UNIVERSITY OF TARTU
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

REPRESENTATION OF GENDER IN THE DIALOGUES OF THE
TEXTBOOKS *ENGLISH STEP BY STEP 5* AND *I LOVE ENGLISH 5*
MA thesis

KÄTLIN LEHISTE
SUPERVISOR: *Assoc. Prof.* RAILI MARLING

TARTU
2013

ABSTRACT

The aim of this thesis is to analyse the representation of gender in the dialogues of two English language textbooks written by Estonian authors for Estonian learners: *English Step by Step 5* (2008) and *I Love English 5* (2008). In comparison to the general representation of men and women in textbooks, dialogues have not been analysed as extensively. However, they are of great importance in the language classroom as they help in developing and practising a variety of conversational skills related to the language being learnt. If one gender is given a smaller number of words or the characters of that gender are represented in a limited number of social roles, the students reading the part of those characters may get less practice opportunities or develop false assumptions of how native speakers of the target language speak.

The introduction of the thesis discusses the role of schools and educational media in the process of socialisation and how doing gender is involved in that process. It also explains how the dialogues create a social context for language use and how inequalities in gendered models of those dialogues can affect learning.

The first chapter gives an overview of the previous research on the topic of gender in textbooks, focusing generally on foreign language textbooks, but also including other textbooks studied in Estonia in order to give a broader overview of the local situation. Language use and its relation to gender are discussed in the second part. The third chapter describes the choice and structure of the materials, and lists the criteria for the quantitative and qualitative analysis. The quantitative analysis focuses on the number of female, male and gender-neutral characters, the number of words and utterances they have and how many mixed-gender dialogues they initiate or conclude. The qualitative analysis focuses on the social roles and settings the characters are presented in, the language used to present them and the language the characters use to address each other or talk about other people, which language functions – informative, phatic, directive or expressive – do the characters use, and which examples of polite language use can be found in their speech. The fourth chapter presents and discusses the findings of this study. The findings in the two books are compared to each other and also to the findings of the previous studies described earlier. Additionally, the possible practice opportunities in gendered roles ascribed by the books are discussed as well.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Inga Wernersson has described schools as "concise, intense mini versions of society" (quoted in Hermansson Hässler 2009: 23). They are important and influential environments for young citizens in forming their identities because they help them learn how to position themselves in different structures of social life. According to Viive-Riina Ruus (2007: 21), schools as social institutions use one of their tools – the curriculum – as a social regulation mechanism, the aim of which is to teach a person to act, feel, speak, and see the world and themselves in a certain way that is in accordance with the most common or governing beliefs of that society. Students are assessed and evaluated on what the national curriculum requires them to know and be aware of. The aim, as summarised by Gabrielle Ivinson and Patricia Murphy (2007: 10), is to become a competent schooled person in the subjects learned and to transform one's identity by using the ways of knowing and acting considered acceptable in different subjects.

The school-student relationship can be viewed as a reinforcement process, which, according to Susan Golombok and Robin Fivush (1994: 76), is based on the following principle in the social learning theory: "behaviour is modified by its consequence". This means that behaviour followed by consequences that are considered favourable (they are rewarded in some way) is more likely to be performed again in comparison to behaviour that is left unrewarded or is punished (Golombok and Fivush 1994). However, it can be relatively difficult to assess or evaluate beliefs or convictions, values and views. Therefore, they are more often than not described as part of the hidden curriculum. This is something that Veronika Kalmus (2002: 124), for example, describes as those values and beliefs that are

presented "silently", in a way that should make them self-explanatory. They are not tested, and in many cases they are not even acknowledged by textbook authors, teachers or students (Kalmus 2002). According to Edgar Reedik (2009: 23), the hidden curriculum can help the teaching-learning process or work against it at the same time. The hidden curriculum can be everything the official curriculum does not include and it can also be a part of it. Intentionally or unintentionally, the hidden curriculum is there, and it is considered to have a large influence on teaching and learning. (Reedik 2009) It can be seen to reflect in every aspect of school culture, which Tiiu Kuurme (2011: 253) explains as the joint creation of everyone involved with a school. Starting from different organisational patterns related to people, lessons or study materials and ending with general beliefs, values and ideologies, the influences of school culture are so broad that they are often regarded as natural or self-evident and they are "received" unconsciously (Kuurme 2011).

An aspect that is considered a part of the hidden curriculum and which is also seen as an important part of the socialisation process and forming one's identity is gender. Deeply embedded in society at large, gender is just as ubiquitous as the hidden curriculum in school culture. As Penelope Eckert and Sally McConnell-Ginet (2003: 33) describe it, gender is everywhere: from government offices to street games, it is in the family, the neighbourhood, church, school, the media, walking down the street, eating in a restaurant and going to the restroom. A person is surrounded by gender already before birth starting from the moment someone wonders about the sex of the expected child and it continues to be ever-present thereafter (Eckert and McConnell Ginet 2009: 15). Due to that, as Jeannine Marie Richards (2002a: 5) points out, people use gender to anchor much of their knowledge about their social environment.

There has been quite a lot of controversy around the appropriate use of the terms 'sex' and 'gender'. Generally, sex is seen as a biological distinction of male and female based on their reproductive potential, and gender is used in referring to the social traits and characteristics associated with each sex (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 2003: 10, Golombok and Fivush 1994: 3). Gender, unlike sex, should not be viewed as something people are born with or something they have – it is something people do (West and Zimmerman 1987: 126), something they perform (Butler 1999: 33). Moreover, according to Anne Fausto-Sterling (2000: 3), the selection of criteria to label someone biologically a male or female is largely based on people's cultural beliefs about what makes someone a male or female, that is, sex is also ultimately a social construct. The latter, as Raili Marling (2011b: 8) points out, does not deny the materiality of biological sex or the fact that men and women have different reproductive organs, it means that biology cannot exist outside culture and cultural norms influence the way biology is understood.

Although there are a great variety of individual modes of doing gender, they are guided by their culture's ideas of what is considered appropriate or expected of men and women. These accepted social or gender roles are learned by observing other members of the society (Golombok and Fivush 1994: 84-85). By learning, people accept and reproduce those roles, as according to Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (2003: 33), "our smallest interactions can be imbued with gender, and our continual performance in those interactions strengthens their role in supporting gender". However, nor the learned roles neither one's identification of themselves as a certain type of man or woman are fixed. As described by Jane Sunderland and Lia Litosseliti (2002: 7), both gender and identity can be seen as fluid and as never-ending processes. Likewise, gender roles also change in relation to changing economic or political situations, and also in relation to the general social development of a community (Marling

2011c: 291). Therefore, it can be said that gender is an integral part of a person's identity as a member of a certain society and people can perform their gender in a variety of ways without having to question their identity as a man or a woman.

Schools use a variety of tools and mediators for the activation of both the official and hidden curriculum. Textbooks and other educational media can be considered some of the most important agents in the process of socialisation. Educational media, according to Staffan Selander (1995: 9), is a broader term to refer to any kind of materials produced for educational purposes: texts, pictorial illustrations, films, computer programs, etc. These agents, as Kalmus (2003: 7) describes the process, are mainly used as means or instruments for passing knowledge and values from one generation to the next. However, textbook discourse, according to Kalmus (2000: 205), can be viewed as relatively controversial in its essence. On the one hand, the somewhat inert nature of the educational institution and the generation filter of the textbook authors ensure that textbooks reflect and reproduce the discursive and social order that has dominated for a longer period of time. On the other hand, textbooks can also be used to spread and support new ideologies. (Kalmus 2000) Either way, as Richards (2002a: 6) points out, the texts and images at school can be shared by entire generations and thus, they are worth analysing in detail.

The influences of the collective mentality of a society on textbook discourse are closely connected to the author's own intentions and viewpoints. Kalmus (2003: 8-9) brings out two general views on the influence and role of textbook authors. The supporters of one view are referred to as maximalists, who see textbook authors as active mediators in the process of socialisation, creating textbooks that act as representatives of educational institutions, dominant groups, or entire societies. Supporters of the other, often seen as the adversaries of the first, are referred to as minimalists, who claim that authors are always influenced by their

own personal views and thus cannot create a representation of broader groups than themselves as there is the possibility of "misinterpreting" the social ideology. (Kalmus 2003) Both views should be taken into consideration when analysing educational media as they are likely to appear in combined forms. Although all textbooks used in schools need to be in accordance with the national curriculum, the latter still leaves a relatively large space for the authors to fill with their personal ideas or views, which will not be seen as misinterpretations because they are not officially required. This may occur, for instance, in the case of foreign language textbooks that are written by authors who themselves are not representatives of the target language and culture. An Estonian author writing an English language textbook for Estonian learners can be viewed as mediating the beliefs and values of the target language society and their own beliefs and values as a member of their native society at the same time.

As tools of socialisation, textbooks reflect the culturally accepted ideas of knowledge, values and behaviour, including, among other aspects, those that influence the formation of children's gender identity. Since gender is primarily a social construct, it may seem logical to start looking for its representations in the textbooks of subjects like civics, social or family life studies: however, it is also represented in seemingly non-gendered subjects, for instance, foreign languages. According to Jane Sunderland et al (2002: 223), foreign language textbooks are worth analysing from the aspect of gender because: "they are characteristically densely populated with people who are not only in social relationships with each other, but who continually verbally interact with each other." Thus, they can be seen as demonstrating the doing of gender in a variety of ways and situations.

The aim of this thesis is to analyse the representation of gender in the dialogues of two English language textbooks: *English Step by Step 5* (2008) and *I Love English 5* (2008). In comparison to the general representation of men and women in textbooks, dialogues have not

been analysed as extensively. However, they are of great importance in the language classroom. According to Martha Jones et al. (1997: 471), dialogues are written or taped conversations between two or more people, which in the classroom can be used as conversation models to be read, acted out or listened to by the students. They help in developing and practising a large variety of conversational skills related to the language being learnt: vocabulary, language structure and use, pronunciation, spontaneous and conversational speech, speed, intonation, the use of pragmatics, and, in general, dialogues create a social context in which to practise all the previously mentioned aspects (Jones et al. 1997: 471*). If textbooks are taken as a model, gender equality in dialogues is very important. If one sex has, for example, fewer words or turns in a dialogue than the other, they can have less practice opportunities and it may result in lower motivation to learn or cause false assumptions about how native speakers of the target language speak (Jones et al. 1997: 473).

The issue of equal practice opportunities could be solved by the teacher by not dividing the roles in the dialogues on the basis of the gendered characters in the book, but, for example, on the basis of what the students need to practise: should a certain boy or girl in the classroom need to practise asking questions, they should be given the role of a character who asks a lot of questions, not whether the character is a 'Tom' or a 'Mary'. However, according to Sunderland (2000: 168), the students may not always agree to swapped roles. Although in the German class she observed the female students agreed to read the role of boys, an interview with the male students in the class revealed that they would definitely not agree to 'become' girls. Nevertheless, even if a boy reads a girl's part and vice versa, the textbook still ascribes certain roles and topics to them, and it cannot be claimed that if, for instance, a male student reads a female character's part, he will automatically assume that everything the female character does or says in the book is acceptable for him in the society at large as well. Thus, it

could be said that foreign language textbooks as agents of socialisation should present the target and native society in a way that avoids stereotypical gender roles and makes it possible to accept the various modes of doing gender. Moreover, the topic is relevant as any educational media used in Estonian schools needs to be compatible with the national curriculum and the national curriculum for basic schools lists gender equality among other societal values as an important part of its fundamental values (Riigi Teataja 2010).

The thesis consists of 4 parts. The first chapter gives an overview of previous research on the topic of gender in textbooks. The connections found between gender and language use are shortly described in the second one. The third chapter describes the choice of materials and methods of analysis. The fourth chapter presents the findings of this study with their analysis and discussion. The two textbooks will be compared to each other and also to the previous studies described in the first chapter of the thesis. Finally, the main ideas and major findings are summarised in the conclusion. The thesis has 16 appendices, two of which present a detailed overview of the findings in the quantitative analysis on both books and the remaining include the full-length dialogues studied in this thesis.

1.   PREVIOUS RESEARCH ON GENDER IN TEXTBOOKS

1.1. Studies on gender in textbooks with a focus on foreign language textbooks

According to Sunderland et al (2001: 252) "the 1970s and 1980s witnessed a flurry of content analyses of gender representation in foreign language textbooks". These studies found male characters to be overrepresented in comparison to females, men were generally shown in more powerful occupational roles, including a greater range of them, and both men and women were depicted in ways that reinforced a variety of stereotypes (Sunderland et al 2001: 252). For example, Marlis Helliger (1980, cited in Romaine 1999: 212) found in her study of English language books used in German schools that women in comparison to men did not engage in undertakings related to personal achievement, creative or professional activity and men also spoke four times more than women.

Similarly, in their analysis of English textbooks used in Singaporean schools, Gupta and Yin (1990, cited in Romaine 1999: 212) found a male dominance in the amount of talk, in the number of characters, and in the representation of different social roles: females mainly appeared as nurturers or service providers (nurses, mothers, teachers, and waitresses) and they were predominately found to be the possessed ones in possessive forms, for example, *Andy's mother*. Additionally, Jones et al (1997: 470) point to the fact that studies made before the 1990s mainly found textbooks to portray women as 'overcontented homemakers' – a depiction against which Fairlee Winfield Carroll also set a strong argument:

> Adult women attending foreign language classes are … there because the language is necessary to them for career advancement, university studies or to make homes and find employment in a second language environment… When many single and married women are part of the labor force, seeking to

enter it, or acquiring foreign language skills to improve their potentials, it is unjust to portray only housewives and future housewives in textbooks. (1978, quoted in Jones et al 1997: 470)

Before the 1990s, few studies had looked at gender bias in the dialogues of EFL materials. Examples of the findings in ETHEL's[1] analyses of *Network* (1980) and *Functions of English* (1977) are given by Jones et al (1997: 472-472). The first textbook featured both men and women asking about the likes and dislikes of other people, but only men also described their own, and only men gave orders. The second book included seven dialogues between two or three men and eight between a man and a woman; however, there were none solely between women.

