Title
Uncovering Cultural Bias in EFL Textbooks

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4rc558zw

Author
Sherman, John Eric

Publication Date
2010-04-29

Peer reviewed

Jennifer Ewald is an Associate Professor of Spanish and Linguistics at Saint Joseph's University in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Her research interests include classroom discourse, applied linguistics, methodology, teacher education, pragmatics, and second language acquisition.

Uncovering Cultural Bias in EFL Textbooks

John Eric Sherman
Hongik University

This study lays the foundation for reasons and ways to investigate the biased treatment of non-native characters in model dialogues in current English as a Foreign/Second Language textbooks. The literature review shows that although a plethora of studies have been conducted on gender bias in textbooks, speaker bias, or labeled nativism here, has been largely ignored. This research addresses this neglect by systematically applying parts of two frameworks previously used in analyzing textbooks for gender bias to four current EFL textbooks. The resulting data is quantitative in nature with some necessary description and qualification and shows that only one text avoids bias against non-native speakers. In the other texts, speaker bias is exhibited by non-native speakers being segregated or being only allowed to interact with a native speaker. In addition, non-native speakers are limited to non-expert roles in two texts. Based on these results, suggestions for further research are offered.

INTRODUCTION

The primary responsibility often articulated by employers to native TESOL teachers in expanding circle countries (see Kachru, 1985) is to build their students' English communication skills. Teachers should accomplish this by choosing appropriate textbooks for their classes. This requirement supports the notion that the centerpiece of most TESOL classrooms remains the text. In reference to studies by Woodward and Elliot (1990), Sadker and Sadker (2001) note, "students spend as much as 80 to 95 percent of classroom time using textbooks and that teachers make a majority of their instructional decisions based on the textbook" (p. 134). Similarly, Auerbach (1995) claims, "the text is seen to be the backbone of the curriculum (and in some cases, it actually *becomes* the curriculum)" (p. 21). Because of this dominance, many researchers have undertaken various analyses and critiques of available textbooks, and rightly so.

In English language teaching, Roberts (2001) makes the point that "language socialization rather than language acquisition better describes how learners come to produce and interpret discourse [. . .]" (p. 108). Thus, if TESOL teachers fail to confront textbook bias, these educators are implicitly supporting as well as possibly socializing their students into accepting it. One might argue that students are not vessels to be filled and could easily resist such socialization of the bias. Sunderland (2000) claims that the "effects of learning of any text are impossible to predict because we cannot predict a given reader's response to that text, including what that reader will 'take' from it" (p. 153). Such unpredictability may seem plausible at first; however, Hall ([1973] 1980), with regard to televisual discourse, points out

that it is possible to predict certain positions—dominant-hegemonic, negotiated and oppositional—when one decodes a message (pp. 136-38). Likewise, Sleeter and Grant (1991) summarizes these possible positions by noting that "many students may internalize what they are taught through textbooks, although others may marginalize it within their own thinking or reject it outright" (p. 97). In the end, how the students respond to a text, specifically the bias within it—whether that response be accepting, challenging or rejecting such bias—becomes an important part of the language socialization process.

Interestingly, although research has been conducted on gender bias in textbooks and the influence of gender in the classroom as well as gender's influence in native and non-native interactions, little has been done regarding speaker status bias in textbooks. Therefore, this is a gap of knowledge this study addresses. The researcher's goal is to create a new dialogue on bias in textbooks against the non-native speaker, a form of cultural bias termed *nativism*, akin to that which has been explored for gender. Thus, the guiding research question is, in general: what forms of cultural bias are TESOL textbooks presenting to EFL students in the model dialogues? More specifically, 1) how are non-native speakers represented in relation to native speakers?, 2) how are non-native female and male speakers represented in relation to native female and male speakers in terms of social roles?, 3) how are non-native female speakers represented in relation to non-native male speakers in terms of social roles?, and 4) how are native female speakers represented in relation to male speakers in terms of social roles? A brief review of the literature on gender and cultural bias studies offers some insights on how to approach and attempt to answer these questions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

As noted, gender bias within EFL textbooks has been widely researched through various content analyses; however, only a few are briefly summarized here. The most popular method is performing an inventory count of the characters, roles and language used in books. Porreca's (1984) analysis of the 15 most popular ESL textbooks at that time is a prime example. She chooses the texts by consulting the current booklists at 27 ESL centers and by observing which ones had been bought in the largest quantities (p. 712). Her analysis focuses on six categories: omission, firstness, occupations, nouns, masculine generic constructions and adjectives. Her methods include counting the number of males and females appearing in the written text and pictures in the books; who is presented first in exercises, examples and sentences; how often male and females appear in occupational roles as well as the different types of occupations shown; every noun that indicates a male or female; the total times masculine generic constructions occur in the text and the adjectives used with males versus females (pp. 712-13). Comparing her results to earlier ones, Porreca (1984) concludes that "in every category of this study, there is

evidence that [. . .] sexism continues to flourish in ESL materials" (p. 718). Studies like Porreca's have been valuable in illustrating how a preference for maleness can easily be found in the materials by quantifying language items.

