

Schooling Process: Is Schooling Experience and Its Outcome the Same for Girls and Boys?

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47175/rielsj.v1i2.80>

| Abdul Wahab Ibrahim^{1,*} | Bashir Ahmad Saleh² |

^{1,2}Department of Education,
Faculty of Education, Sule
Lamido University, P. M. B.
048, Kafin-Hausa, Jigawa
State, Nigeria
abdulwahab.ibrahim@slu.edu.ng

ABSTRACT

The study examined if schooling experience and teacher's classroom interaction is the same for senior secondary school adolescent girls and boys in Jigawa state, Nigeria. It also determined whether influence of students' perceived level of personalisation of the teacher's classroom behaviour and environment exist on their participation in the classroom learning activities. These were with a view to improving the teacher-student's relationships and teacher's classroom effectiveness. The study adopted a survey design. The population consisted of all male and female students in public Senior Secondary Schools in Jigawa state. The sample consisted of 370 Senior Secondary Classes Three (SS III) students. Of this number, 185 were boys and 185 were girls selected through stratified sampling procedure using sex as stratum. Their average age was 15.17 years. A self-developed instrument was used to collect relevant data in the study. Data collected were analysed using Independent t-test statistical method. The results showed that teachers do not significantly interact with girls and boys in the same manner in the classroom. However, there existed a significant influence of students' perceived level of personalisation of the teacher's classroom behaviour on their participation in the classroom learning activities. Also, there was a significant influence of students' perceived level of personalisation of the classroom environment on their participation in the classroom learning activities. It was concluded that schooling experience is not the same for girls and boys respectively. Thus, appropriate interventionist strategies should be put in place to assist realising the objective of equal educational opportunity.

KEYWORDS

Teacher's behaviour; classroom interaction; classroom environment; personalization

INTRODUCTION

Over time, a classroom is regarded as a black box inside which no one knows what is going on. Usually, a school does different things to different categories of children through its hidden curriculum, which research findings indicated to be replete with practices that seem antithetical to the functions for which it is established (Ibrahim, 2014). For instance, the way learning is organised particularly through the school's hidden curriculum of which teacher classroom behaviour is an essential part, may subconsciously be negative to the ideals for which the school is established. Among the objectives of the Nigerian educational system is ensuring egalitarianism, social justice, and self-reliance through the development of children's ability and interests (National Policy on Education, 2014). Much

as equality of opportunity is desired, there are overt and covert forms of discrimination against female students in such areas of education as the instructional materials which have been documented to be sex-typed (Abe, 2014). A study of the schooling process will reveal transactions of gender beneath the surface of educational theory and rhetoric. Hence, this investigation into the schooling process is necessary because research reports indicate that schooling experience and its outcome is not the same for girls and boys (Bruns & Luque, 2015). Thus, by so doing, the researchers believed that the study will contribute to improving the teacher-student's relationships and teacher's classroom effectiveness dovetailing into good academic outcome for both girls and boys in school.

For instance, research reports from the United States of America and United Kingdom revealed that there is a difference in teachers' behaviour towards girls and boys; that teachers interact more with boys than girls in four major areas of teacher's classroom behaviour which comprises of approval instruction, feedback, listening to and prohibitory messages (Araujo, Carneiro, Cruz-Aguayo & Schady, 2016). Researchers found that boys received more than their fair share of teacher attention (Bassi, Busso & Munoz, 2015; Lavy & Sand, 2015).

Similarly, Terrier (2016) reported that teachers' gender biases in primary school affect the academic achievement gap during middle school and secondary school and enrolment in advanced level courses in math and science during secondary school. Lavy and Sand (2015) investigated teachers' gender biases by comparing "blind" and "nonblind" classroom exams in Israel; the findings showed that teachers seem to unconsciously discourage female students by underestimating their abilities while overestimating the skills of their male classmates. Using the same approach, Bassi et al., (2015) found evidence of gender bias against boys among middle school teachers in France; as teachers interact more with boys than with girls; boys received more praise, criticism, and remediation than girls. Also, teachers are less likely to reject behaviour by boys, even if it violates classroom rules. Girls received more "acceptance" than boys. Also, girls who received less attention from their teachers may come to underestimate their abilities and lose motivation.

Further, Abe (2014) examined gender differentiation in teacher classroom behaviour in two primary schools in Lagos metropolis. The two hundred and forty pupils and six teachers of two arms of one three and six randomly selected were the subjects of the study. The findings include the fact that teacher-initiated contact was directed more often to boys than towards girls in number and quality, particularly in Mathematics and Social Studies classes. Researchers (Bertrand & Pan, 2013; Bos, Ganimian and Vegas, 2014; Bharadwaj, DeGiorgi, Hansen and Neilson, 2015) indicated that getting more of a teacher's attention - whether positive (e.g., responding to or working one-on-one with the student) or negative (e.g., disciplining the student) has consequences for students' performance. Most researchers pointed to a prevalence of gender bias in favour of boys across subject areas and school environments, mostly in the form of teachers giving more attention to boys than girls.

