

## Communication Behavior Based on Gender Responsive in Primary School

Ernita Arif<sup>1</sup>, Aida Vitayala S Hubeis<sup>2</sup>, Basita Ginting Sugihen<sup>2</sup>, Ninuk Purnaningsih<sup>2</sup>,  
Amiruddin Saleh<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>) Lecturers of Andalas University –Indonesia,

<sup>2</sup>) Lecturer at the Faculty of Human Ecology, Bogor Agricultural University-Indonesia  
Kampus IPB Dramaga Bogor-Indonesia  
Email: arifernita@yahoo.co.id

### Abstract

*In addition to poor communication, the teacher is still differentiate between male and female students. If the communication behavior of the teacher in the learning process is not gender responsive, it will affect the successful of the learning process. Gender responsive teacher communication behavior will improve the quality of learning. The objective of this research were to analyze the communication behavior of male and female teacher in urban and rural areas. The research was conducted in the city of Padang and Padang Pariaman District began in August to December 2013. Total sample of 200 people consisting of 100 male and 100 female were scattered in cities and in villages. Data analysis using Spearman rank, Chi Square correlation. The research results showed that verbal communication behaviors that include snarl words, purr words, degrading words, confirmation, taboos and euphemisms including the high category is spoken by male and female the teacher in both urban and rural, communication behavior nonverbal such as tone of voice, facial expression, eye contact, proximity, and the average time high.*

*Keywords: teacher, communication behavior, verbal and nonverbal, gender responsive*

### Introduction

Progress of a nation development must be supported by good quality resources, especially human resources aspects. To produce good human resources and quality of education obtained through the process of good quality and also, through formal education, nonformal or informal. The factors that affect the passage of the education process is the presence of teachers, students, community support and government policy.

The teacher is an important and strategic factor in the learning process to produce a quality educates students in addition to other factors. Because, through knowledge transfer teachers to educate students to achieve progress in learning process. The interaction of teachers and students are going well can produce changes in behavior and knowledge in students.

Teacher interaction in the learning process is closely related to communication for almost the entire process of learning to use communication both verbal and nonverbal. The process of learning requires teachers who have good communication skills both verbal and nonverbal. Good communication climate will affect the attitudes of students in learning (Alkatiri 2011). Masjub & Rais (2010) have found that students expect that teachers should not use negative or harsh words.

The failure of the learning process is not always because of the ability of the students, but there are other factors that further specify which related to of communication. Teachers sometimes neglect aspects of communication where the teacher merely convey material without thinking about how the material can be well received by the students so as to make the learning

process into something that is fun for students is not something rigid and frightening. Eriyanti (2011) found that poor communication between teacher and students what students can cause of rejection, accusations, belittling and dignity of the students ability, judgment and censure, coercion, threats, and outbursts of anger. This can result in stiff and tense situation learning because students fear. Poor communication also have a negative impact on students psychological, in the form of fear, shame to classmates, the growth of apparent compliance, verbal resistance, and mimicked ridicule friends.

In addition to poor communication, the teacher is still differentiate between male students with female students. The results of the study Jatiningsih & Kartikasari (2010) found the teachers still distinguish between male and female students, because the boys and girls are socialized differently. Salamah (2006), states that the learning activities and processes of interaction in the classroom are often detrimental to female students. Teachers unconsciously tend to put their hope and greater attention to male students than female students as teachers pointing male student class chief head leader , master of ceremonies, and so forth. The same thing also expressed men still placed in a more favorable position in the overall process of education (Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional 2010). Puspitawati et al. (2013) found that a third (31.6 percent) teachers attention to students differentiate male and female according to the physical and psychosocial needs. The results of the study Triana et al. (2003) also showed that gender socialization in schools of West Sumatra, both in curricular and extracurricular activities, flows to

dichotomy feminine and masculine. Suharyo et al. (2003) found that male are still dominant in behavior in the classroom, at school, and even in socially at school. The students are still divided into steriotipy female are feminine and men are masculine. Bayraktar (2011) found that teachers have a variety of roles and styles in students by gender interaction.