Others seek to analyze ways in which sexism might more directly affect students. Jones, Kitetu, and Sunderland (1997) note that little attention has been given to the model dialogues often presented in EFL textbooks. The focus has mostly been on the reading texts or grammar examples, but when the dialogues have been analyzed, they were treated in the same way as the other types of texts. However, Jones, Kitetu, and Sunderland stress that such dialogues are often used in certain ways in the classroom: as oral models, as basis for pair work, as a model for writing and as a model for listening or reading. Thus, they see their use as "developing knowledge of the language being learnt," "provid[ing] a social context in which to practice new language" and "a means of actually practicing conversational speech" (p. 471). They then conclude that gender bias in such dialogues could affect the students' knowledge, practice opportunities and language skills being learned (p. 473). Particularly problematic is the fact that students assigned to dialogues based upon their gender could have different amounts of practice and also practice different language skills. To test their ideas, they analyze the dialogues meant to be utilized for conversation practice in 3 EFL textbooks. Their methodology is quantitative and similar to that of Porreca's (1984). They focus on the number of male/female roles, the number of times males/females started a conversation, the number of turns each gender took and the number of words spoken (pp. 475-76). Interestingly, their results show very small differences that were not significant. However, Jones, Kitetu, and Sunderland (1997) note that this could be because of the occupational or social roles given to the characters in the dialogues (p. 480); something they fail to consider. They make reference to a study done by Poulou (1997). She analyzes the occupational and social roles in dialogues as well as the language functions: informational, phatic, directive and expressive (p. 68). She discovers inequality in the language functions assigned to different roles based upon gender (p. 71). Thus, Poulou's (1997) work seems to verify the fears of Jones, Kitetu, and Sunderland (1997). This continuation of sexism in textbooks deserves further study but also needs to be examined in conjunction with another important characteristic: speaker status.

Moving beyond these earlier studies by including the language status of the persons demonstrating the language in the dialogues is not easy because the native versus non-native speaker dichotomy is a contentious issue in language teaching. The native speaker has been long viewed as the correct model to be imitated, especially in regards to pronunciation, with the non-native speaker as a second best. However, much debate has revolved around the nature of the native speaker, as well as non-native speaker, with many calling into question the use or meaning of these terms (see Paikeday, 1985; Widdowson, 1994; Kramsch, 1995; Canagarajah, 1999; Cook, 1999; Rajagopalan, 1997, 1999; Davies, 2003; and Higgins, 2003). Gupta (2001) notes that "the most usual definition of a 'native speaker' of a lan-

guage is 'one who acquired the language in infancy, before any other language was acquired (though not necessarily as the sole language being learnt)'" (p. 366). However, even this definition can be contested. For example, Brutt-Griffler and Samimy (2001) point out through four case studies that "nativeness constitutes a non-elective socially constructed identity rather than a linguistic category" for many international speakers of English (p. 100). Furthermore, adding to this debate is the fact that others have questioned the usefulness of Kachru's (1985) division of English into 3 concentric circles as the language's continuing spread is making the boundaries less clear (see Graddol, 1997 and Yano, 2001). In the end, it seems it is the non-native English speaking professional who continues to suffer the most from this dichotomy, especially when that professional's identity is being socially constructed in the classroom by students because of race (see Amin, 1997). Many have been quick to point out the advantages and disadvantages of both native and non-native teachers to confront this problem (see Medgyes, 1992; Phillipson, 1992; Widdowson, 1992; Tang, 1997 and Arva and Medgyes, 2000). However, a short interview with almost any non-native teacher will show that much progress has yet to be made on this issue.

Even with so much debate over the native/non-native dichotomy, Cook (1999) notes, "In practice [. . .] the native speaker model remains firmly entrenched in language teaching and SLA research" (p. 188). With the native speaker model and ideal being far from permanent replacement, it is no wonder that "Language professionals often take it for granted that the only appropriate models of a language's use come from its native speakers" (Cook, 1999, p. 185). Moreover, curriculum developers and producers reflect this expectation. Rajagopalan (2004) points out:

> the day is not far off (if it has not come already) when more and more people across the globe will be using the language for communication between non-English speakers than for linguistics encounters involving at least one native speaker, considered the stereotypical case by most curriculum planners and course designers. (p. 115)

However, more and more professionals are now beginning to demand that instructional materials better reflect this spread and use of English as an international language (see Alptekin, 2002; and Matsuda, 2003). The appearance of the non-native speaker in more recent textbooks illustrates that some curriculum developers and producers are finally beginning to accept the coming change in English use worldwide and are responding to language professionals. However, Cook (1999) notes that "unequal gender roles in EFL textbooks" have been analyzed and claims that "the status of L2 users is in even more need of redress, because they are virtually never represented positively" (p. 200). Thus, this study hopes to address this neglected issue using techniques from some of the gender analyses previously completed as well as similarly employed in other studies of cultural bias.

One example of such a study is Colebrook (1996) who confronts various forms of cultural bias in EFL texts by drawing upon Barthes' work to analyze their symbolic structure (p. 153) as well as Said's work to analyze their relationship with culture, power and knowledge (p. 156). He examines the text as a marketable commodity and the discursive practices within it that support the native speaker hierarchy. Although his work is focused more generally on how the cultural bias is being packaged and sold in EFL textbooks, it was Colebrook's (1996) statement that "the positioning of the 'native speaker' and its 'other,' the non-native speaker, is still transparent throughout the discourse of ELT and EIL" (p. 158) that established the basis for this study and its investigation of cultural bias termed *nativism* here. More specifically, it was Ndura's (2004) analysis of ESL textbooks that helped structure this paper. Drawing upon Sadker and Sadker's (2001) list of seven types of gender bias—invisibility, linguistic bias, stereotyping, imbalance, unreality, fragmentation and cosmetic bias—Ndura (2004) utilizes three of the types in her analysis of six ESL textbooks that were being used in a school district in the western United States (p. 145). She discovers various examples of stereotyping, invisibility and unreality in the chosen texts used from elementary to high school (pp.146-48). Thus, Ndura's (2004) application of a framework for gender bias to study cultural bias became a guide to this research project.