Stallings and Knight (2013) investigated how teachers dispense reward and approval in three sixth grade classrooms in the United States and found that both classroom observers and children noted that teachers expressed greater approval of girls and greater disapproval of boys. Boys were found to receive more prohibitory control messages than girls. Some of the findings included the fact that teachers did not only interact more with males than with females, but also that males were asked more abstract questions while females were asked low-level factual questions.

A study by Carneiro, Cruz-Aguayo and Schady (2017) examined teacher class organisation, instructional support, and emotional support. The findings showed that the quality of interactions between teachers and students affects differences in math scores among children in early elementary school. Boys tend to be more active than girls; teachers may instinctively pay more attention to boys in order to control the classroom. Within the pool of “good teachers,” class will be unable to distinguish between teachers who pay more attention to boys to control and maintain order in the classroom and teachers who try to balance their interactions with boys and girls. The fact that class does not capture attention to different groups of students may explain why Carneiro et al., (2017) reported no correlation between class and gender differences in learning outcomes. Similarly, boys and girls react differently to various aspects of the climate of the classroom. Girls react more negatively than boys to friction between students, strict rules, and teacher favouritism. The presence of these factors in a classroom is related to a general decline in attitude toward science. The more negative response of girls contributes to the poorer attitudes toward science held by girls. A classroom that is highly structured, teacher controlled, and has clear directions and constant feedback is associated with achievement in science and is favoured by girls. However, this climate inhibits interests and activities outside of class. This latter situation becomes a special problem where girls are concerned because they report fewer outside science activities and opportunities. Teachers who emphasize the difficulty of science also create a negative learning climate for girls. Girls, unlike boys, avoid tasks labelled difficult and do not return to difficult tasks if they experience failure.

Noteworthy, teacher behaviours and strategies are often employed without malicious intent. Despite most teachers’ desire to be fair to all students, it turns out that they sometimes distribute praise and criticism differently to boys and girls. The tendency is to praise boys more than girls for displaying knowledge correctly, but to criticize girls more than boys for displaying knowledge incorrectly (Delamont, 2016; Golombok & Fivush, 2014). Another way of stating this difference is by what teachers tend to overlook: with boys, they tend to overlook wrong answers, but with girls, they tend to overlook right answers, culminating in a tendency to make boys’ knowledge seem more important and boys themselves more competent. Likewise, Golombok & Fivush (2014) claimed that teachers tend to praise girls for good behaviour, regardless of its relevance to content or to the lesson at hand and tend to criticize boys for bad or inappropriate behaviour. This difference can also be stated in terms of what teachers overlook: with girls, they tend to overlook behaviour that is not appropriate, but with boys they tend to overlook behaviour that is appropriate. The net result in this case is to make girls seem better than they may really be, and to make their goodness seem more important than their academic competence. By the same token, teacher’s patterns of response imply that boys are worse than they may really be.

Against this backdrop, there are numerous indicators within schools that point to the fact that gender bias is present in the curriculum and teachers’ practices. Although there are many exceptions, boys and girls do differ on average in ways that parallel conventional gender stereotypes and that affect how the sexes behave at school and in class. The differences have to do with physical behaviours, styles of social interaction, academic motivations, behaviours and choices. They have a variety of sources namely parents, peers and media. Teachers are certainly not the primary cause of gender role differences, but sometimes teachers influence them by their responses to and choices made on behalf of students. Therefore, this study investigates whether teachers interact with girls and boys in the same manner; and whether influence exists between students’ perceived level of

personalisation of the classroom environment and teachers' classroom behaviour on their participation in the classroom learning activities, which are considered as an important aspect of the teaching-learning process. It is in recognition of the prominent position occupied by classroom behaviours initiated by both the teachers and the students in school to enhance academic attainment particularly in science subjects where girls are currently recording low participation and lack of success, eventuating in differential career routes for girls and boys, and to ensuring quality control of the schooling process and effective equity strategies, that this study is embarked upon. Therefore, the specific objectives of this study are to:

1. Investigate whether students' perceived level of personalisation of the teacher's classroom behaviour influences their participation in the classroom learning activities.
2. Determine if students' perceived level of personalisation of the classroom environment influences their participation in the classroom learning activities.
3. Investigate whether teachers interact with girls and boys in the same manner in the classroom.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Educators, psychologists and scholars in the field of personality development had proposed that each individual person's perception of reality determines his behaviour (Martin, Veldman & Anderson, 2018; Zimmermann, 2013; Hebb, 2011; Schachter, 2008; Evertson, 2001). This focus of individuality is an important aspect of the concept of self-actualisation. Perception of students can influence what they learn and how they learn and internalise it. Thus, what is seen or heard will depend on what one already knows and how he reacts (Ilogu, 2001). For instance, many factors both organismic and external affect students in various learning situations. Even when institutions have all the physical facilities the processes through which the students interact with their environment is more critical than the physical features of the environment.