Some studies made during the second half of the 1990s and after the year 2000 have shown improvements regarding the inequalities of gender representation in educational texts. Among others, Jones et al (1997) analysed dialogues meant to be used as a model for speaking practice in three English language textbooks (*Headway Intermediate* (1987), *Hotline Intermediate* (1993), *Look Ahead 2* (1994)) and found that, regarding the number of different female and male characters, initiation of dialogues, turn-takings and the number of words spoken, the gender differences were too small to be significant. They suggest that such results could be due to the range of different occupational and social roles being relatively evenly distributed between female and male characters (Jones et al 1997: 481).

Carolyn Gascoigne (2002-2003) analysed target-language interaction in five first-year post-secondary French textbooks issued between 1999 and 2002. Individual textbook series were not named, as the researchers wished to keep the focus on the trends rather than the texts themselves. Out of the 24 dialogues analysed, six were between two males, six between two females, and 12 between a female and male character. Gascoigne (2002-2003: 86-87) found

---

[1] a group of feminist EFL teachers working in Italy, and the name of their newsletter

only subtle differences: males spoke slightly more words and initiated more dialogues, and females had more turns and produced some minimal responses. Nevertheless, none of those findings were found to have significance regarding inequalities in representations of gender. The largest difference worth noting was that dialogues between females were longer than those between males, and therefore females as a whole spoke more words. Regarding certain linguistic features, no monologues, examples of mitigating devices or hesitant language were found, there very few minimal responses and no overlaps or cases of interrupting the other speaker but one; thus, giving too little information in order to make any conclusions on a gendered basis (Gascoigne 2002-2003: 86-87). Therefore, regarding the number of characters, words, turns and conversation leads, no significant gender inequalities were found in the French books. However, the books cannot be claimed to lack gender bias on the basis of a quantitative analysis alone – a qualitative analysis of the social roles attributed to the characters and the content of their conversations may have given different results.

Some studies, however, have only found "partial evidence" of equal gender representation. For instance, Sofia Poulou (1997) examined the differences in discourse roles of men and women in the dialogues of textbooks for teaching Greek as a foreign language to adults. Although the number of words and utterances produced by men and women were found to be relatively equal, the same cannot be said about the books as a whole. Poulou (1997: 71) found that women were ascribed a great amount of expressive language in one book, which "suggests a preoccupation with feelings", and if there were no expert participants involved, women were mainly asking for information and making requests, while men were mainly giving information and performing the majority of various directives, which gives the impression of women as dependent of men. According to Poulou (1997: 71), dialogues reflect the language usage within a context – they give examples of when, where and how to use

certain language. Therefore, it is important that the language "spoken" in textbooks has the same functions for female and male characters, otherwise dialogues "run the risk of giving incomplete information to students" (Poulou 1997: 71). In this study of the Greek language textbooks, learners did not get enough examples of dialogues between non-experts, in which men ask for information and make requests or in which women perform directives, that is, men were not shown as dependent of women.

The study by Jackie F. K. Lee and Peter Collins (2008) also showed only some improvement regarding a more equal representation of gender. They analysed 20 English language textbooks used in Hong Kong: 10 newer ones published between the years 1997-2004 and 10 earlier ones, no longer in use, published 1986-1994. They found confirmation to their hypotheses that the recent textbooks, in comparison to the earlier ones, show a higher ratio of female to male characters, more gender-neutral generic pronouns ("they", "he or she") were used, and women were more often addressed by the title "Ms". However, there was no significant change in the representation of women in social and domestic settings, thereby proving also a number of hypotheses wrong. Similarly to earlier textbooks, Lee and Collins (2008: 135) found that newer textbooks also showed women in a relatively limited and stereotyped set of activities and careers, and depicted them in weaker or more passive roles than men. Neither did women have more visual representation than before, and males were also still predominately mentioned first in comparison to women, thereby enforcing the secondary status of the latter (Lee and Collins 2008: 135-136).

Although the studies described above focus on foreign language textbooks that are all published and/or used in different countries and the books are therefore, to a greater or lesser extent, influenced by different socioeconomic aspects, the more recent analyses on textbooks all showed some improvement regarding the equal representations of gender.

1.2. Studies on the representation of gender in textbooks used in Estonia

One of the most extensive analyses made on the topic of gender in textbooks used in Estonia was compiled and published by researchers of the University of Tartu in 2002 as a collection titled *Soorollid õppekirjanduses* (Gender Roles in Textbooks) (Mikk 2002). The researchers focused on readers and history, civic, family studies and English language textbooks published between the years 1996-2001. The content of language textbooks can easily be related to that of any other subject as they often include topics on history, politics, economics and a variety of issues related to social studies. Therefore, an overview will be given of all the studies published in the aforementioned collection.

In general, male characters were found to outnumber female characters in all studies, and researchers also pointed out a variety of representations of men and women that were labelled as stereotypical. Analyses showed that a binary classification of men being more part of the public and women more part of the domestic sphere was common to all textbooks. Family studies textbooks, for example, represented women as happy in the domestic sphere, while for men the most important thing was succeeding in their work and simultaneously, they felt the pressure to provide for their family (Kukner 2002: 120, Kalmus 2002: 126).

Men were presented as active persons, they showed more initiative and creativity, they made decisions and took risks, and their doings were described in greater detail than that of women's, who were generally presented as relatively passive characters (Järviste 2002: 18, Säälik: 42, 43, Hieiväli 2002: 73, Värs 2002: 168, Põldme 2002: 225, Richards 2002b: 247-248). There were some exceptions, though: boys and adult women were the most active, leading and successful characters (often solving problems, being creative, and engaging in purposeful activities) in comparison to men and girls in the reader analysed by Siret Linnas

(2002: 186). Additionally, girls were the ones who know things, gave information and helped others (including boys), they were also shown as balanced, but not passive in the reader analysed by Elen Põldme (2002: 225-226). In general, however, men were also represented in a large variety of social roles while women were only shown in few roles mainly related to, for instance, religion or family in history textbooks (Järviste 2002: 18-19; Säälik 2002: 41) or home, voluntary and factory work in civics textbooks (Toom 2002: 100).

According to Riin Hieväli (2003: 69-71) and Liina Järviste (2002: 13, 15), men were shown in roles of higher status and power than women in history and civic textbooks, while in some readers, which include mainly school and home related topics, represented both men and women having high and low status (Männik and Piirimägi 2002: 158) or women even having higher status than men (Sula 2002: 221). History textbooks also contained many words that could have referred to either gender, for example, names of nationalities, however, the context gave reason to think of such words referring to men only, thereby excluding women (Järviste 2002: 17). In civic textbooks, there were also many words referring only to women and excluding men; however, there were almost twice as many words referring only to men in the same book (Toom 2002: 103). Both types of textbooks mainly dealt with topics about the state and politics, war or economics. Historically, not many women participated (or had the chance to participate) in those spheres, which can therefore explain the male dominance in some history textbooks (Säälik 2002: 39, Leinus 2002: 57).

Some researchers also point out the gender of the textbooks authors as one reason for the occurrence of gender bias. For example, it could be that more men are represented and topics about war or politics and state affairs are chosen because of male authors' interests (Säälik 2002: 39) or a more frequent depiction of women in illustrations in comparison to their representation in texts can be due to the illustrator being female (Säälik 2002: 41). It is,

however, not that simple. As Milvi Martina Piir (2010: 144) points out, both female and male authors work within a certain paradigm by following traditions, considering the curricula and at the same time also taking their own formal education and personal preferences as a basis. She also draws parallels with the fact that history teachers in Estonia, for example, have mainly been women for a remarkably long period of time. Since this has not resulted in a "feminisation" of teaching history, Piir sees no reason to expect such a change to occur if more female authors were to start writing history textbooks.

The only analysis of two English language textbooks, *English Step 5* (1997) by Estonian authors and *TipTop 5* (1996) by English authors, by Jeannine Richards (2002b: 239, 242) also showed a general male dominance. Out of all the characters males comprised more than half, while women represented only 11 and 9 per cent in *Step 5* and *TipTop 5* respectively. In addition to the larger number of male characters, the words 'he' and 'man' were often used to refer to 'he/she' and 'people' respectively and women were often referred to in reference to another person (usually male), not as individuals on their own (for example, "the man and his wife", "the Eskimo's wife"). Men were shown more in all spheres of life, except for domestic and family related settings, where women were represented 8: 1 in relation to men (Richards 2002b: 245); however, a gender division was still found in the type of activities men and women engaged in. Men were shown doing work that requires more physical strength (building, wood and metal work) or anything that generally happens outside (gardening, taking care of animals), while women did household activities that require less strength (knitting, sewing, embroidery) and took care of children (Richards 2002b: 241). In general, women were shown in positions of power as often as men; however, that was mainly because of their high status in the family and school, otherwise, male characters were still found to dominate in both textbooks (Richards 2002b: 247-248). Characters whose gender could not be defined made up

about one third in both textbooks, which is less than the number of male characters but about three times more than the number of females. *Step 5* also showed a small number of mixed gender groups, while *TipTop 5* included none.

Although the textbooks analysed in the Estonian studies are published around the same time or even later as those analysed by Jones et al (1997), Poulou (1997) or Gascoigne (2002-2003), the findings of the Estonian studies showed considerably more inequalities in the representation of men and women in textbooks and generally resembled to the findings of the studies carried out during the 1970s and 1980s. Nevertheless, since the studies did not compare their findings to any earlier analyses of Estonian textbooks, it is difficult to say whether perhaps any changes had occurred in gender representation in comparison to earlier textbooks.

Richards's (2002b) study can be compared to a more recent BA thesis by Maive Salakka (2007). Using the same methods as Richards, she also carried out a study on two English language textbooks: *I Love English 5* (2004) written by Estonian authors and *Enterprise 2* (2000) by English authors. Although male characters were still found to outnumber females, it was only by nine per cent in both textbooks (Salakka 2007: 9). According to Salakka (2007: 9), characters whose gender could not be determined made up the majority (61%) in the Estonian textbook and constituted almost half (46%) in the English authored textbook; thus, in comparison to Richards's findings of *Step 5* (1997), the newer Estonian authored textbook *I Love English 5* (2004) gives considerably less gendered role models, as in *Step 5* gender-neutral characters made up only about one third of all characters. In Salakka's (2007: 22) study gender-neutral characters were mainly shown as clients, teachers, "white collar" workers, tourists, or in roles providing some service. The number of mixed gender groups in *I Love English 5* was not much bigger than that in *Step 5*; however, in Salakka's study the

English-authored textbook also included about five per cent of mixed gender groups in comparison to *TipTop 5* which had none.

The newer textbooks analysed by Salakka also showed men and women in a greater variety of social roles. Both men and women were represented in roles related to family, education, culture, medical and rescue services, and economy. However, men were additionally shown in roles related to armed and defence forces, journalism, church and religion, and as leaders of the country, for instance, as a king (Salakka 2007: 18). According to Salakka (2007: 16-19), the most popular roles for women in *I Love English 5* were in creative or culture related occupations (as writers or artists) and for men the most popular role was being a student. *Enterprise 2* included a much wider range of roles and occupations for both genders. The most popular roles for women were a tourist, a friend, a wife or housewife and a "white collar" worker. Although men occupied a large variety of roles in *Enterprise 2*, a remarkably large number of men were also shown as characters in need of help (for example, as patients, or as victims of accidents or crime). However, they did not need help because of their weaknesses, but as a result of their courageous acts that put them in life-threatening situations (Salakka 2007: 16-19).

In short, it can be said that in comparison to the earlier study by Richards (2002b), Salakka's (2007) findings show some positive changes in the representation of gender, as a remarkably smaller dominance of male characters was found and men and women were both shown in a larger variety of different social and occupational roles.

2. GENDER AND LANGUAGE

Earlier research on language and gender, for instance around the 1970s, pointed out how the language used to describe, define or talk about people often discriminated between men and women, excluded women and encouraged their subordination, and they also focused largely on finding differences between female and male language use, often ending up with opposing binary classifications (Pearson et al 1991: 80, Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 2003: 1-3).

The English language does not contain any "grammatically obligatory" gender in comparison to, for example, French or German, in which every noun has a gender. However, there are certain linguistic resources, the main function of which is to distinguish between genders. For example, there is the English third-person pronoun *he* for male, *she* for female and *it* for referring to something inanimate or when gender is not considered to be important, sometimes in the case of animals (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 2003: 60). Another option to distinguish between genders is to use suffixes like –*ess* or –*ette*, which can be added to generic (or male) nouns in order to refer to females (Pearson et al 1991: 98-99). There is also the suffix –*man* that can be added to nouns to indicate males. Although it is not a common trend anymore, earlier, the generic "man" was often used when referring to all human beings, and therefore other man-linked words, along with the pronoun "he", also adopted generic qualities. As summarised by Pearson et al (1991: 80-81), the overuse of such words can indeed make women less visible, and thereby less powerful and less important in comparison to men.

Some words refer directly to specific gender as well, for example, *female* and *male*, *boy* and *girl*, *man* and *woman*, *father* and *mother* (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 2003: 60). Sometimes

such words are also seen to carry positive or negative meanings. For example, according to Pearson et al (1991: 99) a man who never marries is a "bachelor", while the same term for a woman is "old maid" and the latter is considered to have a much negative connotation than the first. "Bachelorette" is also relatively popular for women; however, it stems from the male version and the suffix *–ette* also carries diminutive meaning. Studying the pejoration of terms designating women in English, Muriel R. Schulz (1990: 136) also gives examples of a variety of "word pairs" in which the one used for a female has acquired a debased connotation or obscene reference over time. For example, a *governor* can be defined as a sovereign authority in a colony, territory, or state, and *governess* used to be its female equivalent; however, over time the latter became to denote a female caregiver who educates children in a private household. Similarly, *master* seems to have kept its original meanings as a title of courtesy and still refers to a person of either great power and/or skill; however, *mistress* has mainly come to mean a woman who has continuous, extramarital sexual relationships with men.

In some cases one gender also has more "options" in one category. Considering honorifics, for example, there is *Mr* and *Ms* for referring to men and women respectively; however, women can also be referred to as *Miss* or *Mrs* regarding their marital status, while there is no such option for men, as if it were not important whether men are married or not (Pearson et al 1991: 94).