The government has sought to narrow or eliminate the gender gap in the various fields of life to the enactment of Presidential Decree No. 9 of 2000 on gender mainstreaming in national development, which is then followed by the release of Ministerial Regulation No. 84 Year 2008 on Guidelines for the Implementation of Gender Mainstreaming in Education. The expectation around the interactions that occur in the learning process can apply principles of justice and gender equality the attention of male and female. This study aims to analyze the level of teacher communication behavior in gender responsive classroom.

### **Methods**

The study was designed as descriptive explanatory survey, and was conducted in the city of Padang and Padang Pariaman of West Sumatra Province held for five months, from August to December 2013. Population consisted of male and female who teach in elementary school, the total sample of 100 teachers in the city of Padang (50 male and 50 female) and 100 teachers in the district of Padang Pariaman (50 male and 50 female) using Taro Yamane formula. The data collected consisted of primary data and secondary data. The collection of primary data through questionnaires, indepth interviews, focus group discussions, and direct observation. Quantitative data were analyzed using

descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. Spearman rank correlation test and Chi Square ( $X^2$ ) was applied to determine the relationship between X with Y variables, whereas the t- test was applied to determine the difference between a teacher at the village in the town, and between male female teachers. The process of data analysis using SPSS 20 software.

### **Results**

Male and female teachers generally are productive adulthood (36-50 years) in both urban and rural. The level of formal education is generally taken in the category of high teacher both in cities and in villages even though there are 30 percent who have high education below bachelor. Associated with the background of teachers, teachers generally come from a family of farmers, number of siblings on average 4-7 people, the number of sisters an average of 3-5 people, number of brothers 0-2 people, and status in the family as middle child. Teaching experience male teachers and girls are generally quite low (1-12 years). Cosmopolitan knowledge of individual all were low, meaning that teachers rarely travel out of town/village for activities such as searching for information to the education department, attending meetings, training, attending seminars, working groups following the teacher, following the comparative study, and visit the library as well as low in the use of mass media such as radio,

newspapers, magazines, television and the internet. Based on the different test there is a significant difference between teachers level of education of male and female where male teachers are more highly educated than female teachers. It is presumed male teachers have more access and opportunities than female teachers. Female teachers have limitations and constraints to continue their education because of the multiple roles in addition to working as well as housewives. Based on the different test there is a significant difference between teachers cosmopolitan level in the rural town where teacher in the city is more cosmopolitan than the teacher in the village. This is due to the teachers in the city have more access and are in the provincial capital. While a teacher in a rural far from the center of information and constraints transportasi means to get to town.

Gender responsive communication behavior is a form of verbal and nonverbal responses are expressed in the form of words spoken and the attitude displayed by the male and female teachers and students. In this study gender responsive teacher communication behaviors were analyzed from verbal communication through negative words, positive words, degrading words, confirmation, euphemism and taboo spoken by the teacher as well as nonverbal communication through tone of voice, facial expression, eye contact, proximity, and time. More are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Mean scores of communication behavior

Communication behavior	The mean scores							
	Urban		Rural		Total		Coefficient (t test)	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	Areas	Gender
1. Verbal Communication								
Snarl words	2,86	2,88	2,98	2,99	2,92	2,93	4,03*	27,70**
Purr words	3,07	3,13	2,72	2,80	2,90	2,96	108,43**	1,34
Degrading words	2,82	2,91	2,89	2,97	2,85	2,94	6,91*	34,72**
Confirmation	2,88	3,03	3,00	3,02	2,94	3,02	160,88**	0,10
Taboo	3,13	3,05	3,10	3,03	3,11	3,04	3,33	56,05**
Euphemism	2,81	2,77	2,01	2,04	2,41	2,41	110,63**	2,60
2. Nonverbal Communication								
Tone of voice	3,02	2,96	2,87	2,86	2,91	2,91	0,17	0,12
Facial expressions	3,09	3,20	3,04	3,08	3,07	3,14	39,30**	26,11**
Eye contact	3,29	3,38	2,88	2,87	3,09	3,12	26,63**	7,97*
Proximity	2,72	2,89	2,35	2,52	2,54	2,70	2,52	0,04
Time	3,05	3,04	3,03	3,00	3,04	3,02	13,47**	1,91