Students' perception of classroom environment was categorised by Fraser (2001) into five namely: degree of participation, personalisation, independence, investigation and differentiation. In different studies, researchers found that the degree of participation in the class and academic performance are significantly related (Rubbins, 2018; Evertson, 2001). Similarly, Walberg (2019); Martin et al., (2018) and Zimmermann (2013) respectively found that the degree of personalisation of the environment significantly influenced students' academic achievement. In the same vein, studies found that degree of independence in the classroom significantly influenced academic achievement (Vaidya & Chamsky, 2018; Owen & Barnes, 2012).

Evertson (2001) in set and motor adjustment theory asserted that individuals perceive one thing at a time and as such, when a number of things or objects are seen, a clear perceptual act requires some organisation to produce a kind of unity. Schachter (2008) in sensory-tonic field theory claimed that perception is a total dynamic process in which the sensory (i.e., ear, eye, and other movement) and tonic (part or whole body movements) factors combine to have a common dynamic outcome. Hebb (2011) in cell assembly and phase sequence theory highlighted the stimulus and response interaction, which involves discrimination learning, formation and preservation of associative image patterns among the elementary brain processes involved in the perceptual act. Gibson (2009) in attentional theory explained that individuals take in only limited amount of information hence they select what to attend to in a systematic way.

With regard to relationship between perception and learning, scholars agree that individuals' perception of his immediate environment affect his academic performance (Owana, 2018; Ibrahim, 2014; Nwadinigwe, 2006). Wohlwill (2017) alluded that perception is influenced by behavioural and central determinants such as needs, values, tensions, rewards and experiences. He concluded that since these traits are different in individual, the differential perception arises there from. Moscovic (2019) believed that various stimuli include perception and learning hence the need to prevent stimuli in specific and intensive way so as to provide insight into what is being learnt.

Contextually, classrooms are regarded, first, as segment of agents of socialisation, and second, as psychological atmospheres in which teachers and students interact and learn. This is because the classroom is a unit within which a phenomenal range of behaviour is not only possible but highly probably. In a typical classroom, common themes have been found to recur among the perceptions of members of particular class, since students who are members of the classroom often tend to attribute to themselves characteristics they assume to be typical peer groups to which they are strongly attracted and with which they wish to identify themselves. In fact, students who have acquired poor perception in some areas seem to reject their own success experiences at first. Presumably, they do so because these experiences are not congruent with their perception. For instance, the desire to be affiliated with and identified with a powerful dominant majority may lead to perceptual distortions of teacher-students' interaction in the classroom. So also the socialisation process in the classroom may often involve particular kinds of training which foster development of particular qualities in perception. Hence, the individual, in everyday life, is engaged to some degree in a dialogue with social structure. The person may elect to minimize the dialogue (for reward, for simplicity, for certainty) by identifying closely or entirely with some specific piece of social structure (e.g., a school). Or the person may elect to maximise the dialogue with social structure, standing apart from it, though perhaps participating in it, reflecting, autonomously, continually evaluating the relationship (Ibrahim, 2019).

Therefore, the more talking a teacher allows amongst students, and encourages by his teaching methods, the greater the mutual liking there tends to be among them and the greater the class cohesiveness. The theories reviewed above have buttressed the theory that personality develops through interaction with other personalities. And of significance too is the fact that the quality of teacher-student interaction in the classroom is significant in determining the degree of influence or the effect which one personality had on another. Thus, the kind of roles the teacher assumes has a profound effect on the perceptions of the students toward him.

Research Hypotheses

Based on the objectives of this study, the research hypotheses formulated and tested in this study were:

1. There is no significant influence of students' perceived level of personalisation of the teacher's classroom behaviour on their participation in the classroom learning activities.
2. There is no significant influence of students' perceived level of personalisation of the classroom environment on their participation in the classroom learning activities.
3. Teachers will not significantly interact with girls and boys in the same manner in the classroom.

RESEARCH METHODS

Research Design

The study is exploratory in nature adopting descriptive survey research design. According to Upadhya and Singh (2008), descriptive survey research design is a type of research design that explains phenomena by collecting numerical data that are analysed using mathematically based methods. It is survey descriptive survey in that data gathered from the subjects with the use of questionnaire only describe whether teachers interact with girls and boys in the same manner in the classroom. There was no conscious manipulation of the variables since the interaction among them have been completed (Ibrahim, 2014).