Although there may be situations where it is difficult to avoid using gendered language, according to Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (2003: 69) it is still not obligatory. Speakers can choose to avoid or emphasise gender. For instance, one can choose whether to use the generic "man" and "he" when talking about people and their doings in general or not, or how to refer to a representative of the police force – as officer or police man/woman.

Numerous studies have been devoted to finding differences in the language use of men and women, starting from general questions such as 'who speaks more?' to the use of specific vocabulary or types of language functions (for example, asking or giving information, commanding, instructing or advising others, making invitations or offers, etc.). For example, although any utterance, as Janet Holmes has pointed out (cited in Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 2003: 139), can serve both affective and referential/instrumental functions, women's talk has still often been associated more with the former and men's talk with the latter. The affective function of talk includes, for example, expressing emotions or helping to maintain social relations, which is often contrasted to simply conveying information or establishing facts – that is, the referential/instrumental function of talk (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 2003: 139). A part of maintaining good social relations includes using "polite language", which Holmes, according to her observations and research, also suggested to be more characteristic of women than men (cited in Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 2003: 136-137). The aspect of politeness will be discussed in further detail in the following section on materials and methods of analysis.

If differences between the language use of men and women were found, researchers, especially in earlier studies, sometimes used facts of physical development, biology and genetic differences to explain them. For instance, women's cerebral hemispheres are more integrated than men's and in the case of brain trauma, women are less likely than men to suffer from speech impediments because the functions of the damaged hemisphere will be taken over by the other; however, there are yet not enough definitive findings regarding the connection between brain physiology and thinking (Pearson et al 1991: 124, Marling 2011a: 197). Moreover, some differences between men and women do not derive from their biological differences, but because gender is taken as a basis for cultural norms and traditions. According to Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (2003: 15, 18), several studies have shown that children are

treated differently based on their gender, which starts from the moment the doctors can tell whether "it's a boy" or "it's a girl". Differential treatment leads to boys and girls learning to be different. For instance, although men tend to have a lower voice pitch than women due to longer vocal tracts, children learn to differentiate their voices already at the age of four or five (well before there actually is a difference), as boys (consciously or unconsciously) lower their voices and girls raise theirs (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 2003: 13-14).

Thus, it can be said that both language and gender derive their meanings from the social practices people engage in. People resemble or differ in their language use more often due to age, cultural or educational background rather than their gender (Marling 2011: 209). Depending on the roles people have in a society and how they are formed by the cultural norms and traditions of that society, people may speak differently at home and at work, or with friends in comparison to strangers. People that engage in similar activities or are part of the same social groups develop common knowledge and beliefs, or ways of doing things (including talking) in similar ways. This is something that Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger called the "community of practice" (cited in Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (2003: 57).

Therefore, whether considering the language used to describe people or the language people use themselves, if practice is taken as a basis for both language and gender, the focus shifts from finding differences to observing the kinds of personae men and women can present in different situations (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 2003: 5).

3.   MATERIALS AND METHODS

3.1. Materials

This thesis analyses the representation of gender in the dialogues of the English language textbooks *English Step by Step 5* (2008) and *I Love English 5* (2008). The books were chosen because they are both written by Estonian authors, they are both written for the same audience (Estonian learners of English, who generally use it in the 7th grade if they are learning English as a first foreign language and started learning in the 3rd grade), they are published in the same year, and they both contain dialogues. The teacher's books of the two textbooks will also be looked at with the aim of finding guidance or advice on the topics of dialogues and gender.

English Step by Step 5 is divided into 8 units, each consisting of 4 lessons. The aim of each lesson is to approach different subjects, which are linked to each other on a general level throughout the unit. The book starts with a text 'Lets tune in' which introduces the book to the students and helps them in adjusting with the materials to be learned. The units are connected by *Break Talks* – texts about school life that are meant for helping students improve their spoken language and communication skills. *Break Talk* texts are accompanied by dialogues that can be both listened to and acted out in the classroom. This relatively general description about the dialogues in the *Break Talk* units is the only guidance provided in the teacher's book for the use of dialogues in the classroom. The teacher's book does not give any information on the topic of gender.

I Love English 5 consists of 20 units (and three additional units that can but do not have to be used as additional material at any time during the course), out of which 17 present different topics and opportunities to learn and practise 'everyday English', and the remaining 3 are

titled 'round-up' units with the aim to revise a selection of previously learned topics. There are about 2-3 different oral activities in each unit (mainly instructed to be carried out as pair work). Dialogues relate to the general topic of the unit and are meant to be acted out in the classroom or to be used as a model for extended activities (for example, students are asked to create a similar dialogue of their own by following the model or to answer questions on the basis of the information found in the dialogues). The teacher's book does not give any additional guidance on how the dialogues should be used in the classroom (for example, if those dialogues which the textbook instructs to be read silently, with the aim of finding information, could also be read out loud). Neither does it give any information on the topic of gender.

3.2. Methods

On a general level the dialogues will be categorised on the basis of whether they are between:

a) female,

b) male,

c) female and male,

d) gender-neutral and male and/or female characters,

e) gender-neutral characters.

Characters considered gender-neutral would be, for example, *librarian, sales person, police officer,* etc., and also names that could refer to both a male or female character, such as, for example, *Ryan, Robin, Jordan*, etc.

All dialogues are then studied more closely according to the criteria listed in the quantitative and qualitative analysis. Gapped dialogues in which, for example, the part of only one participant is given and the other(s) need to be completed by the student, were excluded. However, gapped dialogues or those resembling a multiple choice exercise were included if they had fixed answers that students need to choose from and which can, for example, be checked by listening to the same dialogue with correct answers.

Illustrations accompanying the dialogues are generally not included in the analysis. Although in *I Love English 5* one accompanying illustration could potentially be used to identify a gender-neutral character's gender (Kurm and Jõul 2008: 80), it is largely left for the reader to decide whether the librarian is a man or a woman with short hair who is wearing pants. Other dialogues that include gender-neutral characters are not accompanied by illustrations. In *English Step by Step 5* one illustration can be used as a source of more specific information on the teacher – *Mrs. Wilson.* A mathematic equation on the board suggests that Mrs Wilson could be a mathematics teacher (Kariis and Peets 2008: 37).

3.2.1. Quantitative analysis

The quantitative analysis is compiled by relying on similar studies by Jones et al (1997) and Poulou (1997). It focuses on the following aspects:

1) the number of characters in the dialogues (if the gender is unclear or not included, for example, there are no personal pronouns referring to it, the characters are counted as gender-neutral). If the same characters appear more than once, a distinction is made between types and tokens. As described by Jones et al (1997: 476) in reference to David Crystal's (1986) original categorisations those would be:

a) the number of different female, male and gender-neutral characters (types);

b) the total number of appearances of the different female, male and gender-neutral characters (tokens);

2) the number of utterances spoken by female, male and gender-neutral characters (an utterance, according to Gupta and Yin (1990), is a participant's turn of speech (a word, sentence or sequence of sentences) in a dialogue that is preceded and/or followed by other participants' utterances (in Poulou 1997: 69)):

3) the number of times characters of different gender initiate and conclude dialogues in mixed-gender dialogues;

4) the number of words spoken by female, male and gender-neutral characters (contracted forms, prices and numbers in numerical forms, and hyphenated words are counted as single words);

3.2.2. Qualitative analysis

The qualitative analysis is compiled by relying on the research by Poulou (1997), Richards (2002a) and Eckert and McConnel-Ginet (2003). It focuses on the following aspects:

1) the language used in presenting the characters: proper names, honorifics, family or occupation related names, etc;

2) the language used by the characters to address other members in the dialogue;

3) how often and how do female, male or gender-neutral characters speak about other female, male or gender-neutral characters: are they talked about as active agents or is the activity directed towards them as passive receivers/objects and what kind of language is

used to refer to them (for example, are they introduced by using proper names or family related names);

4) the social roles that the characters are presented in. A distinction is made between experts and non-experts (for example, in the pairs *teacher – student, receptionist – visitor*, the former is the expert and the latter the non-expert; non-experts also include characters in different family related roles);

5) the differences between experts and non-experts in mixed- and same-gender dialogues according to the number of characters, words, utterances and initiating and concluding utterances;

6) the settings the characters are presented in and the topics discussed or the activities the characters engage in;

The qualitative analyses also focuses on the different language functions that can be found in the dialogues. The following four points of criteria are a combination of the language functions described by Poulou (1997) and Geoffrey Leech (1974: 47-49), whose work Poulou's distinction is also based on:

7) the number of informational utterances/components spoken by female, male and gender-neutral characters. A distinction is made between:

   a) the number of utterances/components asking for information;

   b) the number of utterances/components giving information;

8) the number of phatic utterances/components spoken by female, male and gender-neutral characters (such as, greetings, expressions of thanking and their acknowledgements, standardised expressions required for maintaining social relations (for example, 'Welcome'); language that accompanies and describes an act without carrying any

information (for example, 'Let me show you to your room'); expressions complying to or rejecting directives (for example, 'Yes, sir'));

9) the number of directive utterances/components spoken by female, male and gender-neutral characters (language trying to influence another person's behaviour and/or attitude). A distinction is made between:

   a) the number of utterances/components ordering/commanding/instructing

   b) the number of utterances/components advising/recommending/suggesting

   c) the number of utterances/components offering/inviting

   d) the number of utterances/components requesting;

10) the number of expressive utterances/components spoken by female, male and gender-neutral characters (relating to one's own feelings and/or attitudes (for example, 'Brilliant!'));

The distinction between utterance and component is given above for the reason as described by Poulou (1997: 69) that one utterance could consist of many components, each of which may have a different function. For instance, the utterance: "Hello, can I help you?" (Kurm and Jõul 2008: 80) is made up of two components 'Hello' and 'can I help you'. The first one can be counted as phatic and the second as informational.

11) how many and which kind of examples of positive and negative politeness can be found in the language use of female, male and gender-neutral characters.

As given by Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson (cited in Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 2003: 134-135), positive politeness involves empathizing with someone, including them in your 'we' or 'in-group', for example, by giving compliments or also engaging in a commiseration about common problems, as such are the positive face needs − being approved or liked by others, being connected to others. Negative politeness, on the other hand, includes

showing respect and avoiding imposing or offending – a person's negative face needs involve projecting oneself as a separate individual, to be respected and recognised. In order for a person's negative face to receive less threat and to cater for the negative face needs there are, for example, apologies, thanks, greetings and farewells, and formal modes of address (*sir, madam, professor*). (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 2003) Negative politeness also often includes directives when they are accompanied by the word 'please' or put in an indirect form: *would you mind passing the salt?* instead of *pass the salt* (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 2003: 135, 188).

As a whole, all the dialogues will be analysed from the perspective of what kind of examples they set of female, male and gender-neutral characters. Since gendered roles may also be important considering students' opportunities to practise, an overview will be given from this perspective as well. Although all the dialogues could be read out in the classroom, not all of them have such instructions: some are just asked to be read (which is usually done silently), or some are given as examples which students are asked to use as a model and create their own dialogues. Therefore, the following section will firstly give an overview of all the dialogues found in the two textbooks, and after that the analysis will be narrowed down to the dialogues with specific instructions to practise by reading out loud only. The information found in all dialogues will also be compared to the findings of some earlier studies that were summarised in the previous section.

4.   PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The number of dialogues analysed in *English Step by Step 5* (ESBS) and *I Love English 5* (ILE) was 11 and 21, respectively. As it was already briefly mentioned in the previous section, the dialogues in ESBS are always a part of the *Break Talk* units, except for one short joke in dialogue form on page 72 (*see Appendix 4*). They make up a continuous story with two schoolboys as the main characters who mainly interact with each other or one of the two teachers also featured as participants in dialogues. Additionally, a few other students are talked about and one also has a few turns in a dialogue. ILE includes a much larger number of different characters, as all the dialogues (except for no. 6-10) usually feature different ones. In ILE some dialogues are part of one exercise, for example numbers 1-5, 6-10 and 12-18, but they were treated as separate dialogues (*see Appendices 11, 12 and 14*). Although dialogues 6-10 feature the same characters and the instructions ask to put them in a chronological order, the dialogues all take place in different locations and they are still separate dialogues, not parts of one longer dialogue. The content of dialogues 1-5 and 12-18 gives no suggestions of the characters being linked by the same storyline.

4.1. Quantitative overview

As can be seen from Table 1, 10 dialogues out of the total 11 include one or more male characters in ESBS. There are 5 dialogues between males only and 5 between characters of mixed gender, which include female and male participants; yet none of those characters are gender-neutral and there are no dialogues between women only. The dialogue that includes

two gender-neutral characters is not part of the *Break Talks*, it is the short joke referred to above, and thereby its significance in the book as a whole is relatively small.

ILE has a much larger variety of different dialogues, as in addition to the types in ESBS, there are also dialogues between women only and those between a gender-neutral character

Table 1. Types of dialogues according to the gender of the characters.
Numbers in brackets mark the number of characters in dialogues.

	f	m	f and m		n	n and f	n and m	Total
English Step by Step 5			1f / 1m	1f / 2m				
	-	No 1 (2) No 6 (2) No 8 (2) No 9 (3) No 10 (2)	No 2 No 5	No 3 No 7 No 11	No 4 (2)	-	-	
	-	5 (45%)	2 (18%)	3 (27%)	1 (9%)	-	-	11 (100%)

	f	m	f and m		n	n and f	n and m	Total
I Love English 5			1f / 1m	3f / 1m		(1n / 1f)	(1n / 1m)	
	No 6 (2) No 7 (3) No 8 (3) No 9 (3) No 21 (2)	No 2 (2) No 4 (2)	No 1	No 10	No 12 (2) No 13 (2) No 14 (2) No 15 (2) No 16 (2) No 17 (2) No 18 (2)	No 3 No 19	No 5 No 11 No 20	
	5 (24%)	2 (10%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	7 (33%)	2 (10%)	3 (14%)	21 (100%)

and a female or male. Altogether there are 7 dialogues between characters of different gender and 14 between those of the same gender. Females are featured in 9 and males in 7 of the total 21 dialogues; however, there are only 2 dialogues between men in comparison to the 5 between women. According to Table 1, dialogues between gender-neutral characters make up the largest part in ILE. However, since all those dialogues are from the same exercise, they are relatively short in comparison to others and they all discuss similar topics, at this point their importance is mainly relevant in number (*see Appendices 2 and 14*).