Description : The mean score of 2.01 to 2.33 = very low, 2.34 to 2.66 = low, high = 2.67 to 2.99, 3.00 to 3.32 = very high. \* Significant at  $p < 0.05$ , \*\* Significant at  $p < 0.01$

Verbal communication behavior in terms of the usage of negative words, positive words, degrading words, confirmation, taboo and euphemism generally include both high responders in cities and villages, as well as nonverbal communication behavior in terms of tone of voice, facial expression, eye contact, and time is generally too high. The use of negative words pronounced by higher teacher in the village of teachers in the city. It means that teachers in the village tend to use negative words like lazy, stupid, *mada*, like noise, and so on to students. It is alleged the teacher in the village received less coaching and training on communication. Female teachers more often use negative words than male teachers. This is due to the amount of more female teachers than male teachers, long service life as well as the double burden, so it is expected to affect the behavior of female teacher communication. Based on observations of female teachers tend to use negative words to the boys because boys are considered to have more learning problems than female students. Pronunciation of words *mada*, stupid,

lazy and so commonly heard in the learning process.

Teachers in the urban are more competent in using positive words such as smart, great, good child, and so on compared to teachers who are in the rural, it is thought to have been a teacher in the urban more advanced than the teachers in the rural through mass media such as television, radio, newspapers, magazines, and the Internet as well as following the training. In line with the opinion of Yoseph (2010) which says that a person can be a lot to know because a lot of listening, a lot of reading and a lot of communication. While teachers in the village have limitations in accessing information and following training. Based on the findings that male teachers in urban and rural in utter positive words tend to balance the male students and perempuan, whereas female teachers in urban and rural, especially in the villages tend to use positive words to male students men because it is considered male students need special attention.

Teachers in the urban high category using degrading words compared to teachers in the rural.

Female teachers high category using degrading words compared to male teachers. The use of the words high category degrading female conducted by the teacher to the males because males are considered often make teachers angry. Teachers in the urban over the students acknowledged the existence of a teacher in the rural. The use of euphemisms like “active children, children with special need, childrens mental retardation and so on” high category in urban than in rural. It is alleged the teacher in the urban more reading, many heard about the euphemism of books, the Internet, mass media, and training. Male teachers is keep the words taboo more female teachers.

Teacher non verbal communication behavior of male and female in both urban and rural general were high category. Teachers in the urban use nonverbal communication in terms of facial expressions, eye contact, and the time of the more teacher in the rural. Female teachers high category use nonverbal communication in terms of facial expressions and eye contact.

The teacher is a strategic factor in the learning process. The success of the learning process will be greatly influenced by the teachers competency communicate. Good teachers will have the ability to communicate both verbal and nonverbal. But in reality there is a difference between teacher communication behaviors of male and female and between teachers in the rural and urban. This becomes a discourse that need attention from various parties, especially the government. In order for future teachers both male and female in urban and rural communication competence same gender responsive thus improving the quality of learning both in rural and urban.

### References

- Alkatiri H. 2011. Alkatiri, H. 2011. *Pengaruh Komunikasi Persuasif Guru terhadap Sikap Siswa dalam Pembelajaran Pendidikan Agama Islam*. Tesis. Bandung: Universitas Padjajaran.
- Bayraktar A. 2011. Possible Effects of Gender on Teacher- Student Interactions. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15 : 2545-2548.
- Eriyanti, RW. 2011. Kekerasan Verbal dalam Pembelajaran di SMP Kota Malang. Disertasi. Malang Universitas Negeri Malang.
- Idris J. 2005. *Kompilasi Pemikiran Pendidikan*. Yogyakarta: Taufiqiyah Sa’adah dan Suluh Press.
- Jatiningsih, Kartikasari. 2010. *Upaya Menyemaikan Nilai-nilai Kesetaraan melalui Pendidikan Gender di Taman Kanak-Kanak*. [Penelitian]. Surabaya : Universitas Negeri Surabaya.
- [Kemendiknas] Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional. 2010. *Acuan Pelaksanaan Sekolah Dasar Berwawasan Gender*. Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional.
- Majzub RM , Rais M.M. 2010. Boys “underachievement” : Male versus Female Teachers. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* , 7 (C): 685-690.
- Puspitawati H, Sarma M, Herawati T, Latifah M, Moeljono P. 2013. *Analisis*