Sample and Sampling Techniques

The population is the group of interest to the researcher, the group to which the researcher would like the results of the study to be generalisable (Upadhya & Singh, 2008). Thus, the population of the study comprised all male and female students in public Senior Secondary Schools in Jigawa state, Nigeria. There are 27 Local Government Areas (LGAs) in Jigawa state. Based on data provided by the Ministry of Education on enrolment in public Senior Secondary Schools by level, gender and LGAs, there are a total of 87,032 boys and girls in Senior Secondary Schools in the state. Out of this number, 57, 964 (66.6%) and 29,068 (33.4%) were boys and girls respectively. Specifically, in Senior Secondary Classes One (SS I), there are 24,131 (24.2%) and 10,568 (12.1%) boys and girls. This is followed by 15, 360 (17.7%) and 11, 451 (13.2%) boys and girls in Senior Secondary Classes Two (SS II), as well as 18,473 (21.2%) and 10, 049 (11.6%) boys and girls in Senior Secondary Classes Three (SSIII) respectively, making a total of 87,032 (100%) boys and girls in Senior Secondary Schools in the state as at the time of this study.

Multi-stage sampling technique is a complex form of cluster sampling in which two or more levels of units are embedded one in the other. The first stage consists of constructing the clusters that will be used to sample from. In the second stage, a sample of primary units is randomly selected from each cluster rather than using all units contained in all selected clusters (Upadhya & Singh, 2008). Hence, multi-stage sampling technique was used in selecting the SS III students in the study. The students were selected using the 27 LGAs in the state as the first stratum. From each of the LGAs, one Senior Secondary Schools in urban area and one Senior Secondary Schools in rural area were selected using simple random technique. From each of the selected urban and rural Senior Secondary Schools, stratified random sampling method was employed to select a total of 210 SS III students totalling 11,340 across the state, using sex and class as strata. The students were selected from 27 urban and 27 rural Senior Secondary Schools in each of the LGAs making a total of 54 public Senior Secondary Schools. 105 male and 105 female students were selected from each of the randomly selected one urban and one rural public Senior Secondary Schools making a total of 5,670 SS III students per urban and rural public Senior Secondary Schools. This was done to balance gender difference and to ensure gender equity. Thus, a total of 11, 340 consisting of 2,835 male and 2,835 Senior Secondary Classes Three (SSIII) students served as accessible population in the study.

A sample is a part or portion of the population for which data are actually gathered, selected in such a way as to be fairly representative of the parent population and must possess the desired characteristic of the population (Ilogu & Nzelibe, 2017; Obe, 2015). This is to enable results based on the sample to be generalisable or inferred to the entire population, and to improve the external validity of the study. Thus, the sample size refers to the actual number of the participants to be scientifically selected for the study that

should be representative of the population. Other things being equal, the larger the sample, the greater the precision and accuracy of the data it provides (Upadhya & Singh, 2008).

Consequently, the sample size was determined using Krejcie and Morgan (1970) sampling Table, which shows that from a total of 11, 340, the appropriate sample size for the study was 370 Senior Secondary Classes Three (SS1II) students. Of this number, 185 were boys and 185 were girls selected through stratified sampling procedure using sex as stratum. Their average age was 15.17 years. All 370 students returned the instrument administered on them. Thus, the return rate was 100%. Noteworthy, SS III students were selected because they were considered more matured and capable of making decisive judgement on what affect them during classroom interactions than their counterparts in Junior Secondary Schools in the state.

Instrumentation

A highly structured self-developed instrument tagged: “Teacher Interaction Questionnaire (TIQ)”, was used to collect data in the study. The instrument contained 30 items divided into three sections and rated on a five-point Likert-scale graduated from “Most of the time” to “None of the time” agreement about the statement. The questionnaire was of three parts: part one elicited students’ bio-data such as name of the institution, sex, class, age, LGA, today’s date, name of school, location of school, to mention only a few. The second part comprised of three sections, which consisted thirty items with each item designed to collectively measure each of the dimensions of schooling processes by examining the issue of gender equity in teacher-classroom behaviour. Section A consists of 10 items, measures students’ perceived level of personalisation of the teacher classroom behaviour on their participation in the classroom learning activities. Section B consists of 10 items and measures students’ perceived level of personalisation of the classroom environment on their participation in the classroom learning activities. While Section C consists of 10 items and measures nature of teacher-students’ classroom interaction.

Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

Validity is the degree to which the research instrument measures what it has been designed to measure and it also assists the researcher assess the questionnaire’s contents. In other words, validity is an indication of how sound one’s research is. More specifically, validity in data collection means that one’s findings truly represent the phenomenon the researcher is investigating. Hence, validity claims are solid claims (Ilogu & Nzalibe, 2017). The face and construct validity of the instrument were established through subjecting items to expert judgments of five experts. Two of these experts were Tests and Measurement, while the remaining three were Educational Psychology, Sociology of Education and Guidance and Counselling experts respectively.