Overall, quite a few frameworks have been developed and used to analyze bias in textbooks. However, one problem has been that many researchers have worked with only one framework at a time to analyze a given set of textbooks. Each framework is like a photograph: it gives a one-time static view of the text from a certain angle. What would be more beneficial is to use several frameworks, at least two, to analyze the same set of chosen texts from a variety of angles giving a fuller picture. Although this is still a static view in the sense that one is observing the textbook outside of its use in a classroom, it is nevertheless a necessary view to have so that teachers can better strategize in dealing with the inherent bias carried by the text. If educators are unaware of such bias, in both its obvious and hidden forms, then they cannot begin to help students go beyond comprehension to discussion of and possible questioning of such bias. Furthermore, Lesikin (2001) points out that "a variety of approaches may be needed to account for the inherent contradictions in texts" (p. 276). In addition, a variety of methods must be used not only to help verify results but also to give a fuller picture of how the bias may be manifested in different ways in texts. Thus, two frameworks are utilized in this study: Sadker and Sadker's (2001) to give a clearer picture of how non-native speakers are interacting with each other and with native speakers and Poulou's (1997) to see which occupational and social roles are being presented in the text. These frameworks can not only illustrate differences between gender but also between speaker status. Uncovering cultural bias in model dialogues will help other educators in expanding circle TESOL contexts better confront these issues when using such conversations in their classrooms.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Operationalization of Key Concepts

Representation of non-native female and male and native female and male speakers is being measured by a systematic quantitative analysis of classifying and counting various aspects of the dialogues. The exact elements classified and counted are explained in detail under both of the chosen frameworks. All other concepts such as fragmentation, experts, and non-experts are also defined or explained within the paper.

Participants/Materials

Four textbooks marketed and sold in South Korea are chosen based upon their inclusion of non-native speakers, their publishers being international and their type being conversation focused. These texts include *Person to Person* from Oxford UP, *World Link* from Thomson Heinle, *Top Notch* from Pearson Education and *Interchange* from Cambridge UP. For congruency, the study focuses on the high beginner to intermediate levels of these series, and the texts all focus on young adult learners of university age or above. Moreover, the conversation lengths in high beginner to intermediate level texts are of more appropriate length for analyzing. Every model dialogue in each chapter of each text is analyzed with most containing only one per chapter but two can be found in *Person to Person* as well as one chapter in *World Link*. Lastly, the study utilizes dialogues because these easily illustrate how the non-native speakers are represented in the text.

Procedure

The study follows these steps. First, the conversations for analysis are identified as below:

Person to Person 2: 12 units in this textbook with each having 2 model conversations for a total of 24. These model conversations are located in sections labeled *Conversation 1* and *Conversation 2*.

World Link 2: 12 units are in this textbook with Unit 1 having 2 model conversations and Units 2-12 having one each for a total of 13. These model conversations are located in a section titled *Speaking*.

Top Notch 2: 10 units are in this textbook. Each unit has 1 conversation for a total of 10. The model conversations are located in a section titled *Sound Bites*.

Interchange 2: 16 units are in this textbook. Each unit has 1 conversation for a total of 16. The model conversations are located in a section titled *Conversation*.

Second, each conversation is systematically analyzed using parts of the two frameworks listed and explained below. Parts of these frameworks are used because of a need to make adjustments since the study uses dialogues and not all of the written text in the books as well as the focus including speaker status and not

just gender. In general, the results are divided into two categories—non-native and native speaker—or four categories—non-native female, native female, non-native male and native male.

Sadker and Sadker's (2001) Framework

Sadker and Sadker (2001) identify seven forms of bias: invisibility, linguistic bias, stereotyping, imbalance, unreality, fragmentation and cosmetic bias (pp. 135-37). This study uses fragmentation. Sadker and Sadker present fragmentation in terms of gender as when a textbook "separates the discussion of women into a disconnected chapter, or perhaps a separate section or insert" and "when groups are depicted as interacting only among themselves and as having little or no influence on society as a whole" (p. 137). To discover if speaker-status fragmentation is occurring in the dialogues, the researcher counts and records the number of: 1) conversations between two native, two non-native or one native and one non-native speakers. Some conversations have more than two speakers, so adjustments in categories (e.g. two native and one non-native) are necessary for this. The goal is to observe the interaction occurring between non-native and native speakers and how the textbooks might separate these groups. This framework addresses the first research question: how are non-native speakers represented in relation to native speakers?

For speaker status, a native speaker is determined by someone who is born in an inner circle country, a country where English is the mother tongue (see Kachru, 1985). A non-native speaker is determined by someone born in an expanding circle country—a country where English has spread through colonialism and has some official status by law—or in an outer circle country—a country where English has spread as a lingua franca but where it does not have official status by law (see Kachru, 1985). However, as Yano (2001) points out there are possible native speakers born in expanding circle countries as an established variety of English may be the language learnt first (p. 122).

When country of birth is not given, other criteria like name, pictures, audio recordings are used as clues to identify where speakers were most likely born. Because so few of the characters state their country of origin, these criteria are used. Personally, the researcher finds equating Caucasian with native speaker status and people of color with non-native speaker status very troubling but knows this idea is common in the EFL/ESL industry (see Amin, 1997) and among students. In summary, speakers are classified into non-native, native and ambiguous categories by the following criteria:

1. Names given in the text: first and sometimes last
2. Pictures accompanying each model conversation showing ethnicity
3. CD/Tape recordings of the model conversations in which the speakers have a clear non-native or native accent.

4. Country in which conversation occurs if stated or suggested in text or country from which the character comes if stated or suggested in text.

Some problems do occur in using these four criteria. They are discussed in the data section with the accompanying detailed notes presented in Appendix 1.