A similar tendency can be found in the total number of utterances and words spoken by gender-neutral characters in ILE. As can be seen in Table 2, gender-neutral characters do have the largest number of utterances, but the lengthiest parts belong to females, whose total number of words makes up 65% in comparison to the 22% of words spoken by gender-neutral participants and the 13% by males. Although, regarding the number of characters by type,

Table 2. Summary of quantitative findings

		Characters			Utterances (turns)			Initiate mixed-gender dialogues			Conclude mixed-gender dialogues			Words		
		f	m	n	f	m	n	f	m	n	f	m	n	f	m	n
English Step by Step 5	*Types:*	2 28,57%	3 42,86%	2 28,57%	35 20,47%	134 78,36%	2 1,17%	2 40%	3 60%		1 20%	4 80%		502 24,56%	1526 74,66%	16 0,78%
	Tokens:	5 19%	19 73%	2 8%												
I Love English 5	*Types:*	8 22%	9 25%	19 53%	41 37%	22 20%	47 43%	1 14%	3 43%	3 43%	3 43%	3 43%	1 14%	800 65%	158 13%	273 22%
	Tokens:	19 40,43%	9 19,15%	19 40,43%												

gender-neutral characters dominate and there are no large differences between females and males, when looking at the tokens of different characters, female and gender-neutral participants outnumber males in equal numbers. Thus, it can be said that although female and gender-neutral characters in ILE have been given relatively equal opportunities to talk, the former's turns of speech last longer. In mixed-gender dialogues only 1 dialogue is initiated by a female, while they conclude 3. The situation is reversed for gender-neutral participants, and males initiate and conclude the same number of dialogues. However, the number of mixed-gender dialogues in ILE is not large enough to make any generalisations in this respect.

In contrast, ESBS is very male dominated due to the main characters being schoolboys. Although the number of characters does not show many differences in types, throughout the

dialogues males make up 73% of the participants. They also have the largest number of opportunities to speak (about 78% of the utterances) and they speak about 75% of the words. A more detailed overview regarding the characters and the number of utterances and words in each dialogue is given in Appendices 1 and 2.

4.2. Language used to present the characters participating in dialogues

In ESBS there are two ways in which characters are presented: proper names and names of professions. Proper names, in turn, can be divided into two types: first names and title plus last name. Out of the 11 dialogues 10 feature characters with proper names and only one dialogue with characters whose names refer to their professional or social role (Teacher and Student). No characters participating in the dialogues are defined in reference to someone else (for example Mary's mother). All the dialogues including characters with proper names feature either both or one of the recurring school boys, Tom and David. Four dialogues additionally include the teacher Mrs Wilson and one of the dialogues includes the science teacher Mr Rowan. The choice of Mrs for the female teacher gives the information that she is married to a Mr Wilson; however in the case of Mr. Rowan, the reader only learns his last name. There is no obvious reason why the marital status of the teacher has been chosen to be presented in the textbook – the name could also be Ms Wilson. If there was, for example, a married couple working at the school and the woman has taken her husband's last name, referring to the woman as Mrs may have more relevance. There is only one dialogue which also includes a female student, Sandra, in addition to the two school boys.

Just as ILE has a larger variety of different types of dialogues, it also presents a larger number of different characters. Although the largest number of the participants is presented

using proper names or occupation related names like in ESBS, some characters are also presented using family related names. The latter, however, include only two different female names – *Mother* and *Granny*. The number of females and males presented using proper names is almost equal – 5 and 6, respectively. One character also had the name *Robin*, and since there were no indicators of her/his gender, that name was counted as gender-neutral. While there were only 2 gender-neutral characters with an occupational name in ESBS, the number of such gender-neutral characters is larger in ILE, including *customer, shop assistant, cashier, librarian* and *teacher.* Additionally, there is also 1 occupational name which refers to the person being male – *waiter* – and the context gives information that one of the teachers is also male, since *Thomas* addresses his teacher as *sir* in dialogue 4. Neither of the books include occupational names that would refer to females, not in the name itself nor contextually.

4.3. Language used by the participants to address other participants

Besides addressing each other as *you,* the characters mainly turn to each other by their given (proper) names in both textbooks. That is also true of the students addressing both teachers in ESBS, while in ILE a teacher is turned to as *sir*, which gave the implication that the teacher is male. Since the other teachers, who were counted as gender-neutral, occur in the dialogues of the same exercise, this one male teacher might give reason to think about the gender of the other teachers or raise questions about why those teachers were not turned to as 'sir' or for example title and last name. Additionally, Mrs Wilson in ESBS, for example, often turns to the two students as *boys* and the mother in ILE in dialogue 10 addresses her daughter and Silvia as *girls*. In one dialogue in ESBS, Mrs Wilson compares Tom to a *little kid* when he brings excuses to why he has not done his homework. The choice of 'kid', instead of 'boy' for

example, is generic, implying that Tom's behaviour can be characteristic of female and male children, not only boys. However, since Tom is the one acting out this sort of behaviour, another question is whether the users of this book would see it as a behaviour possibly performed by all children or mainly boys. Both Tom and David also call the other *idiot* once as a way of judging the other's behaviour. In general, the characters in ILE turn to each by using something other than just 'you' much less than the characters in ESBS, in number such instances of address were 6 and 30 respectively.

4.4. Talking about other people

The characters in ESBS talk more about other people than in ILE: there were respectively 99 and 58 of such instances. Except for the dialogue between Sylvia and Granny, which is also much longer than all the other dialogues in ILE, other people are seldom talked about. In ESBS others are mainly referred to in dialogues 5-11, 2 dialogues (no. 1 and 4) do not mention other people, and dialogues 2 and 3 only have a few references to others.

The characters in ESBS talk more about men than about women or people whose gender cannot be determined (47 times, in comparison to the 25 and 28 respectively). Both men and women are talked about more as active doers than passive receivers or objects of an activity; however, there are more active men (26) than active women (15), and at the same time there are also more passive men (16) than passive women (10). Additionally, 5 men were also just mentioned without any assigned passivity or activity, for example, David says: "Oh, the science teacher..." in dialogue 5 in ESBS. Therefore, the relation of activity and passivity between characters of the same gender differs about 20% in the case of females and males. People whose gender cannot be determined, however, are referred to about 25 % more as

passive than as active, the precise numbers being 17 and 10, and there is also just one mentioning of a gender-neutral character.

About half of the times (31), the characters in ILE talk about people whose gender cannot be determined and more seldom about males (17) or females (10). All people are spoken of more as active rather than passive. Although the total times active men or people in general are talked about is larger than when active females are spoken of, the dialogues feature 9 active and only 1 passive female. That difference between activity and passivity is slightly smaller in the case of males (15 active, 2 passive) and other people (22 active, 7 passive).

The fact that males have more words in ESBS correlates with them talking more about other people (78 times). About half of the times they speak about other males; females and people in general are both spoken of about 25% of the times. Females talk about other people 21 times (4 females, 8 males, and 9 others), but gender-neutral characters (the teacher and student in dialogue 4) do not talk about anyone else. In ILE, however, females have the largest number of words and they also speak more about other people than males or gender-neutral characters. As mentioned above, that happens mainly in dialogue 21. Women mainly talk about people in general (59%), then about men (29%), and lastly about other women (12%).

Considering the language used when referring to other people, the characters in both books use different pronouns in about half of the cases (*he, she, they, someone, everybody, no one*, etc) and also family related names (7 times in both books). Family related names differ a little in detail as those used in ESBS include *mum* (2), *dad* (1), and *parents* (4), while ILE has *mum* (3), *sister* (1), and *dad* (3). Other usages differ in the books. ESBS uses many proper names (24), while ILE has only 2. The dialogues in ESBS show how using proper names can differ according to the social relationship of the speakers. The students address their teachers as *Mrs Wilson* and *Mr Rowan* when speaking to them directly or when speaking about one of them

with the other teacher; however, when the students talk to each other they often refer to the teachers in a more casual way by just using their last names *Wilson* and *Rowan*. More occupational names are used in ILE (*cashier, security guard, clerk, removal men, head teacher, teacher, hairdressers,* and *carpenters*) than in ESBS (*science teacher*). Additionally, the characters in ILE also talk about people by using nationalities (*Swedes, Poles*), and words referring mainly to age (*children, grown-up*) or gender (*boy*). In both books there are also a few instances of a person being defined in relation to someone else. ESBS includes '*my* mum' (2), '*my* dad' (1), and '*your* parents' (4), while the examples from ILE are less family oriented, including '*my* sister' (1), '*our* old neighbours' (1), '*our* new neighbours' (2), '*our* head teacher' (1).

There are no examples of the usage of the generic 'man' or 'he' when speaking about all people. General words such as, for example, *people, population, neighbour* in ILE, the impersonal pronouns in ESBS (*for example someone, no one, everybody*) or the personal pronoun *they* in both books usually do refer to all people, not only men or women. However, the same cannot be said about occupational names. Although only one of them (*removal men*) in ILE actually contains a gender reference in the word itself, the others can be divided by gender due to other words (usually personal pronouns) referring to it: females include *cashier* and *teacher,* males appear as *science teacher, security guard*, *clerk*, and people who could be of either gender include *head teacher, hairdressers, carpenters* and *cashier*. None of the characters in either of the books use constructions like 'he/she', 'he or she' or 'they' to refer to a person in singular, whose gender is not evident from their name or context. Such people are generally talked about in plural or if they are mentioned in singular, then only once and thus without the need to use any personal pronouns.

4.5. Social roles, settings and topics or activities

The number of different social roles is rather limited in ESBS. As can be seen from Table 3, it features *teacher* as the only expert role which is also represented in "all" genders, but the female teacher has the largest number of occurrences. Depending on whether in some dialogues the two boys are seen more as friends, classmates or students, 2-3 non-expert roles can be counted. Since they are friends because they happened to be in the same class, the roles

Table 3. Social roles.
Numbers in brackets mark, firstly, the number of different characters in the respective roles and, secondly, all occurrences of the given roles.
The last row signals the total number of different types of expert or non-expert roles (not considering different characters in the same role) and the total number of times these roles occur as tokens.

		English Step by Step 5		*I Love English 5*	
		Experts	**Non-experts**	**Experts**	**Non-experts**
	f	teacher (1/4)	classmate (1/1)		mother (2/4) student (1/1) daughter (1/3) customer (2/2) classmate (1/1) granddaughter (1/1) grandmother (1/1)
	m	teacher (1/1)	friend/classmate (2/12) student (2/8)	teacher (1/1) waiter (2/2)	son (1/1) student (2/2) library visitor (1/1)
	n	teacher (1/1)	student (1/1)	teacher (2/2) shop assistant (6/6) cashier (1/1) librarian (1/1)	customer (8/8) classmate (1/1)
	types: **tokens:**	**1f; 1m; 1n** **4f; 1m; 1n**	**1f; 4m; 1n** **1f; 20m; 1n**	**0 f; 3 m; 10 n** **0 f; 3 m; 10 n**	**9f; 4m; 9n** **13f; 4m; 9n**
Total	**types:** **tokens:**	**1** **6**	**3** **22**	**5** **13**	**9** **26**

friend and *classmate* were always marked together as one occurrence. In dialogue 7 the boys were both counted twice: once for the role of *friend/classmate* and as *students* for the part

when Mrs Wilson enters the dialogue. In general there is no large difference between the occurrence of the roles *student* and *friend/classmate*; however, the largest part of those roles is prevailingly filled by male participants.

Although ILE includes 4 more expert roles, there are no female experts and the majority of expert roles are dominated by gender-neutral characters, the most popular role being *shop assistant*. There are more non-experts than experts in both books regarding different types of roles and also the number of times all those roles occur. Although Table 3 shows an equal number of different types of female and gender-neutral non-experts in ILE, that is only due to the fact that gender-neutral characters feature a larger number of different participants in the same role. For example, 8 different *customer*s were counted as gender-neutral, while there were only 2 different *mother*s and female *customer*s. However, when looking at different roles, female non-experts are featured in 7 different ones, males in 3, and gender-neutral characters in 2. Altogether, the role of 8 participants (2 male and 6 female in tokens, 2 male and 2 female in types) in ILE could not be determined and were therefore left out from the expert/non-expert comparison.

According to Tables 4 and 5, neither of the textbooks features more than one expert in the same dialogue. Although ESBS includes expert characters of all genders (that is, female, male and gender-neutral), none of them occur together. As mentioned above, ESBS features the only female expert across both textbooks. In ESBS she occurs 4 times in comparison to the male and gender-neutral experts who each occur only once. She also occurs more often than the male experts in ILE, but less often than the gender-neutral ones. Nevertheless, she has more words and utterances than either of them. The female expert initiates 2 and concludes 1 out of the total 4 she participates in.

