Since the educational system has adopted the practice of coeducation, some people have the opinion that returning to gender-segregated schools might have a positive effect on pupils. Those in favour of single-sex schools argue that separating boys and girls in school allows for a better focus on each gender's strengths and weaknesses. In their opinion the chance of academic success is much higher in a single-sex environment and this can be observed in private single-sex schools. Despite the arguments in favour, we should not switch to single-sex education because these kinds of schools are not inherently better than their coeducational counterparts and they bear many dangers like creating further gender bias and the risk of financial discrimination.

Firstly, pupils of private single-sex schools do not perform better academically because of the gender-segregated nature of the schools, but rather for other reasons. While some differences can be seen in the way that boys and girls perform in these environments, all these differences can be explained by factors other than gender. Private schools generally preselect their students using tests (academic and psychological) and admission fees to weed out the children they do not deem compatible with their school. Apart from weeding out the academically weak demographic of less wealthy people, admission fees also serve the purpose of guaranteeing good funding. Schools that have better funding than the average, government funded school allow a better teacher-to-student ratio, which allows the teachers to focus on every student individually. These differences in funding and demographic, not the fact that girls and boys are taught separately, are the reasons for the high rate of academic success among pupils of these schools.

Another downside of switching to single-sex education is the problem of adding another layer of financial discrimination to our already flawed school-funding system. At present, financial discrimination is restricted to geographical and socio-demographic factors. Schools in areas with an economically weak population usually do not receive as much

Comment [E1]: This is an example of a theoretical introduction. In this case the author has presented one side of the argument first and countered that with their thesis statement. When writing an introduction this way it is important to use a linking phrase / word of contradiction when introducing the thesis statement.

Comment [E2]: note the introductory phrase of this topic sentence. also because it is the first body paragraph and the main idea takes a lot of words to express it, is ok to not write this topic sentence like a mini thesis statement.

Comment [E3]: development

Comment [E4]: illustration – all very concrete examples of the above mentioned factors

Comment [E5]: this wrap up restates everything that has already been said in a different way. "pupils do not perform better academically ... but rather for other reasons" was changed to "these differences ..., not the fact that..., are the reasons for the high rate of ....". changing the phrasing, using synonyms, and varying word classes are all strategies of doing this.

Comment [E6]: this topic sentence continues to guide the reader by using transitional phrasing (another downside). it is also a successful attempt at a mini-thesis statement. notice, that it does not simply repeat the thesis statement's assertion (we should not switch), but changes the word class (another downside of switching to) so that it does not sound repetitive.

financial aid as schools in wealthier areas because schools are funded by the money received through taxes. Adding gender-segregated schools into this already complicated system would mean another school competing for funding and it would be extremely difficult to keep up an appearance of fairness. For example, if one school receives more funding than the other this could be perceived as discriminating against one gender. As gender and gender-based discrimination is an emotionally loaded topic, single sex schools would be detrimental to the morale of pupils and the population in general.

Lastly, single-sex education furthers gender stereotypes. Those in favour of single-sex schools argue that girls and boys perform better in certain subjects, but, in fact, girls and boys are not inherently worse at particular subjects. The real problem is that both genders have been encouraged to pay more attention to fields of study "appropriate" to their gender. Single-gender school advocates also argue that co-gender classes lead to both sexes being distracted. The assumption that young people are incapable of following lessons if a member of the opposite sex is present is not only sexist, but also insulting to the intelligence of said young people. It implies that young men are primarily driven by their sexual urges, young women have nothing better to do than seek the attention of their male peers and both are not capable of prioritizing. Clearly these two aspects of gender stereotyping should not be furthered with the spread of single-sex environments.

The assumption that single-sex education is inherently superior to coeducation is false. Private single-sex schools cannot be used as a positive example in this case because they are too different from regular, government funded schools and there are other factors, apart from their single-sex nature, that play into their pupils' academic success. Furthermore, gender-segregated schools bear a lot of risks such as accepting and possibly furthering outdated stereotypes or the danger of financially discriminating against one gender. Keeping these problems in mind is extremely important when arguing in favour of single-sex schools.

Comment [E7]: this time the development is a bit longer, because claims made in the topic sentence are not as obvious.

Comment [E8]: in this case a short example is all that the author needed to give to illustrate the argument

Comment [E9]: again, rather than restating "we should not switch" the author says it in a different way. it is also important to note that the first part of this wrap up is used as a way to transition from the example to the restated main idea part of the wrap up (it also adds a few words to the shortes of the three body paragraphs).

Comment [E10]: the last topic sentnece is short and sweet. perfectly acceptable some times.

Comment [E11]: development – we kind of have two ideas here, but as they both fall under stereotyping, it's ok. also note that although the counter argument is mentioned, it is also refuted right away and it was really the only way to bring up the idea. be EXTREMELY careful doing this if you chose to. if you don't have to bring in the counter argument, don't.

Comment [E12]: illustration

Comment [E13]: wrap up

Comment [E14]: conclusion – restating argument, and three supporting ideas in different ways than they were said before. this conclusion could have gone a step further by universalizing, or reflecting on the situation. the way it ends is also ok though.