Afolabi (2012) maintained that face validity of instrument is based upon a superficial examination of the nature of the instrument. Hence, the experts appraised the items based on ambiguity, relevance and sentence structure respectively. The experts’ judgments revealed that the instrument had adequate face and construct validity. Thereafter, a pilot study was conducted to establish the reliability of the instrument. This involves the double administration of the instruments on 30 Senior Secondary School Classes Three (SS III) students from a public senior secondary school with a two-week interval. The 30 students randomly selected were not the same with the 370 students used for the study as sample. A Pearson product moment correlation co-efficient formula was used for data analysis. The result shows a test-retest reliability co-efficient of 0.87 ($n = 30$; $p < 0.05$) and internal consistency reliability estimate of 0.78 ($n = 30$; $p < 0.05$). The test-retest reliability was

preferred because of the desire to determine the internal consistency of the instrument for data collection. Thus, the instrument was accepted as highly reliable, consistent and valid over time.

Data Collection

The research instrument was personally administered to the respondents by the researchers with the aid of the Research Assistants recruited for the purpose of this study. A total of 370 instruments were administered on the selected sample. All questionnaires were returned correctly filled by students making a return rate of 100% was achieved. Thereafter, a key was developed to code every information received from the questionnaire. Hence, the questionnaires were scored variable-by-variable as guided by the research hypotheses. For part one of the questionnaire, items 1-8 enabled the classification of the respondents into male and female students; high perception and low perception; urban and rural secondary school students. Part two, section A, B, and C of the questionnaire consisted of thirty items which were broken down to variables in the study. Each of the items was scored in an increasing (ascending) order of magnitude for those items that were positively worded; while those items that were negatively worded were scored in a decreasing (descending) order of magnitude. The combination of these scores formed the basis on which the data were analyzed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Using updated SPSS version 24.0., the data collected were subjected to analysis, computing first, the mean (\bar{x}) scores and standard deviations (SD). Afterwards, independent t-test statistical method was used to test hypotheses one, two, and three. Hence, all hypotheses postulated were tested at 0.05 level of significance.

Table 1. *Influence of Students' Personalisation of Teacher Classroom Behaviour on Their Participation in the Classroom Learning Activities*

Variables	N	Mean (\bar{x}) Scores	SD	t-cal	p
High Perception	286	18.13	2.51		
Low Perception	84	15.32	3.37	4.64	<0.05

***Significant; df = 368, critical t = 1.649**

Table 1 shows that significant influence of students' perceived level of personalisation of the teacher's classroom behaviour on their participation in the classroom learning activities exist ($t = 4.64$, $df = 368$; $p < 0.05$); since the calculated t-value of 4.64 was greater than the critical t-value of 1.649 given 368 degree of freedom at 0.05 level of significance. Consequently, the research hypothesis was supported. This means that there is a significant influence of students' perceived level of personalisation of the teacher classroom behaviour on their participation in the classroom learning activities.

This finding is not surprising as it is in consonant with the findings of Araujo et al., (2016); Bassi et al., (2015) and Bertrand & Pan (2013). These scholars in their separate findings discovered that there is a difference in teachers' behaviour towards girls and boys; that teachers interact more with boys than girls in four major areas of teacher-classroom behaviour which comprise of approval instruction, feedback, listening to and prohibitory messages. Thus, boys received more than their fair share of teacher attention. Similarly, Bassi et al., (2015) reported that teachers interact more with boys than with girls as boys receive more praise, criticism, and remediation than girls. Also, teachers are less likely to

reject behaviour by boys, even if it violates classroom rules. Girls receive more acceptance than boys. Also, girls who receive less attention from their teachers may come to underestimate their abilities and lose motivation.

The implication of this result is that such personalisation of the teacher's classroom behaviour on their participation in the classroom learning activities ultimately leads to the development of either negative or positive self-concept by such students in such teachers' subjects. This either make them a good achiever academically or a bad one. Hence, the kinds of roles the teacher assumes, be it nomothetic or ideographic, have a profound effect on the perceptions of students toward her/him, and the way a particular student is regarded by her/his classmates is affected by the teacher's behaviour toward her/him.