Table 4. Quantitative findings according to the expert/non-expert distinction in *English Step by Step 5*
Characters are counted according to all their occurrences (tokens)

		No	characters F	M	N	initiate F	M	N	conclude F	M	N	utterances F	M	N	words F	M	N	
Mixed-gender	F exp - M non	4	4	6		2	2		1	3		32	52		461	533		
	F non - M non	1	1	2			1			1		3	5		41	26		
	Totals:	5	4			2			1			32			461			expert
			1	8			3			4		3	57		41	559		non-expert
Same-gender	M exp - M non	1		1			1			1			5			90		
				2									5			55		
	N exp - N non	1			1			1							1			6	
					1						1				1			10	
	M non - M non	4		4			3			2			34			418		
				4			1			2			33			404		
	Totals:	6		1	1		1	1		1			5	1		90	6	expert
				10	1		4			4	1		72	1		877	10	non-expert

Table 5. Quantitative findings according to the expert/non-expert distinction in *I Love English 5*
Characters are counted according to all their occurrences (tokens)

		No	characters F	M	N	initiate F	M	N	conclude F	M	N	utterances F	M	N	words F	M	N	
Mixed-gender	M exp - F non	1	3	1			1		1			3	2		33	5		
	M exp - N non	1		1	1		1			1			5	4		13	23	
	N exp - F non	1	1		1			1	1			1		1	2		28	
	N exp - M non	2		2	2			2		1	1		8	9		45	46	
	F non - M non	1	1	1			1			1		1	2		1	47		
	F non - N non	1	1		1	1			1			4		3	49		38	
	Totals:	7		2	3		2	3		1	1		7	10		18	74	expert
			6	3	2	1	1		3	2		9	10	7	85	92	61	non-expert
Same-gender	M exp - M non	1		1			1						1			18		
				1							1			1			5		
	N exp - N non	7			7			2			3			14			64	
					7			5			4			16			74	
	F non - F non	4	3			2						4			36			
			3			1			2			4			27			
			1			1			1			7			254			
			1									6			288			
	Totals:	12		1	7		1	2			3		1	14		18	64	expert
			8	1	7	4		5	3	1	4	21	1	16	605	5	74	non-expert

In comparison, the male expert in ESBS both initiates and concludes the only dialogue he is in. In ILE the 3 different male experts all initiate their dialogues, but only one concludes it, and out of the 10 gender-neutral experts, 5 dialogues are initiated and 4 concluded by them, while 1 dialogue is both initiated and concluded by a gender-neutral expert.

There are an equal number of dialogues in ESBS between a female expert and a male non-expert, and those in which both participants are male non-experts, making up 8 out of the total 11. However, on the basis of the words and utterances, male non-experts speak more to each other than in the dialogues with the female expert. In ILE the largest number of dialogues is between a gender-neutral expert and a gender-neutral non-expert (7), followed by dialogues in which both characters are female non-experts (4). In the case of the latter, the third participant in 3 dialogues is a female with an unknown role. As can be seen from Table 5, both types of gender-neutral characters have more opportunities to speak (utterances) than any of the female non-experts; however, since the female non-experts are the two participants in the longest dialogue in ILE their turns are almost 4 times longer in one dialogue than the turns in all the gender-neutral dialogues combined.

Not only are both textbooks dominated by non-expert characters, they also speak more than the experts in the book. As can be seen from Tables 4 and 5, male non-experts as a whole have the largest number of utterances and words in ESBS, while the smallest number of utterances is spoken by the only 2 gender-neutral characters in the book: each only has one utterance, and the expert also has 4 words less than the non-expert. However, when looking at the 4 dialogues between the teacher and two schoolboys more closely, it can be said that in 2 dialogues the expert and non-expert have an equal number of utterances and in only one case the non-expert speaks more than the expert. In one of the remaining dialogues, the two students together have more utterances than the teacher, but not separately and they speak

much fewer words; however, in the fourth dialogue the boys have more than half as many utterances as the teacher already separately, and both of them also have more words than the teacher. In ILE, male experts are given the smallest chance to speak both in words and utterances, while female non-experts dominate in the number of words and utterances due to the length of dialogue 21.

As can be seen from Table 6, all the dialogues in ESBS are set in a school environment. The topics the female teacher engages in include discussing students' problems with grades, homework and organising oneself, and explaining the consequences of misbehaving and cutting class. Additionally, the male students engage in the activity of getting to know each other, and talk about bullying, supporting friends, dating and having a crush on someone (the latter also includes the only female student participant). The male teacher mainly tells the students about his experience on how students have tried to cheat and what the consequences of such behaviour were with the aim of discouraging them from trying anything of the like. Since it seems that none of the students actually cheated, the reader does not know if Mr Rowan would have kept to his rules, as the female teacher Mrs Wilson, although she also talks about what the rules are and what should happen to those who do not follow them, she still does not do anything to the boys but makes them promise not to misbehave again. As already mentioned earlier, the dialogue between a gender-neutral teacher and student is a short joke on the topic of not doing homework.

In addition to the school, ILE presents a much larger variety of settings. Altogether the dialogues happen in 8 different places, the most popular ones being different kinds of shops, but also home and a pub or cafe. Single instances include settings such as *in the street, phone call,* or *at the library*. Females are featured *at home* as a mother, granddaughter and grandmother, *at school* as a student, *at a pub* having lunch (and previously looking for a

Table 6. Distribution of roles and topics according to the settings of the dialogues.

	Setting	Gender	Roles/relationship	Topics/activities	
English Step by Step	at school	2 m	friends, classmates	getting acquainted	
				talking about bulling, supporting friends	
				talking about dating, having a crush	
		1 m - 1 f	student - teacher	discussing problems with homework and organising oneself	
				discussing problems with grades	
		2 m - 1 f	students - teacher	misbehaving in class and its consequences	
				planning to cut class	
		3 m	students - teacher	talking about cheating and its consequences	
		2 m - 1 f	classmates	talking about dating, having a crush	
		2 n	student - teacher	joke: problems with homework	
	unknown	2 m	friends, classmates	talking about cheating or studying for a test	
Total:	**1**			**types: 10**	**tokens: 11**
I Love English 5	at home	1 m - 1 f	son - mother	joke: going to school	
		2 f	granddaughter and grandmother	talking about multiculturalism, new neighbours	
		2 f	*unknown*	talking about going out for lunch	
	at school	2 f - 1 n	student - teacher	joke: mathematics	
		2 m	student - teacher	joke: punishing	
		1 m - 1 n	student - teacher	joke: shape of the Earth	
	in a pub	3 f	mother, daughter, *3rd unknown*	deciding what to eat	
				ordering lunch	
	in a pub or cafe	1 m - 1 n	waiter - customer	ordering and paying for a meal	
	in the street	3 f	mother, daughter, *3rd unknown*	talking about favourite dishes	
	in front of a cafe	3 f	mother, daughter, *3rd unknown*	choosing a place where to eat	
	in a shop	2 n	shop assistant - customer	buying a shirt	
				trying on clothes	
				buying cough sweets	
				just looking around	
				looking for the cashier	
				asking to see a MP3 player	
			customer- cashier	paying for a purchase	
	phone call	1 f - 1 n	classmates	phoning to ask about homework	
	at the library	1 n - 1 m	librarian - visitor	returning and borrowing a book	
	unknown	2 m	*unknown*	joke: learning history	
Total:	**8**			**21**	

suitable place in 2 different settings) as a mother, daughter and a character in an unknown role, and as *receiving a phone call* from a classmate. Males are featured *at home* as a son, *at school* as students (2) and as a teacher, as a waiter *in a pub or cafe* (2), and as a visitor *in a library*. Additionally, there are 2 male participants with an unknown role in a dialogue which setting cannot be determined as well; however, since it is a short joke about learning history, the dialogue is not very important in comparison to other longer dialogues in ILE. Gender-neutral characters occur as teachers *at school* (2), as a customer *in a pub or cafe*, as customers (7), shop assistants (6) or a cashier *in a shop*, and as a classmate *phoning* another to ask about homework.

Other than the 5 jokes, 2 of which include females, 4 males and 2 gender-neutral characters, the characters in ILE engage in activities and talk about things that may be useful on a more general social level, in comparison to the daily school topics and activities of ESBS. Female characters (keeping in mind that there are no female experts in ILE) talk about 3 things: multiculturalism and greeting new neighbours, favourite dishes, and going out for lunch. They engage in 4 activities: looking for a suitable place to have lunch, deciding what to have and ordering it, and giving a classmate (gender-neutral non-expert) some information about homework. In addition to the teacher and students in a joke, the male expert as a waiter takes orders at a pub or cafe, and the male non-expert as a library visitor returns books and borrows a new one. Expert gender-neutral characters assist or serve customers (who are mainly gender-neutral non-experts), lend books and give advice about them as a librarian. Thereby, it can be said that all characters, whether female, male or gender-neutral, hold a conversation on some topics and engage in some activities and differences in number from a gendered perspective are not that significant.

4.6. Language functions

Tables 7 and 8 give an overview of the four different language functions analysed in the two textbooks. In addition to the number of respective utterances/components counted, the number of words these utterances included was also added in order to show the length of each type of utterances/components.

As can be seen from Table 7, informational utterances/components make up 171 (59%) of those counted in ESBS and they involve the lengthiest part of whole text (1615 words, 79%). They are followed by phatics with 48 (16%), expressives with 41 (14%) and directives with 32 (11%). However, the directives are longer than the phatics (213 and 111 words respectively). More information is given (70%) than asked for (30%), and there were equally 10 directives ordering, commanding or instructing and advising, recommending or suggesting, which were followed by 8 directives offering or inviting and 4 requests.

Non-expert males dominated the dialogues in general in ESBS and similar tendencies occur in the majority of language functions analysed. Out of the total informational utterances/components males speak 49% more than females, and gender-neutral characters only have 1%. Males in general give about 61 % more information and ask for about 21% more than females. However, out of those utterances/components the single female expert on average asks and gives approximately 86% more information than the single non-expert and the same in reverse applies to males, as the two non-experts give and ask for 94% more information than the single expert. The same tendencies of domination occur throughout all other language functions and in general, similar trends can also be found regarding the length of the utterances/components.

Table 7. Language functions in *English Step by Step 5*.

English Step by Step 5		Total	f			m			n		
			total	expert	non-expert	total	expert	non-expert	total	expert	non-expert
Informational	ut/comp	171	42	39	3	127	4	123	2	1	1
		59%	25%	93%	7%	74%	3%	97%	1%	50%	50%
	words	1615	395	359	36	1204	62	1142	16	6	10
		79%	24%	91%	9%	75%	5%	95%	1%	37,5%	62,5%
ask	ut/comp	51	19	17	2	31	1	30	1	1	
		30%	37%	89%	11%	61%	3%	97%	2%	100%	
	words	325	125	112	13	194	8	186	6	6	
		20%	38%	90%	10%	60%	4%	96%	2%	100%	
give	ut/comp	120	23	22	1	96	3	93	1		1
		70%	19%	96%	4%	80%	3%	97%	1%		100%
	words	1290	270	247	23	1010	54	956	10		10
		80%	21%	91%	9%	78%	5%	95%	1%		100%
Phatic	ut/comp	48	10	7	3	38	1	37			
		16%	21%	70%	30%	79%	3%	97%			
	words	111	28	23	5	83	2	81			
		5,6%	25%	82%	18%	75%	2%	98%			
Directive	ut/comp	32	9	9		23	3	20			
		11%	28%	100%		72%	13%	87%			
	words	213	61	61		152	23	129			
		10%	29%	100%		71%	15%	85%			
ordering/ commanding/ instructing	ut/comp	10	5	5		5	2	3			
		31%	50%	100%		50%	40%	60%			
	words	37	18	18		19	13	6			
		17%	49%	100%		51%	68%	32%			
advising/ recommending/ suggesting	ut/comp	10	2	2		8		8			
		31%	20%	100%		80%		100%			
	words	106	27	27		79		79			
		50%	25%	100%		75%		100%			
offering/ inviting	ut/comp	8				8		8			
		25%				100%		100%			
	words	32				32		32			
		15%				100%		100%			
requesting	ut/comp	4	2	2		2	1	1			
		13%	50%	100%		50%	45%	55%			
	words	38	16	16		22	10	12			
		18%	42%	100%		58%	45%	55%			
Expressive	ut/comp	41	4	4		37	2	35			
		14%	10%	100%		90%	5%	95%			
	words	105	18	18		87	3	84			
		5,4%	17%	100%		83%	3%	97%			
Total utterances/components:		292	65	59	6	225	10	215	2	1	1
Total words:		2044	502	461	41	1526	90	1436	16	6	10

In all cases the social role and frequency of how often the characters participate in dialogues needs to be taken into consideration. The female expert gives and asks for more information than the female non-expert or the male expert because of the role as a teacher who firstly, participates in dialogues more often than the female non-expert or the male expert in ESBS (although the latter is also a teacher), and secondly, the role as a teacher requires speaking quite a lot, especially regarding giving and asking for information. Additionally, the teacher's use of phatic language (7) and a slightly more frequent use of directives (9) relate to her social role, which can also be a reason for why her use of expressive language is quite small (4).

Nevertheless, the male non-experts dominate in all cases mainly because they are the main characters in the book, who participate in the greatest number of dialogues and have the biggest number of words. However, males also dominate in phatic and expressive language use. Moreover, although males dominate in using directives that advise, recommend or suggest (8 to 2) and are the only ones making an offer or invitation (8), female and male characters also use an equal number of 5 directives ordering, commanding or instructing and an equal number of 2 requests each. Regarding the common directives, they also speak them by almost the same number of words (females 18 and males 19); however, male requests are slightly longer than female ones (22 in comparison to 16 words).