Poulou's (1997) Framework

Poulou's (1997) study focuses on the female and male discourse roles in dialogues in "textbooks for teaching Greek as a foreign language" (p. 68). She focuses on mixed-sex dialogues by recording the "amount of speech (number of utterances and number of words), number of initiating utterances and final utterances, and language functions" (p. 68). However, for this study, another part of her work is utilized. Poulou's (1997) analysis also includes classifying the social roles of the speakers in the dialogues. This is done as such roles could offer further explanations on why certain characters are using certain language functions and who is dominating the conversation. However, on a more basic level, it also shows if females or males are being regulated to certain stereotypical roles such as women always being seen as homemakers or secretaries while men are the doctors or bosses. In this study, this classification is important to see if non-native and native speakers are portrayed on equal terms in various roles. In her classification, Poulou (1997) makes a distinction "between speakers exhibiting an occupational role (hotelier, baker etc.) and speakers having only a personal relationship role (mother, husband etc.)" and uses the terms "experts" and "non-experts" respectively to identify each group (p. 69). Interestingly, in her results, Poulou (1997) only presents jobs in the occupational or expert category (p. 70). This must mean she considers the role of customer as a personal relationship role. Thus, all characters in a customer role are classified as a non-expert. In many textbooks, characters exhibiting an occupational role are often labeled as such with no name given, while those exhibiting a personal relationship role are usually identified by a name only. Within some conversations, the context explicitly suggests the kind of personal relationship. In some instances, inferences have to be made. However, all clues or information provided in the dialogues are used to make classifications.

Since the goal is to move beyond just looking for gender bias and include cultural bias, the study divides the characters by their gender and speaker status. The results from Sadker and Sadker's (2001) framework are used for the second division. The following criteria are used for the gender division into female, male and ambiguous classifications:

1. Names given in the text: first and sometimes last
2. Pictures accompanying each model conversation showing gender
3. CD/Tape recordings of the model conversations in which the speakers have a clear male or female voice.

Again, some problems do occur in using these three criteria. They are discussed in the data section with the accompanying detailed notes presented in Appendix 2.

Finally, this study's use of Poulou's (1997) framework is to address the last three of the four research questions: 2) how are non-native female and male speakers represented in relation to native female and male speakers in terms of social roles?, 3) how are non-native female speakers represented in relation to non-native male speakers in terms of social roles?, and 4) how are native female speakers represented in relation to male speakers in terms of social roles?

Approaches to Data Analysis

Most of the previous gender studies including Poulou (1997) have used comparisons between totals of raw counts as well as percentages to illustrate bias. Thus, this study uses these as well.

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited in the following ways: 1) by the textbooks chosen for analysis (cannot generalize to other texts), 2) by analyzing only the dialogues within each text (limited scope of analysis), 3) by being static in nature (not analyzing the textbooks in use in a classroom), and 4) by the researcher's own subjectivity that could affect the reliability and validity.

DATA

Due to the nature of Sadker and Sadker's (2001) framework, conversations that include characters with unclassifiable speaker statuses result in the entire conversation being excluded from the results, but only for this particular framework. For example, some problems do occur in using the four criteria for this framework because some texts, like *Person to Person 2*, include non-native characters who have seemingly adopted English first names. In those instances, the researcher goes by the last name (if given) and criteria 2-4 for these characters. Also, majority rule is used at times, so when there is conflicting information, the side that has more support is chosen. Another problem is that some texts do not accompany all of their conversations with pictures and sometimes use cartoon drawings or pictures of objects or places to illustrate the dialogues. For example, *Interchange 2* uses only cartoon drawings, so criteria 1, 3 and 4 are applied for classification of the speakers of this text. Moreover, some texts use all native speakers on their recordings even though characters in the books are clearly meant to be non-native. In these instances, the researcher relies on the other criteria to make a decision regarding the speaker's status. In fact, due to these problems, only criterion 1 can be used for *World Link 2*, and some names such as Omar, Maria and Mina are unclassifiable as definitely non-native or native, so these conversations are not used in the analysis. One other note is that in *Top Notch 2*, the researcher discovers that the directions

of the *Sound Bites* section also imply if the conversation is between non-native speakers or native speakers. All of the dialogues that have 2 non-native speakers have the directions "Read along silently as you listen to a conversation in a (hotel/ car rental agency/meeting) in (Spain/Germany/Brazil)" (Saslow and Ascher, 2006). All of the dialogues that involve 2 native speakers have the directions "Read along silently as you listen to a natural conversation" (Saslow and Ascher, 2006). The use of *natural*, or not, seems to show which conversations are between native speakers and which are not beyond the four criteria utilized. Also, all of the texts include characters with no name, but these individuals are identified with a social role like woman or renter or by a job title like agent or detective. In regards to the last issue, all of these characters are deemed a native speaker unless there is evidence to suggest otherwise. This evidence comes from the application of criteria 2-4 for this framework where possible. In short, in *Person to Person 2* one conversation is unusable, as the speaker status of at least one character cannot be determined by the criteria used. Thus, only 23 conversations are included in the results. Moreover, in *World Link 2* three conversations are unusable, as the speaker status of at least one character in each cannot be determined by the criteria used. Therefore, only 10 conversations are included in the results. Finally, to see specifically the application of this framework, please refer to Appendix 1 that includes the detailed classification notes for each speaker in the analyzed model conversations.

Due to the nature of Poulou's (1997) framework, only the lines spoken by characters with unclassifiable gender or speaker statuses are excluded from the results. Since the researcher divides the characters not only by their gender but also by their speaker status, the results from the criteria developed for Sadker and Sadker's (2001) framework are used for the speaker status division while the results from the criteria developed for this framework are used for the gender division. Therefore, the division of speaker statues is non-native, native and ambiguous and the division of gender is female, male and ambiguous. Some specific problems occur in using the three criteria for this framework because some texts, like *World Link 2* and *Interchange 2*, do not accompany all of their conversations with pictures and sometimes use cartoon drawings or pictures of objects or places to illustrate the conversations. Furthermore, there is even an instance in which a character's gender in one book conflicts with the voice on the recording of the dialogue. In regard to these issues, the characters are deemed a female or male by majority rule using as many of the three criteria for this framework where possible. However, when one criterion is not applicable, a tie is possible and, in fact, does happen once, so the character has to be classified as ambiguous and the lines are excluded from the data. Once again, any specific data from conversations that include characters of ambiguous speaker status or gender status is recorded but is not included in the final results and analysis. However, only the specific data related to that ambiguous character is disqualified and not all of the data from the entire analyzed conversation.

