,* Albany: Sunny Press.

Wolpe, A. (1988) *Within School Walls: The Role of Discipline, Sexuality, and the Curriculum,* London: Routledge.