As can be seen from Table 8, the 85 informational utterances/components also constitute the largest part in ILE, which is about half (54%). Similarly to ESBS they are also the lengthiest part considering the number of words (80%), and the gap between informative and other utterances/components is relatively large as well. The informatives are followed by phatics with 38 utterances/components (24%), directives with 22 (14%) and expressive with 13 (8%). The phatics in ILE are also shorter than the directives (93 and 127 words

respectively). Once again more information is given (65%) than asked for (35%). However, the situation with directives differs from ESBS: there are no directives advising,

Table 8. Language functions in *I Love English 5*

I Love English 5		Total	f				m				n		
			total	expert	non-expert	unknown role	total	expert	non-expert	unknown role	total	expert	non-expert
Informational	ut / comp	85 / 54%	39 / 46%		28 / 72%	11 / 28%	16 / 19%	6 / 37,5%	8 / 50%	2 / 12,5%	30 / 35%	17 / 57%	13 / 43%
	words	986 / 80%	677 / 68,7%		586 / 87%	91 / 13%	135 / 13,7%	30 / 22,2%	83 / 61,5%	22 / 16,3%	174 / 17,6%	112 / 64%	62 / 36%
ask	ut / comp	30 / 35%	9 / 30%		6 / 67%	3 / 33%	4 / 13%	4 / 100%			17 / 57%	9 / 53%	8 / 47%
	words	190 / 19%	66 / 35%		51 / 77%	15 / 23%	17 / 9%	17 / 100%			107 / 56%	69 / 64%	38 / 36%
give	ut / comp	55 / 65%	30 / 55%		22 / 73%	8 / 27%	12 / 22%	2 / 17%	8 / 67%	2 / 17%	13 / 24%	8 / 62%	5 / 38%
	words	796 / 81%	611 / 77%		535 / 88%	76 / 12%	118 / 15%	13 / 11%	83 / 70%	22 / 19%	67 / 8%	43 / 64%	24 / 36%
Phatic	ut / comp	38 / 24%	9 / 24%		8 / 89%	1 / 11%	7 / 18%	3 / 43%	3 / 43%	1 / 14%	22 / 58%	7 / 32%	15 / 68%
	words	93 / 8%	27 / 29%		23 / 85%	4 / 15%	15 / 16%	6 / 40%	8 / 53%	1 / 7%	51 / 55%	15 / 29%	36 / 71%
Directive	ut / comp	22 / 14%	13 / 59%		10 / 77%	3 / 23%	1 / 5%		1 / 100%		8 / 36%	2 / 25%	6 / 75%
	words	127 / 10%	82 / 65%		67 / 82%	15 / 18%	4 / 3%		4 / 100%		41 / 32%	8 / 20%	33 / 80%
ordering/ commanding/ instructing	ut / comp	2 / 9%	2 / 100%		2 / 100%								
	words	4 / 3,1%	4 / 100%		4 / 100%								
advising/ recommending/ suggesting	ut												
	words												
offering/ inviting	ut / comp	5 / 23%	4 / 80%		4 / 100%						1 / 20%	1 / 100%	
	words	40 / 31,5%	34 / 85%		34 / 100%						6 / 15%	6 / 100%	
requesting	ut / comp	15 / 68%	7 / 47%		4 / 57%	3 / 43%	1 / 6%		1 / 100%		7 / 47%	1 / 14%	6 / 86%
	words	83 / 65,4%	44 / 53%		29 / 66%	15 / 34%	4 / 5%		4 / 100%		35 / 42%	2 / 6%	33 / 94%
Expressive	ut / comp	13 / 8%	8 / 62%		7 / 87,5%	1 / 12,5%	2 / 15%		1 / 50%	1 / 50%	3 / 23%	1 / 33%	2 / 67%
	words	25 / 2%	14 / 56%		10 / 71%	4 / 29%	4 / 16%		2 / 50%	2 / 50%	7 / 28%	3 / 43%	4 / 57%
Total utterances/components:		158	69		53	16	26	9	13	4	63	27	36
Total words:		1231	800		686	114	158	36	97	25	273	138	135

recommending or suggesting, requests make up the largest part with 15 utterances/components, which are followed by offers or invitations with 5 and 2 directives ordering, commanding or instructing.

Non-expert females largely dominated in general in ILE due to dialogue 21 and the same kind of tendencies can be found in the language functions, although less strict ones than in ESBS. As the two non-expert females participated in the longest dialogue of the book, they also have the largest number of words and, as can be seen from Table 8, any kind of words in general. Females always outnumber males, regardless the fact that they are all non-experts, and generally females also outnumber gender-neutral characters. However, there are a few exceptions. For example, gender-neutral characters ask for more information than females (17 to 9), and they also use more phatic utterances/components (22 compared to 9). They both make 7 requests, but the female characters use more words to do so (44 and 35 respectively). Additionally, non-expert females make a total of 4 offers or invitations, while an expert makes the only one by gender-neutral characters.

When looking at the dialogues more closely, females actually only ask one question ('Why?') from a male (dialogue 1), whereas in other cases if they ask for information they mainly ask other women, not men or gender-neutral characters. In relation to social roles, the three teachers featured in the jokes all ask more questions than give information. Besides two of the teachers, gender-neutral characters as experts (shop assistant or cashier) and non-experts (customer) give some examples of how non-experts tend to ask more for information than experts (8 and 6 utterances/components respectively) and vice versa, experts give more information than non-experts (8 and 5); moreover, giving more information also correlates with experts having 62 % more words in those utterances than non-experts, suggesting that they either speak more or at greater length.

Considering social roles and settings, female and gender-neutral non-experts make a relatively large number of requests as customers in a pub, cafe or shop, and in such public situations they are also more likely to use phatic language in order to keep to certain social standards of public communication. Similar behaviour and language use can be seen in dialogue 19 between a male non-expert and a gender-neutral expert. Additionally, females may use more expressive language due to the fact that they occur in non-expert rather than expert roles and are therefore shown to freely express their feelings, emotions or attitudes – something they would perhaps do much less in expert roles, for example, like *Mrs Wilson* in ESBS.

4.7. Politeness

The largest number of different instances of politeness expressed in ESBS was by non-expert males – 18 of the total 25. Formal address forms constituted the largest part (6), which was followed by an equal number of greetings and apologies (3), 2 examples of farewells and 1 example of expressing thanks. There were also 3 examples of positive politeness, as the boys engaged in commiserating about common problems regarding the choice of topics in the music lesson, how bad the bullies Fred and James are, and the difficulty of the science test. Nevertheless, examples of negative politeness still dominated, as throughout the two books no other examples of positive politeness were found, for example, no one complimented someone or used other language to convey the meaning of including someone in a common 'we'. The female teacher in ESBS was counted to portray 5 examples of negative politeness: 1 greeting, 2 thanks, and 2 polite requests. The female non-expert only has one example of politeness in the form of a greeting and the male teacher utters one polite request: *Please clear you desks.*

While in ESBS formal address forms and greetings made up the largest part of negative politeness examples, then in ILE requests in indirect forms or those accompanied by please have the largest part (13), followed closely by 12 instances of expressing thanks. Out of the total 39 examples of (negative) politeness, gender-neutral non-experts displayed the biggest part of polite language use (a total of 21 instances), with the most popular being expressions of thanking (8) and polite requests (6). Considering that the majority of gender-neutral non-experts were in the role of a customer, polite requests and thanking for receiving information or a service seem as a common part of such social settings. Gender-neutral experts also have an adequate amount of polite language (5), as single instances of a greeting, a farewell, a thanking, a polite request and following general standard parole by saying *You're welcome* to the other person's *Thank you very much* were found. Females do have more examples of polite language use (9) than males (4), but the majority of those examples come from the characters *Mother, Olivia* and *Silvia*, who engage in ordering food at a pub as customers (dialogues 7 and 10). Aside from Silvia thanking the others for a good meal in dialogue 8, there are no other examples of polite language. Therefore, it can be said that they use polite language because of the social setting they are in, rather than because they are women. Out of the 4 examples of polite language use by males, 3 were by non-experts and 1 by an expert. Altogether there were 2 examples of thanking: Liam thanking the Librarian for their recommendation and a Waiter thanking the Customer for paying the bill, 1 example of formal address forms: Thomas turning to the teacher as *sir*, and Liam making a request for advice in an indirect form: *Can you recommend something?*.

Therefore, neither of the textbooks in their dialogues can be viewed to support the opinion that women's language is more polite in comparison to men. In ESBS the male non-experts probably used the largest proportion of polite forms for the same reason as with other aspects

analysed – because they are the main characters in the book. However, while female non-experts had the largest number of words due to dialogue 21, no obviously polite language use was used between the characters, probably because the dialogue's main aim is to be simply informative; therefore, instead of females, gender-neutral characters appeared to be the most polite participants instead.

4.8. Practice opportunities and role models

In short, if all dialogues are read out in the classroom and the textbook is taken as a model, then with ESBS both male and female students get the opportunity to practise the role of a student and a teacher; however, males could practise the student's role 18 times in comparison to the one part the male teacher has and females could mainly practise the role of a teacher, rather than a student (4 to 1). Males would generally get a better and more varied practicing opportunity considering, for example the number of turn takings and words in general, and the topics would be more varied as well. Additionally, male students would get the opportunity to practise the largest variety of different language functions and polite language use. Since all the *Break talk* dialogues have the instruction that they can be role-played in the classroom, not much would change if the only gender-neutral dialogue (the short joke) were not to be practised by reading out loud as it does not have such instructions.

If all dialogues in ILE were practised by reading out loud, female students would benefit the most. Not only would they get the lengthier texts and more opportunities to speak, but by adding the dialogues that include 1 or more gender-neutral characters, which could be read out by any students, the practice opportunities of female students can increase even more. However, if all the gender-neutral dialogues were to be read by male students, they would

have much more opportunities (turns) to speak than female students, to practise a larger variety of social roles, including more turn-takings and initiating and concluding mixed-gender dialogues. They could engage in more topics and activities, practise the majority of different language functions and polite language use. Nevertheless, although their speech as a whole would have a higher quality, it would still not be longer than the female parts.

By removing all those dialogues as potential sources of practice that are not instructed to be read out loud or to be acted out with a partner, the textbook users would be left with 8 dialogues. 7 of them are from the same exercise (dialogues 12-18), which feature 3 different types of gender-neutral characters: *shop assistant, customer,* and *cashier*. The other dialogue (no. 20) is set at the library and is held between the librarian and a boy who is returning and borrowing books. Thereby, there is one fixed non-expert male role – a boy who likes reading books – and the remaining roles could be read by both female and male students.

Considering practice opportunities, there would not be much difference from a gendered perspective; however, the speech would be relatively short: in dialogues 12-18, both dialogue participants would get 69 words on average, the one reading the part of the Librarian in dialogue 20 would get 34 words and Liam's part has 31. The variety of different social roles and topics would decrease, as the only two settings would be some shop and the library. Although the students would also have remarkably fewer opportunities to practise different language functions, with the smallest loss being with phatic utterances/components, the majority of polite language use was found in these dialogues. Additionally, as phatic utterances/components are often connected to polite language use, as their aim is to keep social relations in good repair and not offending the speaking partner, they make these dialogues relatively rich of language that caters for the negative face needs.

4.9. Discussion of findings in the light of previous research

Although the analysis of ESBS and ILE are two detailed case studies which cannot be used to make broad generalisations on the representation of gender in textbooks, they still contribute to documenting possible changes, especially when the findings are compared to other similar studies made.

In general, researchers like Jones et al (1997), Gascoigne (2002-2003) and Poulou (1997) found improvements in newer textbooks, as very little or no differences were found in the quantitative representation of male and female characters, the number of words they speak and how many times they were given the opportunity to speak. ESBS and ILE, however show slightly different trends in their dialogues. ESBS as a whole is still relatively male oriented, while women and gender-neutral characters dominate in ILE.

More can be said in comparison to the Estonian analyses. For example, while characters whose gender could not be defined made up about one third in Richards's findings, ESBS has only 2, who each occur once and have one utterance. They constitute slightly more than a half (53%) in ILE; yet, considering the frequency of occurrence, there is an equal number of female and gender-neutral characters (approximately 40%). If in the books analysed by Salakka, the gender-neutral characters constituted either a similar or larger number, then men still outnumbered women in those books, which can be noticed only in ESBS. The roles of gender-neutral characters in ILE are similar to those in Salakka's books, as they also include clients, teachers, and roles providing some service. If the books analysed by Richards and Salakka showed a relatively small (or in some cases nonexistent) occurrence of mixed-gender dialogues, then ESBS has 5 out of 11 (all taking place between a male and a female).

However, ILE has much less – 7 out of 21 (2 between males and females, 5 between gender-neutral and female or male characters).

Both ESBS and ILE show their characters in a remarkably smaller variety of different social roles and settings than the textbooks studied by Richards and Salakka; however, that might also be due to the fact that they (selectively) analysed all texts in the books while this thesis focused only on dialogues. Additionally, it can be said that neither of the textbooks necessarily showed women in stereotypical roles as, for example, Lee and Collins (2008) still found it to be the case in newer English language textbooks used in China. In ESBS, the roles are generally limited to a total 2-3, but in ILE women occur in a larger variety of social roles than men or gender-neutral characters.

Additionally, there are no obvious examples of the binary public-domestic classifications regarding the settings men and women appear in as there were in the Estonian books analysed. In ESBS all the dialogues take place at school, and although ILE mentions more women in domestic settings, including a mother, grandmother and granddaughter, while there is only a son mentioned from male characters, in general, it still cannot be said that there is such a binary classification in ILE. Moreover, since this thesis analyses dialogues, the main focus in which is to discuss something rather than to describe doing something, no parallels can be drawn between the findings in Richards's study, in which men were found to engage more in activities that require physical strength and women were associated with easier jobs.

However, when considering expert roles, which usually denote a higher position than that of the non-expert, Richards (2002b), for example, found women in positions of power just as often as men. The analysed books differ in this respect from earlier findings and from each other, as ESBS has a dominating female expert in comparison to the featured male expert, and ILE has no expert women at all, thereby giving male and gender-neutral characters all the

power. Additionally, since ESBS has 2 main characters, they could be seen in the position of power, despite the fact that they are non-experts.

Lee and Collins also found the female characters to be still shown as weak and in passive roles, which enforces their secondary status. The same tendency was found in the majority of the Estonian textbooks, with the exception of a reader that showed boys and adult women as the most active. In the case of ESBS and ILE the activity of the characters themselves in dialogues is determined on how often they participate and how much they speak. Keeping that in mind, it can be said that ESBS is similar to the Estonian reader as the female teacher and two schoolboys are the most frequent and active characters. In ILE, women of all kind and gender-neutral characters dominate in that respect. Additionally, however, other people that were talked about did include more active men in ESBS, and in ILE the most mentioned were active people whose gender could not be identified, then men and lastly women; however all people were spoken of as mainly active doers rather than passive receivers, except for people whose gender could not be identifies in ESBS.

While Lee and Collins's study revealed more gender-neutral generic pronoun use ('they' and 'he or she') Richards still found the word 'he' to be often used when referring to someone who could equally be either a 'he' or 'she' and several instances of using the word 'man' while referring to people in general. In ESBS or ILE there were very few of such cases. People in general were mainly spoken of in plurals and there was only one occupational name that referred to the gender of the people because of the word 'men' in the name (*removal men*).