Lastly, to see specifically the application of this framework, please see Appendix 2 that includes the detailed classification notes for the occupational/personal roles in the model conversations.

RESULTS, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Sadker and Sadker's (2001) Framework

Sadker and Sadker's (2001) framework reveal how much interaction is occurring between non-native and native speakers in the model conversations and how separate these groups are in some textbooks. First, *Person to Person 2* proves to be the best in its integration of non-native and native speakers with *World Link 2* being second as can be been in tables 1 and 2 below.

Table 1: Frequency of Dialogues between Only Native Speakers, Only Non-native Speakers or Mixed Speakers for Person to Person 2

	Dialogues with only native speakers	Dialogues with only non-native speakers	Dialogues with mixed speakers	Total dialogues
Frequency (%)	0 (0%)	7 (30%)	16 (70%)	23 (100%)

Table 2: Frequency of Dialogues between Only Native Speakers, Only Non-native Speakers or Mixed Speakers for World Link 2

	Dialogues with only native speakers	Dialogues with only non-native speakers	Dialogues with mixed speakers	Total dialogues
Frequency (%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	7 (70%)	10 (100%)

Of the 23 conversations analyzed in the first text, 16 are with mixed speakers and seven with only non-native speakers. The text has no conversations featuring only native speakers. The examples given in this text seem most appropriate in an EFL context where students are most likely to be using English with other non-native speakers. In fact, more conversations could have featured only non-native speakers interacting with one another. Of the ten conversations analyzed in the second text, seven are with mixed speakers and three with only native speakers. This text has no dialogues with only non-native speakers, a troubling find for an EFL context. Thus, the text seems unable to let go of the native speaker as one has to be present at all times in each conversation. However, the majority of conversations in both texts shows non-native and native speakers interacting with one another, a good sign. This is not the case in the other two texts as shown in Tables 3 and 4 below.

Table 3: Frequency of Dialogues between Only Native Speakers, Only Non-native Speakers or Mixed Speakers for Top Notch 2

	Dialogues with only native speakers	Dialogues with only non-native speakers	Dialogues with mixed speakers	Total dialogues
Frequency (%)	7 (70%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	10 (100%)

Table 4: Frequency of Dialogues between Only Native Speakers, Only Non-native Speakers or Mixed Speakers for Interchange 2

	Dialogues with only native speakers	Dialogues with only non-native speakers	Dialogues with mixed speakers	Total dialogues
Frequency (%)	14 (87.5%)	0 (0%)	2 (12.5%)	16 (100%)

Table 3 shows that in *Top Notch 2*, non-native and native speakers are segregated from one another as the majority of the conversations (7) are with only native speakers and the minority (3) are with only non-native speakers. Thus, this text presents a world in which only native speakers interact with each other and non-native speakers interact with each other. Such separation, whether it is based upon speaker status, race, gender etc., is quite problematic in a textbook. Table 4 shows that *Interchange 2* avoids such segregation, albeit barely. In this text the vast majority of conversations (14) are with only native speakers with just two including a non-native speaker. Thus, non-native speakers are present but only as a small minority.

Poulou's (1997) framework

Poulou's (1997) framework shows some interesting patterns in three of the textbooks when the speakers are classified into expert (occupational) and non-expert (personal relationship) roles. In *World Link 2* and *Interchange 2*, non-native speakers never occupy expert roles and are only seen as non-experts as Tables 5 and 6 show below.

Moreover, Tables 5 and 6 show that native speakers are clearly seen in both expert and non-expert roles in both textbooks. The complete absence of non-native males in *Interchange 2* is quite apparent here as well. Considering that many EFL students are studying English for future job requirements, this lack of non-native speakers using English in their occupation is quite curious in these texts. Thus, the books suggest that non-native speakers only use English for personal relations but not for business. Interestingly, *Top Notch 2* presents the exact opposite as Table 7 shows below.

Table 5: Frequency of Expert and Non-expert Roles for Non-native Female and Male and Native Female and Male Speakers for World Link 2

	Non-native		Native	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
Experts	None	None	Politician (1) Detective (1) Receptionist (1)	Politician (1) Detective (1) (Store) clerk (1)
Non-experts	Friend (2) Acquaintance (1) Customer (2)	Friend (2) Acquaintance (1) Classmate (1) Partner (1)	Friend (2) Acquaintance (1) Customer (1) Partner (1) Daughter (1)	Friend (3) Customer (1) Father (1)

Table 6: Frequency of Expert and Non-expert Roles for Non-native Female and Male and Native Female and Male Speakers for Interchange 2

	Non-native		Native	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
Experts	None	None	Hairdresser (1)	Waiter (1) (Airport info.) Clerk (1)
Non-experts	Friend (1) Acquaintance (1)	None	Friend (7) Customer (2) Partner (2) Mother (1) Daughter (1)	Friend (11) Customer (2) Partner (2) Father (1) Son (1)

Table 7: Frequency of Expert and Non-expert Roles for Non-native Female and Male and Native Female and Male Speakers for Top Notch 2

	Non-native		Native	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
Experts	(Car rental) Agent (1) Businesswoman (2)	(Hotel) Clerk (1)	None	None
Non-experts	(Hotel) Guest (1)	(Car) Renter (1)	Friend (6) Partner (1)	Friend (4) Partner (1) Acquaintance (2)

Now non-native speakers occupy both expert and non-expert roles while native speakers are only non-experts. Therefore, this text better represents how non-native speakers may be using English in their lives but fails short in its portrayal of how native speakers use English. Only *Person to Person 2* shows non-native and native speakers of both genders in expert and non-expert roles as can be seen in Table 8.