Table 2. Influence of Students' Perceived Level of Personalisation of the Classroom Environment on Their Participation in the Classroom Learning Activities

Variables	N	Mean (\bar{x}) Scores	SD	t-cal	p
High Perception	235	20.42	2.74		
Low Perception	135	17.63	3.08	3.72	<0.05

***Significant; df = 368, critical t = 1.649**

Table 2 shows that significant influence of students' perceived level of personalisation of the classroom environment on their participation in the classroom learning activities exist ($t = 3.72$, $df. = 368$; $p < 0.05$); since the calculated t-value of 3.72 was greater than the critical t-value of 1.649 given 368 degree of freedom at 0.05 level of significance. Consequently, the research hypothesis was retained. This means that there is a significant influence of students' perceived level of personalisation of the classroom environment on their participation in the classroom learning activities.

This finding corroborates Ibrahim (2014) and Golombok & Fivush (2014) who concluded that degree of personalisation of the classroom environment significantly influences academic achievement. The reason for this finding could be that the more personalised the classroom environment is to an individual, the more s/he feels at ease in it, hence the more s/he is predisposed to learn therein. Not only this, but also the finding supports earlier study by Delamont (2016), who reported that student rate of perception of classroom environment as psychologically conducive does not affect their level of adjustment in it. The finding is in consonance with Ibrahim (2014) claim, which had alluded to the individual student's perception which evolves from the forces of interaction in the classroom, since classrooms are psychological atmosphere whereby teachers and students interact and learn. While the formal curricula of the school help to organise the activities of education, the classroom has a second hidden curricula that influence the behaviours of learners in the same way as other various activities that take place in it and the styles of the individual teacher in the classroom. This is because teaching styles show great diversity, partly because teachers find certain classroom roles more compatible than others and develop the more comfortable ones. Thus, the kind of perception a student has about her/his teacher tends to influence her/his self-concept towards this teacher and the subjects s/he teaches. This eventually affects her/his academic performance at large. This explains why teachers, students and classroom observers do not share the same perspective concerning what took place in the classroom.

In general, students and teachers agree about classroom events. This is probably because teachers are preoccupied with teaching; they are thinking about the next question that they are going to ask, as well as who they have just called upon and her/his answer, and what

misbehaviours might be occurring in another part of the room; in as much as, so much happens so quickly in a classroom that no teacher can be aware of all that occurs during an instructional period of teaching. Of course, teachers have individual, rather than prescribed attitudes and values about behaviour. They tend to agree, however, that student behaviour is bad if it is disruptive or if it threatens the authority of the teacher, since teachers of today are more sensitive to the students' psychological problems even if they are not expressive and hostile behaviours.

Table 3. Whether Teachers Interact with Girls and Boys in the Same Manner in School

Variables	Male Students (N = 185)		Female Students (N = 185)		t-cal
	Mean Scores	SD	Mean Scores	SD	
Teacher encourages students to try again	5.17	2.12	6.16	2.56	1.91(ns)
Teacher praises students for a good job done	5.05	3.41	5.82	3.66	1.64 (ns)
Teacher helps students to correct a wrong answer	6.88	3.97	4.05	2.62	2.42*
Teacher rebukes students for giving wrong answer	4.99	3.85	3.38	1.08	1.23 (ns)
Teacher makes negative comments on students	5.38	4.10	3.65	1.87	2.41*
Teacher accepts correct answer given when a student is called or	5.50	3.84	4.23	1.06	1.18 (ns)
Teacher disciplines when a student shouts out an answer when not called on	4.00	2.73	4.21	1.94	1.86 (ns)

ns = not significant at 0.05; df. = 183; t-critical = 1.649

Table 3 presents the mean ranking of whether teachers interact with girls and boys in the same manner in school. As shown in Table 1, girls more than boys ranked teachers' behaviours such as "Teacher encourages students to try again; Teacher praises students for a good job done, and Teacher disciplines when a student shouts out an answer when not called on" as behaviours directed towards female students than male students. However, boys more than girls ranked teachers' behaviours such as "Teacher helps students to correct a wrong answer; Teacher rebukes students for giving wrong answer; Teacher makes negative comments on students; and Teacher accepts correct answer given when a student is called on" as behaviours directed towards male students than female students in the classroom.

Further, the result of the independent t-test shows that t- calculated values of 1.91; 1.64; 1.23; 1.18; and 1.86 for " Teacher encourages students to try again; Teacher praises students for a good job done; Teacher rebukes students for giving wrong answer; Teacher accepts correct answer given when a student is called on; and Teacher disciplines when a student shouts out an answer when not called on" are less than the t- critical value of 1.649 given 368 degree of freedom at 0.05 level of significance. These results showed no significant difference; hence, the null hypothesis was retained, which means that teachers do not significantly interact with girls and boys the same manner in school. Other two exhibited teacher classroom behaviours (Teacher helps students to correct a wrong answer; and Teacher makes negative comments on students) showed a significant difference.