Considering the use of different language functions, Poulou (1997) noted that women tended to use much more expressive language than men in the Greek language textbooks analysed. On a general scale, that is similar to the findings in ILE, but male characters used them more in ESBS. However, it does not make expressive language more characteristic to

one gender in either of the books, as the frequency of occurrence and number of words in general was also in favour of the gender dominating in expressive language use, whereas in Poulou's study there were no large differences in the number of characters and the length of their speech. In Poulou's study, if no experts were involved, women also asked more questions, while men mainly gave info and performed directives, which in general gave an impression of women being dependent of men. If experts are not considered, then almost all the language functions are performed by the two male students in ESBS; however, in ILE the majority of speech is dominated by non-expert female characters as a whole anyway, and removing the few male experts would not change much.

Although neither the analyses on foreign language textbooks nor the Estonian ones focused on politeness, in comparison to the observations made by Holmes that women in general are associated with using more polite language, the two books analysed proved otherwise, as the majority of polite language use was primarily related to the social roles of the characters. Although in ESBS the use of polite language also largely correlated with the general amount of speech the characters had, making the two schoolboys the most polite participants, in ILE polite language was generally used in public settings that involved a kind of customer-sales person relationship.

CONCLUSION

Schools as small versions of society help young citizens learn how to position themselves in different structures of social life. The school uses its curriculum as a tool for socialisation, which helps to assess and evaluate students' knowledge. It is complemented by the hidden curriculum, which can be said to include everything that is more difficult to teach than facts, numbers or vocabulary and even more difficult to assess or evaluate – different values and beliefs. Gender is considered as part of the hidden curriculum. Since people are gendered, gender is present in all social contexts.

As sociologists have demonstrated for the past 30 years, gender does not refer to just being male or female or even stable norms of masculinity and femininity. It is increasingly understood as a practice that can be done in a variety of ways. Yet, in every culture those individual practices are guided by general norms of what is accepted for the members of that culture. Nevertheless, one's identity and ways of performing gender are not fixed phenomena and can change over time and depending on the context. In general, however, people learn socially accepted gender roles by observing others and once they start performing them, those roles are supported and reinforced.

Educational media in schools function as some of those models, which also provide for "both curricula", as each fact, number or word can be accompanied by values and beliefs. Whether the textbooks represent the discursive and social order that has dominated for a period of time or support new ideologies, they can be a commonly shared source of knowledge for entire generations and are therefore worth analysing in detail. As foreign language

textbooks mainly feature people who are in different social relations with each other and also interact verbally in different situations, they demonstrate a variety of ways of doing gender.

Previous studies on gender in textbooks that were published before the 1990s generally found male characters to dominate females – the latter were outnumbered and represented in stereotypical roles only, for example in the domestic sphere. Men were usually shown as more active characters than women and they spoke more often and in greater length in dialogues. Women were often spoken of in reference to males (the Eskimo's wife) or by marking their marital status (using Miss and Mrs instead of Ms). Additionally, the words 'he' and 'man' were often used to refer to 'he/she' and 'people' respectively. While this thesis mainly described the situation in foreign language textbooks, the previously described trends were also found in a variety of Estonian textbooks that were published between the years 1996-2001.

Studies on foreign language textbooks from the 1990s or later, however, have generally shown many improvements regarding the inequalities of gender representation. The studies by Jones et al (1997) and Gascoigne (2002-2003) found no remarkable differences in the representation of females and males in the number of characters, initiation of dialogues, turn-takings and the number of words spoken. However, Poulou (1997) and Lee and Collins (2008) found only partial improvements. For example, women were still ascribed a greater amount of expressive language, suggesting a preoccupation with feelings, and non-expert female participants mainly asked questions while non-expert males mainly gave information and also performed the majority of various directives, making women seem dependent of men. Women were shown in a more limited and stereotyped range of social roles as well, in which they were additionally depicted as weak or passive in comparison to the strong and active men, thereby enforcing the secondary status of women. While the findings in Richards's (2002b) study on

two English language textbooks used in Estonia still shared a large number of common traits with the findings in studies made before the 1990s, in a similar study by Salakka (2007) a remarkably smaller dominance of male characters was found, and men and women were both shown in a larger variety of social and occupational roles in comparison to earlier research.

This thesis focused on analysing dialogues in two English language textbooks: *English Step by Step 5* and *I Love English 5*. Dialogues help in developing and practising a variety of conversational skills as they function as models regarding the language used to present people and also the language used to talk to each other and about others. Moreover, language use depends greatly on the community it is practised in, as different social groups may require different language use. Dialogues create a social context for the language and therefore, it is important to have equal representations of gender in dialogues in order for the students to get both equal practice opportunities and to have models of social settings and roles which do not prefer characters of one gender to the other, that is, they do not show one as more important than the other.

Similarly to earlier studies on gender in textbook dialogues, the analysis of this study also focused quantitatively on the number of female, male and gender-neutral characters, the number of turn-takings and words, and whether there were any gender related tendencies in initiating and concluding dialogues. Additionally, the dialogues were also analysed from a qualitative perspective: the language (proper names, honorifics, family or occupation related names, etc) used to present the characters and the language they used to address other dialogue participants; the number of times men, women or gender-neutral characters spoke about other people, the kind of language they used while referring to them and whether they were spoken of as active agents or passive receivers/objects of some activity; the social roles and settings the characters were presented in – whether they were experts or non-experts and whether there

were any other tendencies from this perspective regarding the remaining criteria of the quantitative and qualitative analysis; the language functions used (giving and asking for information, phatic language for keeping social relations in order, directives influencing the behaviour of others, and language with the function of expressing one's feelings or attitudes); and finally, the examples of politeness found in the characters' speech.

As a whole, the dialogues were analysed from the perspective of what kinds of examples they give of female, male and gender-neutral characters and which practice opportunities they could have if roles were divided according to the book; however, since not all dialogues had the instructions to be practised out loud, an overview of the role models and practice opportunities regarding only the dialogues which had such instructions was given as well.

In general, male characters dominated *English Step by Step 5* (ESBS) and female and gender-neutral characters dominated in *I Love English 5* (ILE). The dialogues in ESBS were longer than in ILE; however, there were only 7 different characters and 11 dialogues in ESBS, while ILE had a total of 21 dialogues and 36 different characters.

ESBS had 2 male students (non-experts) as main characters who participated in 10 dialogues (1 dialogue was a joke between two gender-neutral characters named *teacher* and *student*) and due to that they dominated in all the aspects analysed. For example, they had the biggest opportunities to speak, their speech was the lengthiest and they also talked most about other people (mainly about other men, and equally about females and people in general), they initiated and concluded more mixed-gender dialogues, used the largest number of all types of language functions and the majority of polite language. Other characters included two teachers as the only expert roles in the book (the female teacher participated in 4 dialogues, the male in 1), and a female student was also featured shortly in 1 dialogue. Both men and women were talked about more as active doers rather than passive receivers or objects of an activity;

however, since men were spoken most of, there were also both more active and passive men than women. All the dialogues were set at school and thus all the topics and activities were also linked to it. The boys spoke about their likes and dislikes concerning mainly school subjects, bulling and supporting friends, dating and having a crush on someone, studying or cheating and its consequences, they also planned to cut class and discussed problems with their grades and behaviour and the consequences of cheating with the teachers. Proper names were mainly used to present characters, address or talk about others; however, the female teacher was called *Mrs Wilson*, which gives us the information that there is also a Mr Wilson, while the reader learns nothing about the marital status of the male teacher, *Mr. Rowan.* Since all the dialogues except for the short joke had guidelines stating that they could be practised out loud, no relevant changes regarding practice opportunities or examples of gendered models would occur if that dialogue was not read out loud.

All dialogues in ILE, except 4, featured different characters. In addition to dialogues found in ESBS – between male and female characters, males only, or gender-neutral characters only – there were also dialogues between women only, and women or men and gender-neutral characters. However, in total the numbers of same-gender and mixed-gender dialogues were almost equal in ESBS, while in ILE there were more dialogues between characters of the same gender (14), than of different genders (7) and therefore the aspect of initiating and concluding mixed-gender dialogues did not have much relevance in ILE as female, male and gender-neutral characters were all given the opportunity to start and/or conclude at least one dialogue.

While females and gender-neutral characters dominated over males in general and females and gender-neutral characters were also given relatively equal opportunities to talk, females as a whole spoke more than the others according to their number of words. They also talked most about others: mainly about people in general, then men and the least often about other women.

Similarly to ESBS, all people were spoken of more as active than as passive; however, the difference between active and passive characters was the largest regarding females as only 1 female was talked about as passive in comparison to the 9 spoken of as active. Due to the large number of words, females also used the largest variety of different language functions. While the most common way of presenting characters in ILE was also by using proper names, there were many occasions in which family or occupation related names were used as well. In comparison to ESBS, ILE featured a larger variety of social settings and roles (8 different places altogether and 14 different social roles). Although the number of non-expert females was the largest of all categories, experts mainly occurred as gender-neutral characters and in settings that involved a kind of customer-sales person relationship, which were also accompanied by the most frequent instances of polite language use. Regarding the practice opportunities and role models dialogues provide if only those were analysed that have the instructions to be read out loud, only 8 out of the total 21 would be suitable. 7 of them feature gender-neutral characters in the customer-shop assistant type of relationships, and 1 is held in a library between a librarian and a boy Liam as the visitor. Although both male and female students could read the parts of gender-neutral characters, they would in general have very few practice opportunities regarding all the aspects described previously, the smallest loss being with phatic language functions, and those dialogues also showed a high frequency of polite language use.

Changes could be made in the dialogues of both textbooks to make them more equal regarding the representation of gender; however, the following aspects should be considered while doing so. Simply changing the roles of female or male students for the sake of equal practice opportunities may not work in the classroom – a girl may simply not agree to read a boy's part (or vice versa), or even if they do so, they may not accept the role and its

characteristic features because the character's gender does not coincide with theirs. Similarly, changing one main character in ESBS into a girl also only helps to provide an equal number of main characters who speak an equal number of words and utterances; however, dividing the topics each character discusses and the activities they engage in may become problematic. The female and male character would equally be in the roles of a student, friend or classmate, but would the boy or the girl be the one to have problems with behaving in class or with his or her grades? Who would consider cheating in a test? Who prefers sports and who likes music? Who has a crush on someone? In any case, the textbook could give the idea that boys and girls engage in different activities and have different problems. Although the textbook users may find it easier to relate to re-occurring characters than a random John or Mary who only appear once, then a larger number of different characters, as in ILE, may help to reduce the chance that students start considering certain qualities, interests or activities to be related to a person's gender. Therefore, adding female and male characters to the dialogues could be an easier way to improve equality in this respect. For example, instead of having only a mother and daughter who go out for lunch, both parents could go with their son and daughter, or instead of a having a grandmother discuss the topic of multiculturalism with her granddaughter, the dialogue could additionally feature a grandfather and grandson. By including a larger number of different characters, the dialogues could also show a larger variety of possible ways of doing gender.

In conclusion it can be said that although these two case studies cannot be used to make broader generalisations, and only dialogues, not entire textbooks were analysed, they still contribute to documenting possible changes. While *English Step by Step 5* had two schoolboys as the main characters, and thus it still gives male students more practice opportunities and role models in comparison to female students, *I Love English 5* was found to do the opposite.

By featuring a larger number of female and also gender-neutral characters and showing them in a variety of settings, engaging in different topics and activities, *I Love English 5* can give female students more practice opportunities and role models. Female characters are more active in this textbook and that differs from the results of previous research. However, if only the dialogues with the instructions to be read out loud were considered, *I Love English 5* would give rather equal practice opportunities and role models to students of both genders and in this respect, it could be considered relatively equal in its representation of gender.

REFERENCES

Primary sources:

Kariis, Margit, Mari Peets. 2008. *Step by Step 5: student's book*. Tallinn: Koolibri

Kariis, Margit, Mari Peets. 2008. *Step by Step 5: teacher's book.* Tallinn: Koolibri

Kurm, Ülle, Mare Jõul. 2008. *I Love English 5: student's book*. Tartu: Studium

Kurm, Ülle, Mare Jõul, Anne Kraubner. 2008. *I Love English 5: teacher's book*. Tartu: Studium

Secondary sources:

Butler, Judith. 1999. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity.* London and New York: Routledge.

Eckert, Penelope, Sally McConnell-Ginet. 2003. *Language and Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fausto-Sterling, Anne. 2000. *Sexing the Body: Gender Politics and the Construction of Sexuality.* New York: Basic Books.

Golombok, Susan, Robyn Fivush. 1994. *Gender Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gascoigne, Carolyn. 2002-2003. The Role of Gender in L2 Interaction: Socialisation via L2 Materials. *Encuentro Revista de investigación e innovación en la clase de idiomas,* 12: 13-14, 81-89.

Hermansson Hässler, Inga-Bodil. 2009. What is Gender Pedagogy?. *Gender Research in Sweden*, 22-23.

Hieväli, Riin. 2002. Soorollide kujutamine Eesti ajaloo õpikus gümnaasiumile. In Jaan Mikk (ed). *Soorollid õppekirjanduses,* 65-80. Tartu: Tartu Univeristy Press.

Ivinson, Gabrielle, Patricia Murphy. 2007. *Rethinking Single-Sex Teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill/Open University Press.

Jones, Martha A, Catherine Kitetu, Jane Sunderland. 1997. Discourse roles, Gender and Language Textbook Dialogues: who learns what from John and Sally?. In Christina Hughes, Rosemary Preston (ed). *Gender and Education*, 469-492. Abington Oxfordshire: CARAFAX Publishing Ltd.

Järviste, Liina. 2002. Meeste ja naiste rollid õpikus "Vanaaeg". In Jaan Mikk (ed). *Soorollid õppekirjanduses,* 11-31. Tartu: Tartu Univeristy Press.

Kalmus, Veronika. 2002. Soorollid ja kodanikukasvatus. In Jaan Mikk (ed). *Soorollid õppekirjanduses,* 122-149. Tartu: Tartu Univeristy Press.

Kalmus, Veronika. 2003. *School Textbooks in the Field of Socialisation*. Tartu: Tartu University Press.