Table 8: Frequency of Expert and Non-expert Roles for Non-native Female and Male and Native Female and Male Speakers for Person to Person 2

	Non-native		Native	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
Ex-perts	Guide (2)	(Hotel) Glerk (1) (Travel) Agent (1)	Secretary (2) Pharmacist (1)	(Info.) Clerk (1)
Non-experts	(Hotel) Guest (1)	(Car) renter (1)	Friend (6) Partner (1)	Friend (4) Partner (1) Acquaintance (2)

The imbalance shown in the other texts—one that warrants further exploration with a larger sample of texts—raises issues again of how students are being socialized regarding the use of the language. Surely, the texts have a responsibility to show non-native, as well as native speakers, in both expert and non-expert roles, so students are exposed to realistic ideas of how English is used. Finally, it should be noted that no significant gender discrimination was found between the roles assigned to females and males in the texts, a positive sign indeed.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study aims to find out how the non-native speakers are being presented in comparison to native speakers in current EFL textbooks. Biased representations in materials, whether they are based on gender, race, class, speaker status and so on, are problematic due to the nature of English language teaching. If biased materials are being used in classrooms and EFL teachers are failing to confront such bias, these educators are implicitly supporting as well as possibly socializing the students to accept it. Of course, students are not empty vessels to be filled with knowledge and can react in various ways to biased texts. However, the educator certainly has a social responsibility not simply to ignore bias in textbooks but to point it out and help students confront it, with the understanding that such confrontation will allow students to better make the final decision in how they respond to it. Overall, how the students react to biased texts, whether that response be accepting, challenging or rejecting the bias, becomes an important part of the language socialization process.

The sexism exhibited in textbooks has been thoroughly researched and documented since the 1970s and continues now with studies moving into the classroom to see how the use of such materials as well as the treatment of such materials by teachers could be affecting students' learning. Although so much research has been conducted on gender bias in textbooks and even on the influence of gender in the classroom as well as gender's influence in native and non-native interactions, a lot less has been done regarding speaker status bias in textbooks. Thus, the goal of this study is to address this gap of knowledge and create a new dialogue on bias in textbooks against the non-native speaker, a form of cultural bias termed *nativism*.

This study utilizes parts of frameworks developed for the study of gender bias. Two frameworks—Sadker and Sadker (2001) and Poulou (1997)—have been adapted to look for speaker bias in four current EFL textbooks: *Person to Person 2*, *World Link 2*, *Top Notch 2* and *Interchange 2*. Unfortunately, just as these earlier studies discover various forms of gender bias in ESL/EFL textbooks, their application here also prove to show forms of discrimination for speaker status.

First, this study utilizes Sadker and Sadker's (2001) idea of fragmentation. The findings show that fragmentation—non-native and native speakers interacting only among themselves—is occurring in one of the texts. In *Top Notch 2*, all of the model dialogues occur between all native speakers or all non-native speakers. Not one conversation shows a non-native and native speaker interacting with one another. *Interchange 2* barely avoids this by including two conversations that contain a non-native speaker with the other 14 conversations featuring only native speakers. These findings prove that just because the selected materials contain non-native speakers does not necessarily mean they are being entirely inclusive. The non-native speakers could be segregated from native speakers or they could be just there to make the text appear to address the issue of such speakers but failing to truly present them using English in a realistic way. The results should serve as a warning to EFL educators to look carefully at how native and non-native speakers are interacting in the dialogues of any text they are currently using or considering for their classes.

Secondly, this study utilizes Poulou's (1997) idea of social roles. For this, the analysis divides characters into expert (occupational) and non-expert (personal relationship) roles. Once again bias is found in three of the four textbooks. Only *Person to Person 2* shows non-native and native speakers in both expert and non-expert roles. *World Link 2* and *Interchange 2* fail to show any non-native speakers in expert roles while *Top Notch 2* fails to show native speakers in any such roles. The lack of non-native speakers using English in an occupational role in some of the texts is quite problematic when the majority of EFL students are studying English for future job requirements in their country. These books suggest that non-native speakers only use English for personal relations but not for business. The texts have a responsibility to show non-native, as well as native speakers, in both occupational and personal relationship roles, so students are exposed to realistic

ideas of how English is used. Once again, the results suggest EFL teachers need to analyze which roles native and non-native speakers are given in the dialogues of any text they are currently using or considering for their classes.

Unfortunately, the results of this study have shown that the introduction of the non-native speaker into EFL textbooks has not been done in a fair and unbiased way. In fact, they suggest that just as many content studies were done for gender over the years to instigate much needed change in that area that many more studies for speaker status should be done as well to push for more equitable treatment of non-native speakers in current and future published materials. Furthermore, just as Sunderland, Cowley, Rahim, Leontzakou, & Shattuck (2001) argue for a shift from analyzing texts in a static way to analyzing them in action in a classroom setting, a future area of study would include studying the use of materials containing non-native speakers in schools. These studies should focus not only on how students respond to such texts and the bias in them but also how both native and non-native teachers treat these texts. One other area of much needed study that is not addressed in this research is English varieties and international English in materials (see Ammon 2000 and Modiano 2001). Of the four textbooks analyzed, both *Person to Person 2* and *Interchange 2* clearly state that they are written in American English while *World Link 2* and *Top Notch 2* both say they are presenting English as an international language. However, in reality they also appear to be in American English. Moreover, although non-native speakers are used on the audio recordings of three of the texts, none of them feature other varieties of English in use such as Indian English or Singaporean English. Thus, the non-native speakers are speaking a standard variety, American English, with a non-native accent without including any particular vocabulary or grammar structures representing a possible variety of English spoken in their country. As with the appearance of the non-native speaker, surely the appearance of other varieties in materials will need to be studied both outside and inside the classroom. Only with such studies can educators be sure that they are empowering their students with a sense of ownership of English.