Also, the study showed teachers do not significantly interact with girls and boys in the same manner in the classroom. Our findings revealed that girls more than boys ranked teachers' behaviours such as teacher encouragement, teacher praises students for a good job done, and teacher discipline as behaviours directed towards them than their male counterparts. Whereas, boys more than girls ranked teachers' behaviours such as teacher assistance to correct a wrong answer; teacher rebukes and negative comments on students; and teacher acceptance of correct answer given when a student is called on as behaviours directed towards them than female counterparts in the classroom. These findings are consistent with Carneiro et al., (2017) study, when they reported that the quality of interactions between teachers and students affects differences in math scores among children in early elementary school. Boys tend to be more active than girls; teachers may instinctively pay more attention to boys in order to control the classroom. The fact that class does not capture attention to different groups of students may explain why Carneiro et al., (2017) find no correlation between class and gender differences in learning outcomes.

The researchers believe that teaching quality is imperative to good learning outcome. An effective teacher reduces the learning gap between able and not-too-able students. The dichotomy between effective teachers and non-effective teachers cannot be predicated on observable characteristics such as the level of education, experience, age, to mention only a few. Instead, effective teaching is associated with the quality of the interactions between teachers and their students, with what happens inside the classroom and how the teacher uses the time in class. However, one can imagine what happens when teachers engage more or differently with some students than with others; as students learn more when teachers spend more class time on academic activities, keep students engaged for longer periods of time, and minimize the time spent on classroom management activities, for instance, taking attendance, explaining the schedule for the day, distributing papers, and so forth. Hence, schooling experience and its outcome are not the same for girls and boys.

CONCLUSION

From the findings of this study, it can be concluded that there existed a significant influence of students' perceived level of personalisation of the teachers' classroom behaviour and classroom environment on their participation in the classroom learning activities. Also, teachers do not significantly interact with girls and boys in the same manner in the classroom. Thus, it was recommended that teachers' classroom behaviour deserves careful attention by all stakeholders in education of the school children, as teachers need to call on or talk to both female and male students in a balanced way. When calling on students who seem to wait longer to answer a question, teacher should make sure to give students at least four to five seconds, as giving students more time to answer will increase the number of students who participate in classroom teaching and learning. Also, appropriate interventionist strategies should be put in place to assist realising the objective of equal educational opportunity.

There is no doubt that interaction with teachers is beneficial to children's learning. For instance, it is believed that criticism received by boys was related to their academic performance. On the other hand, a higher proportion of girls than boys praise was related to their behaviour. If we work out the length of the child's school career, say 15,000, it means more hours than their fair share have been spent on boys than girls, with cumulative consequences for major areas of personal contribution to national development. The link between gender differences in classroom interactions and gender differences in

achievement and attitude should be explored in order to appreciate the magnitude of gender inequality in teacher classroom behaviour.

Another implication that appears obvious is that, regardless of the sex of the teacher, she or he must work in the direction of modifying orientations toward and expectations about male and female pupils. Considering both sexes to have similar cognitive resources during the very elementary years may be a partial determinant of boy's later dissatisfaction with school. Teachers who expect the same level of academic performance for both sexes during these early years may actually be generating in male pupils feelings of inadequacy, incompetency, and negative attitudes toward teachers in general.

The results of this study point to the significant impact of the immediate classroom milieu for a pupil's academic performance. Social-emotional aspects of both sexes relations and teacher relationships appear to be just as important, if not more so, than the extra-school interpersonal influences of the parents in shaping a pupil's motivation to learn and his consequent academic performance. A lack of congruence between the way a pupil feels about classroom behaviours and how he thinks the teacher feels is accompanied by a low level of academic performance. It was further assumed that with few rewards forthcoming from the teacher, a pupil feels excluded and often develops feelings of inadequacy and incompetency. Since individuals tend to behave in a manner consistent with their self-images, it seemed probable that those pupils who see themselves as inadequate and incompetent will be deterred from effective classroom interaction and academic performance.