Kukner, Ivi. 2002. Naise ja mehe hoiakute muutumine ning soorollide kajastamine 11. klassi perekonnaõpetuse õpikus. In Jaan Mikk (ed). *Soorollid õppekirjanduses,*107-122. Tartu: Tartu Univeristy Press.

Kuurme, Tiiu. 2011. Haridus, kasvatus ja sugupool. In Raili Marling (ed). *Sissejuhatus soouuringutesse,* 238-273. Tartu: Tartu University Press.

Lee, Jackie F. K. Lee, Peter Collins. 2008. Gender Voices in Hong Kong English Textbooks – Some Past and Current Practices. *Sex Roles,* 59:1, 127-137.

Leinus, Ingrid. 2002. Meeste ja naiste kujutamine lähiajaloo õpikus. In Jaan Mikk (ed). *Soorollid õppekirjanduses,* 56-65. Tartu: Tartu Univeristy Press.

Linnas, Siret. 2002. Nais- ja meessoo kujutamine II klassile mõeldud lugemiku 2. osa näitel. In Jaan Mikk (ed). *Soorollid õppekirjanduses,* 176-193. Tartu: Tartu Univeristy Press.

Marling, Raili. 2011a. Keel ja sugu. In Raili Marling (ed). *Sissejuhatus soouuringutesse,* 196-215. Tartu: Tartu University Press.

Marling, Raili. 2011b. Sissejuhatus. In Raili Marling (ed). *Sissejuhatus soouuringutesse,* 7-17. Tartu: Tartu University Press.

Marling, Raili (ed). 2011c. *Sissejuhatus soouuringutesse.* Tartu: Tartu University Press.

Mikk, Jaan (ed). 2002. *Soorollid õppekirjanduses*. Tartu: Tartu University Press.

Männik, Agnes, Ilona Piirimägi. 2002. Soorollide kujutamine 1. klassi lugemikus. In Jaan Mikk (ed). *Soorollid õppekirjanduses,* 153-161. Tartu: Tartu Univeristy Press.

Pearson, Judy Cornelia, Lynn H. Turner, William Todd-Mancillas.1991. *Gender and Communication*. 2nd ed. Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Publishers.

Piir, Milvi Martina. 2010. Sooperspektiiv ajalooõpikutes: metodoloogilisi tähelepanekuid. *Ariadne Lõng,* 10: 1, 142-149.

Poulou, Sofia. 1997. Sexism in the discourse roles of textbook dialogues. *The Language Learning Journal,* 15: 1, 68-73.

Põldme, Elen. 2002. Soorollide kujutamine 3. klassi lugemiku 2. osas. In Jaan Mikk (ed). *Soorollid õppekirjanduses,* 224-233. Tartu: Tartu Univeristy Press.

Reedik, Edgar. 2009. Variõppekava mõiste ja selle kujunemine. *Haridus*, 3-4, 21-23.

Richards, Jeannine Marie. 2002a. *Social Representations of Gender in the Hidden Curriculum of School Textbooks in Estonia and England*. MA thesis. Department of Psychology, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia.

Richards, Jeannine. 2002b. Teaching more than English? Gender Roles in English Language Textbooks. In Jaan Mikk (ed). *Soorollid õppekirjanduses,* 234-249. Tartu: Tartu Univeristy Press.

Riigi Teataja. 2010. *Põhikooli riiklik õppekava*. Available at https://www.riigiteataja.ee/akt/13273133, accessed 31 January, 2013.

Romaine, Suzanne. 1999. *Communicating Gender*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associations, Inc.

Ruus, Viive-Riina, Marika Veisson, Mare Leino, Loone Ots, Linda Pallas, Ene-Silvia Sarv, Anneli Veisson. 2007. Õpilaste edukus, toimetulek ja heaolu koolis. In Tiiu Kuurme (ed). *Eesti kool 21.saj algul: kool kui arengukeskkond ja õpilase toimetulek*, 17-58; Tallinn: TLU Press.

Salakka, Maive. 2007. *Meesoost ja naissoost isikute kujutamine 7. klassi inglise keele õpikutes "I Love English 5" ja* "Enterprise 2". BA thesis. Department of Pedagogy, Univeristy of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia.

Schulz, Muriel R. (1990). The semantic derogation of woman. In Deborach Cameron (ed). *The Feminist Critique of Language*, 1st ed, 134-147. London and New York: Routledge.

Selander, Staffan. 1995. Pedagogic Texts – Educational Media. *Internationale Schilbuchforschung,* 17: 1, 9-23.

Sula, Mai. 2002. Ka koolilugemik aitab kaasa võrdõiguslikkuse põhimõtte kujunemisele ühiskonnas. In Jaan Mikk (ed). *Soorollid õppekirjanduses,* 213-223. Tartu: Tartu Univeristy Press.

Sunderland, Jane. 2000. New understandings of gender and language classroom research: texts, teacher talk and student talk. *Language Teaching Research*, 4: 2, 149-173.

Sunderland, Jane, Maire Cowley, Fauziah Abdul Rahim, Christina Leontzakou and Julie Shattuck. 2001. From Bias "In the Text" to "Teacher Talk Around the Text". An Exploration of Teacher Discourse and Gendered Foreign Language Texts. *Linguistics and Education,* 11: 3, 251-286.

Sunderland, Jane and Lia Litosseliti. 2002. Gender identity and discourse analysis: Theoretical and empirical considerations. In Lia Litosseliti and Jane Sunderland (eds). *Gender Identity and Discourse Analysis,* 1-39. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Sunderland, Jane, Maire Cowley, Fauziah Abdul Rahim, Christina Leontzakou and Julie Shattuck. 2002. From representation towards discursive practices: Gender in the foreign language textbook revisited. In Lia Litosseliti and Jane Sunderland (eds). *Gender Identity and Discourse Analysis,* 223-225. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Säälik, Ülle. 2002. Soorollide kujutamine 5. klassi ajalooõpikus. In Jaan Mikk (ed). *Soorollid õppekirjanduses,* 32-47. Tartu: Tartu Univeristy Press.

Toom, Piia. 2002. Soorollide kajastamine 8.-9. klassi kodanikuõpetuse õpikus. In Jaan Mikk (ed). *Soorollid õppekirjanduses,* 99-107. Tartu: Tartu Univeristy Press.

Värs, Merike. 2002. Soorollide kujutamine II klassi lugemiku 1. osas. In Jaan Mikk (ed). *Soorollid õppekirjanduses,* 161-175. Tartu: Tartu Univeristy Press.

West, Candace, Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. Doing Gender. *Gender and Society,* 1: 2, 125-151.

Table 9. *English Step by Step 5*

Nr	Characters			Utterances (turns)			Words		
	f	**m**	**n**	**f**	**m**	**n**	**f**	**m**	**n**
1		Tom			11			131	
		David			10			132	
2	Mrs Wilson			9			126		
		Tom			9			178	
3		David			4			34	
		Tom			7			35	
	Mrs Wilson				9			109	
4			Teacher			1			6
			Student			1			10
5	Mrs Wilson			9			149		
		David			9			115	
6		Tom			10			110	
		David			9			111	
7		Tom			11			82	
		David			12			89	
	Mrs Wilson			5			76		
8		David			7			59	
		Tom			6			87	
9		David			2			24	
		Tom			3			31	
		Mr Rowan			5			90	
10		Tom			7			90	
		David			7			102	
11		Tom			3			13	
		David			2			13	
	Sandra			3			41		
Totals:	**types: 2** **tokens: 5**	**types: 3** **tokens: 19**	**types: 2** **tokens: 2**	**26**	**143**	**2**	**392**	**1636**	**16**

Table 10. *I Love English 5*

Nr	Characters			Utterances (turns)			Words		
	f	m	n	f	m	n	f	m	n
1	Mother[1]	Larry		1	2		1	47	
2		John			2			23	
		Alec			1			2	
3	Megan		Teacher[1]	1		1	2		28
4		Teacher[2]			1			18	
		Thomas			1			5	
5		Johnny	Teacher[3]		2	2		14	12
6	Olivia			3			38		
	Silvia			2			14		
7	Mother[2]			2			10		
	Silvia			2			17		
	Olivia			1			4		
8	Mother[2]			1			7		
	Silvia			1			19		
	Olivia			1			2		
9	Olivia			2			21		
	Silvia			2			22		
	Mother[2]			1			19		
10	Mother[2]	Waiter[1]		2	2		23	5	
	Silvia			1			4		
	Olivia			1			6		
11		Waiter[2]	Customer[1]		5	4		13	23
12			Shop assistant[1]			2			7
			Customer[2]			2			7
13			Customer[3]			3			18
			Shop assistant[2]			2			18
14			Customer[4]			3			16
			Shop assistant[3]			3			9
15			Shop assistant[4]			2			7
			Customer[5]			1			5
16			Customer[6]			2			8
			Shop assistant[5]			1			9
17			Customer[7]			3			9
			Cashier			2			8
18			Customer[8]			2			11
			Shop assistant[6]			2			6
19	Susan		Robin	4		3	49		38
20		Liam	Librarian		6	7		31	34
21	Sylvia			7			254		
	Granny			6			288		
Totals:	types: 8 tokens: 19	types: 9 tokens: 9	types: 19 tokens: 19	41	22	47	800	158	273

RESÜMEE

TARTU ÜLIKOOL
INGLISE FILOLOOGIA OSAKOND

Kätlin Lehiste
Representation of Gender in the Dialogues of the Textbooks *English Step by Step 5* and
  I Love English 5
Soolisuse esindatus õpikute „English Step by Step 5" ja „I Love English 5" dialoogides
Magistritöö
2013
Lehekülgede arv: 87

Annotatsioon:
    Antud magistritö eesmärgiks on analüüsida soolisuse kujutamist kahe inglise keele õpiku, „English Step by Step 5" ja „I Love English 5"dialoogides. Mõlemad õpikud on kirjutatud eesti autorite poolt eesti õpilastele, kes õpivad inglise keelt võõrkeelena. Ainult dialoogidele keskenduvaid uuringuid on tehtud vähem kui töid, mis analüüsivad meeste ja naiste üldist kujutamist õpikutes. Sellegipoolest on dialoogid keeletunnis väga olulisel kohal, kuna nad aitavad arendada ja harjutada võõrkeeles kõnelemise oskust. Kui ühele soole on antud väiksem arv sõnu või sellest soost tegelased on esindatud piiratud sotsiaalsetes rollides, siis õpilased võivad saada vähem võimalusi harjutamiseks või neil võivad areneda valearusaamad sellest, kuidas sihtkeelt emakeelena kõnelevad inimesed räägivad.
    Töö sissejuhatus arutleb kooli ja õppematerjalide rolli üle sotsialiseerimisprotsessis, sealhulgas seoses sooliste praktikatega. Esimene osa annab ülevaate eelnevatest uuringutest soolisuse ja õppekirjanduse teemal, keskendudes võõrkeeleõpikutele. Keelekasutuse ja soolisuse vahelistest seostest annab ülevaate töö teine osa. Kolmandas osas kirjeldatakse valimit ning tuuakse välja kvantitatiivse ja kvalitatiivse analüüsi kriteeriumid. Kvantitatiivses analüüsis uuritakse kui palju on dialoogides mees- ja naissoost ning soo-neurtraalseid tegelasi, kui palju on neil sõnu ja vooruvahetusi, ning mitu korda nad alustavad või lõpetavad dialooge, mille tegelased on erinevast soost. Kvalitatiivses analüüsis uuritakse millistes sotsiaalsetes rollides ja keskkondades tegelasi kujutakase, milline on olnud keelekasutus tegelaste esitamisel ja millist keelt kasutavad dialoogi osalised üksteise adresseerimisel või teistele inimestele viitamisel, ning milliseid keelefunktsioone tegelased kasutavad. Neljandas osas esitatakse uuringutulemused.
    Analüüsi tulemusena selgus, et kuna õpikus „English Step by Step 5" on dialoogide peategelasteks kaks koolipoissi, siis pakub antud õpik kõige rohkem harjutamisvõimalusi meessoost õpilastele. Õpik „I Love English 5" kujutab aga põhiliselt naissoost ja soo-neutraalseid tegelasi, kes esinevad erinevates situatsioonides ning osalevad rohkem erinevates tegevustes kui meessoost tegelased. Seetõttu võivad naissoost õpilased saada ka rohkem harjutamisvõimalusi ja eeskujusid. Kui valimisse jäeti ainult dialoogid, millel olid konkreetsed juhised valjult lugemiseks, ei täheldatud õpiku „English Step by Step 5" tulemustes olulisi muutusi, samas kui õpik „I Love English 5" jäi valimisse 21st dialoogist 8, mis kujutasid valdavalt soo-neutraalseid tegelasi ning seestõttu saaksid nad mõlemast soost õpilastele pakkuda võrdseid harjutamisvõimalusi ja eeskujusid.

Märksõnad: soouuringud, inglise keele didaktika, dialoogid

Lihtlitsents lõputöö reprodutseerimiseks ja lõputöö üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemiseks

Mina   Kätlin Lehiste
                                          (*autori nimi*)
(sünnikuupäev: 24.10.1987   )

1.   annan Tartu Ülikoolile tasuta loa (lihtlitsentsi) enda loodud teose
      Representation of Gender in the Dialogues of the Textbooks *English Step by Step 5* and
                              I Love English 5
                                                                                             ,
                              (*lõputöö pealkiri*)

mille juhendaja on   Raili Marling   ,
                              (*juhendaja nimi*)

1.1. reprodutseerimiseks säilitamise ja üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemise eesmärgil,
      sealhulgas digitaalarhiivi DSpace-is lisamise eesmärgil kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse
      tähtaja lõppemiseni;
1.2. üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemiseks Tartu Ülikooli veebikeskkonna kaudu, sealhulgas
      digitaalarhiivi DSpace´i kaudu kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse tähtaja lõppemiseni.

2.   olen teadlik, et punktis 1 nimetatud õigused jäävad alles ka autorile.

3.   kinnitan, et lihtlitsentsi andmisega ei rikuta teiste isikute intellektuaalomandi ega
      isikuandmete kaitse seadusest tulenevaid õigusi.

Tartus/Tallinnas/Narvas/Pärnus/Viljandis,   13.05.2013   (*kuupäev*)