REFERENCES

Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *ELT Journal*, *56*(1), 57-64.

Amin, N. (1997). Race and the identity of the nonnative ESL teacher. *TESOL Quarterly*, *31*(3), 580-83.

Ammon, U. (2000). Towards fairness in international English: Linguistic rights of non-native speakers? In R. Phillipson (Ed.), *Rights to language equity, power, and education*. (pp. 111-16). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Arva, V. & Medgyes, P. (2000). Native and non-native teachers in the classroom. *System*, *28*, 355-72.

Auerbach, E. R. (1995). The politics of the ESL classroom: Issues of power in pedagogical choices. In T.W. Tollefson (Ed.), *Power and inequality in language education*. (pp. 9-33). New York: Cambridge UP.

Brutt-Griffler, J. & Samimy, K. K. (2001). Transcending the nativeness paradigm. *World Englishes*, *20*(1), 99-106.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). Interrogating the 'native speaker fallacy': Non-linguistic roots, non-pedagogical results. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native Educators in English Language Teaching*. (pp. 77-92). Mahwah, New Jersey: Erlbaum Associates.

Colebrook, R. (1996). The 'literature of ELT' – a question of linguistic and cultural imperialism? In J. E. James (Ed.), *The language-culture connection*. (pp. 149-170). SEAMOEO Regional Language Centre.

Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, *33*(2), 185-209.

Davies, A. (2003). *The native speaker: Myth and reality*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Graddol, D. (1997). *The future of English?* London: British Council.

Gupta, A. F. (2001). Realism and imagination in the teaching of English. *World Englishes*, *20*(3), 365-381.

Hall, S. ([1973] 1980). Encoding/decoding. In Centre for contemporary cultural studies (Ed.), *Culture, media, language: Working papers in cultural studies, 1972-79*. (pp. 128-38). London: Hutchinson.

Higgins, C. (2003). 'Ownership of English in the outer circle: An alternative to the NS-NNS dichotomy. *TESOL Quarterly*, *37*(4), 615-44.

Jones, M. A., Kitetu, C. & Sunderland, J. (1997). Discourse roles, gender and language textbook dialogues: Who learns what from John and Sally? *Gender and Education*, *9*(4), 469-490.

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification, and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk and H. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures*. (pp. 11-30). Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Kramsch, C. (1995). The privilege of the non-native speaker. Plenary address at the Annual TESOL Convention. April. Long Beach, California.

Lesikin, J. (2001). Determining social prominence: a methodology for uncovering gender bias in ESL textbooks. In D. R. Hall & A. Hewings (Eds.), *Innovation in English language teaching*. (pp. 275-283). Oxon: Routledge.

Matsuda, A. (2003). Incorporating world Englishes in teaching English as an international language. *TESOL Quarterly*, *37*(4), 719-29.

Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: Who's worth more? *ELT Journal*, *46*(4), 340-49.

Modiano, M. (2001). Linguistic imperialism, cultural integrity, and EIL. *ELT Journal*, *55*(4), 339-46.

Ndura, E. (2004). ESL and cultural bias: An analysis of elementary through high school textbooks in the western United States of America. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *17*(2), 143-53.

Paikeday, T. M. (1985). *The native speaker is dead!* Toronto and New York: PPI.

Phillipson, R. (1992). ELT: The native speaker's burden? *ELT Journal*, *46*(1), 12-18.

Porreca, K. L. (1984). Sexism in current ESL textbooks. *TESOL Quarterly, 18*(4), 705-24.

Poulou, S. (1997). Sexism in the discourse roles of textbook dialogues. *Language Learning Journal*, *15*, 68-73.

Rajagopalan, K. (1997). Linguistics and the myth of nativity: Comments on the contro-versy over 'new/non-native Englishes.' *Journal of Pragmatics*, *27*, 225-31.

Rajagopalan, K. (1999). Of EFL teachers conscience and cowardice. *ELT Journal*, 53(3), 200-06.

Rajagopalan, K. (2004). The concept of 'World English' and its implications for ELT. *ELT Journal*, *58*(2), 111-117.

Richards, J. C., Bycina, D. & Wisniewska, I. (2005). *Person to Person 2*. 3rd ed. New York: Oxford UP.

Richards, J. C., Hull, J. & Proctor, S. (2005). *Interchange 2*. 3rd ed. New York: Cambridge UP.

Roberts, C. (2001). Language acquisition or language socialisation in and through dis-course? In C. N. Candlin & N. Mercer (Eds.), *English language teaching in its social context*. (pp. 108-121). London: Routledge.

Sadker, D. & Sadker M. (2001). Gender bias: from colonial America to today's class-rooms. In J. A. Banks and C. A. M. Banks, (Eds.), *Multicultural Education: Issues and Perspectives* 4th ed. (pp. 125-151). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Saslow, J. & Ascher, A. (2006). *Top notch 2*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.

Sleeter, C. E. & Grant, C. A. (1991). Race, class, gender, and disability in current text-books. In M. W. Apple & L. K. Christian-Smith (Eds.), *The politics of the textbook*. (pp. 78-101). New York: Routledge.

Stempleski, S. Morgan, J. R. & Douglas, N. (2005). *World link 2*. Singapore: Thomson Heinle.

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

Sunderland, J., Cowley, M., Rahim, F. A. Leontzakou, C., & Shattuck, J. (2001). From bias "in the text" to "teacher talk around a text": An exploration of teacher discourse and gendered foreign language textbook texts. *Linguistics and Education*, *11*(3), 251-286.

Tang, C. (1997). The identity of the nonnative ESL teacher. *TESOL Quarterly*, *31*(3), 577-80.

Widdowson, H. G. (1992). ELT and EL teachers: Matters rising. *ELT Journal*, *46*(4), 333-39.