REFERENCES

- Abe, A. (2014). Gender inequality: Teaching for gender difference. *The Counsellor*, 4(1), 123-130.
- Afolabi, E. R. I. (2012). Validity and reliability. In E.R.I. Afolabi & O. O. Dibu-Ojerinde (Eds.), *Educational tests & measurement* (pp. 190-200). Ile-Ife, Nigeria: Obafemi Awolowo University Press.
- Araujo, M.C., Carneiro, P., Cruz-Aguayo, Y., & Schady, N. (2016). *Teacher quality and learning outcomes in kindergarten*. Washington, DC: Harper & Row Inc.
- Bassi, M., Busso, M., & Muñoz, J. S. (2015). Enrollment, graduation and dropout rates in Latin America: Is the glass half empty or half full? *Economics Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Association*, 16(1), 113–156.
- Bertrand, M., & Pan, J. (2013). The trouble with boys: Social influences and the gender gap in disruptive behaviour. *American Economics Journal of Applied Psychology*, 5(1), 32–64.
- Bharadwaj, P., DeGiorgi, G., Hansen, D., & Neilson, C. (2015). *The gender gap in mathematics: Evidence from a middle-income country*. New York: Federal Reserve Bank of New York.
- Bos, M.S., Ganimian, A., & Vegas, E. (2014). *America Latina en PISA: Cómo se desempeñan los varones y las mujeres?* Washington, DC: Harper & Row Inc.
- Bruns, B., & Luque, J. (2015). *Great teachers: How to raise student learning in Latin America and the Caribbean*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Carneiro, P. M., Cruz-Aguayo, Y., & Schady, N.R. (2017). *Where the girls are not: Households, teachers, and the gender gap in early math achievement*. Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank <https://doi.org/10.18235/000070>
- Delamont, S. (2016). *Women's place in education*. Brookfield, MA: Avebury Publishers.

- Evertson, C. M. (2001). Relationship between classroom behaviour and student outcome in junior high school mathematics and English language. *American Educational Research Journal*, 17(1), 43-60.
- Fraser, B. (2001). *Learning environment in curriculum evaluation: A review*. Oxford: Pengamon.
- Gibson, E. (2001). *Principles of perceptual learning and development*. New York: Appleton.
- Golombok, S., & Fivush, R. (1994). *Gender development*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hebb, D.O. (2011). *The organisation of behaviour*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Ibrahim, A. (2019). The teaching of the school child and classroom management. In A. D. Usoro (Eds.), *Basics in quality teacher preparation* (pp.147-151). Moldova, Europe: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.
- Ibrahim, A. (2014). The students' perception of teachers' classroom effectiveness on their self-concepts in Lagos metropolis. *Journal of Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2(2), 133-141. <http://journals.uob.edu.bh>
- Ilogu, G.C. (2001). Students' perception of their chemistry teachers and its influence on their chemistry performance. *Lagos Journal of Educational Research*, 1(1), 16-27.
- Ilogu, G. C., & Nzelibe, C.G.O. (2017). *Fundamentals of research methods*. Enugu, Nigeria: Optimal Publishers
- Lavy, V., & Sand, E. (2015). *On the origins of gender human capital gaps: Short- and long-term consequences of teachers' stereotypical biases*. Cambridge: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Martin, J., Veldman, D., & Anderson, L. (2018). Within class relationships between students' achievement and teachers' behaviour. *American Educational Research Journal*, 17(4), 479-490.
- Moscovic, S. (2019). Influence of a consistent minority on the responses of a majority in a colour perception test. *Sociometry*, 32(6), 365-380.
- National Policy on Education (NPE) (2014). *Philosophy and goals of education in Nigeria*. Yaba, Lagos: NERDC Press.
- Nwadinigwe, I.P. (2006). Differential perception of classroom environment and academic achievement of senior secondary school students in Lagos Mainland Local Government Area: Implication for Counselling. *Journal of Educational Research and Development*, 1(1), 29-38.
- Obe, E. O. (2015). Towards funding educational research: Topic selection, proposal, justification and budget. *Lagos Journal of Educational Research*, 1(1), 1-15.
- Owana, V.C. (2018). The relationship between self -perception and academic achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 60(1), 308-314.
- Owen, L., & Barnes, J. (2012). Effects of cooperation, competition, and individualised learning preferences on students' perception of classroom learning atmosphere. *American Educational Research Journal*, 19(2), 182-200.
- Rubbins, R. (2018). Difference between sexes in mathematics and science course. *International Review of Education*, 19(1), 47-63.
- Stallings, J., & Knight, S. (2003). *Using the stallings observation system to investigate: Time on task in four countries*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Schachter, S. (2008). Cognitive effects of bodily functioning. In K. Doyle Jr. (Eds.), *Interaction: Readings in human psychology* (pp. 145-148). London: D.C. Health and company.

- Terrier, C. (2016). *Boys lag behind: How teachers' gender biases affect student achievement*. Bonn: Institute of Labour Economics.
- Upadhya, B., & Singh, Y. K. (2008). *Advanced educational psychology*. New Delhi: APH Publishing Corporation.
- Vaidya, L., & Chamsky, O. (2018). *Learning and teaching: Processes and practices*. New York: Salmon Press.
- Walberg, H. (2019). Social environment as a mediator of classroom learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 60(4), 443-449.
- Wohlwill, J. F. (2017). The physical environment: A problem for a psychology of stimulation. In K. Doyle Jr. (Eds.), *Interaction: Readings in human psychology* (pp. 174-188). London: D.C. Health and Company.
- Zimmermann, J. (2013). The corner school development programme. *Education Research Consumer Guide*, 6(3), 164-169.