Widdowson, H. G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, *28*(2), 377-389.

Yano, Y. (2001). World Englishes in 2000 and beyond. *World Englishes*, *20*(2), 119-31.

APPENDIX 1

Sadker and Sadkers' (2001) framework
Key for this framework: N = native, NN = non-native, Ambiguous

Person to Person 2:
Note: One conversation is unusable, as the speaker status of at least one character cannot be determined by the criteria used. Thus, only 23 conversations are included in the results. This text includes non-native speakers who have English first names. Thus, the researcher uses their last name (if given) and criteria 2-4 for these characters. Also, majority rule is used for this textbook, so when there is conflicting information, the side that has more support is chosen.
Unit 1: Conversation 1: Pete Wilson = N, Liz Wu = NN; total = 2 speakers.
Conversation 2: Luis: N, Liz Wu = NN, Eun-joo = NN; total = 3 speakers. **Unit 2: Conversation 1:** Sandy = NN, Mari = NN; total = 2 speakers
Note: Both Sandy and Mari are English names. The picture is of 2 Asian women. The speakers on the CD have clear Asian accents. Majority rules NN. **Conversation 2:** Clerk = N, Mari = NN, Woman = N, Man = Ambiguous; total = 4 speakers **(unusable). Note**: The man has no name. The picture shows him to be a person of color. He has a distinctive Australian accent on the CD. Even though there are people of color in Australia without a clear majority of evidence for native or non-native, a justifiable classification cannot be made. **Unit 3: Conversation 1:** Jo = N, Hong-an Li = NN, Mrs. King = N; total = 3 speakers. **Note:** Jo is an English name. The picture shows her as a person of color. Her accent on the CD is clearly American. Majority rules N. **Conversation 2:** Voice = N, Woman = N, Hong-an Li = NN; total = 3 speakers. **Note:** Voice (on an answering machine) and woman are given no names. The picture shows a person of color. Her accent on the CD is clearly American. The caller Hong-an gives his address as Chicago and is calling the woman at an English Language Institute so he can take a class. The answering machine picks up at first. Thus, the location suggests U.S. Majority rules N for voice and woman. **Unit 4: Conversation 1:** Jane = N, Pat = N, Jim = NN; total = 3 speakers **Note:** Jane is an English name. Her picture shows her to be Asian. Her accent is American. Majority rules N. (This is one of two cases in this textbook in which the picture is of an Asian person and the voice on the CD is native. All of the other Asian pictures match Asian accents on the CD). Jim is an English name. His picture is Asian. He has an Asian accent on the CD. Majority rules NN. **Conversation 2:** Jim = NN, Tamara = N; Total = 2 speakers. **Note:** Jim is an English name. His picture is Asian. He has an Asian accent on the CD. Majority rules NN. **Unit 5: Conversation 1:** Young-hee = NN, Jung-soo = NN; total = 2 speakers. **Conversation 2:** Young-hee = NN, Yumi = NN; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 6: Conversation 1:** Li-Wei = NN, Jay = NN; total = 2 speakers **Note:** Jay is an English name. His picture is Asian. His accent on the CD is also Asian. Majority rules NN. **Conversation 2:**

Pharmacist = N, Jay = NN; total = 2 speakers. **Note:** Jay is an English name. His picture is Asian. His accent on the CD is also Asian. Majority rules NN. **Unit 7: Conversation 1:** Denise = N, Terumi = NN; total = 2 speakers. **Conversation 2:** Denise = N, Terumi = NN; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 8: Conversation 1:** Agent = NN, Julie = NN, Lisa = NN; total = 3 speakers. **Note:** Julie and Lisa are English names. Julie and Lisa are shown to be Asian in the picture. Julie and Lisa have Asian accents on the CD. Majority rules NN. **Conversation 2:** Julie = NN, Clerk = NN, Lisa = NN; total = 3 speakers. **Note:** The picture of the clerk is Asian. The clerk has an American accent on the CD. The conversation takes place in a hotel in Tioman (this is known from conversation 1 in which the women book a hotel in Tioman). Majority rules NN. (This is one of two cases in this textbook in which the picture is of an Asian person and the voice on the CD is native. All of the other Asian pictures match Asian accents on the CD). Julie and Lisa are English names. Julie and Lisa are shown to be Asian in the picture. Julie and Lisa have Asian accents on the CD. Majority rules NN. **Unit 9: Conversation 1:** Sang-woo = NN, Guide = NN; total = 2 speakers. **Conversation 2:** Sang-woo = NN, Guide = N; total = 2 speakers. **Note:** The guide has no name. The guide's picture is Caucasian. She has an American accent on the CD. The location is Hong Kong. Majority rules N. **Unit 10: Conversation 1:** Mariko = NN, Bob = N; total = 2 speakers. **Conversation 2:** Mariko = NN, Rosa = N; total 2 speakers. **Unit 11: Conversation 1:** Max = N, Shigeo = NN; total = 2 speakers. **Conversation 2:** Shigeo = NN, Max = N; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 12: Conversation 1:** Angie = N, John = NN; total = 2 speakers **Note:** John is an English name. John is shown to be Asian in the picture. John has an Asian accent on the CD. Majority rules NN. **Conversation 2:** Angie = N; John = NN; total = 2 speakers. **Note:** John is an English name. John is shown to be Asian in the picture. John has an Asian accent on the CD. Majority rules NN.

World Link 2:
Note: Three conversations are unusable, as the speaker status of at least one character cannot be determined by the criteria used. Thus, only 10 conversations are included in the results. Because the pictures do not always show the characters in the conversations, the tape recording of the dialogues features all native speakers and only one conversation has a reference to a country, criteria 1, 2 and 3 are not applicable here. Therefore, only criterion 1 is used for this text. Some names such as Omar, Maria and Mina are unclassifiable as definitely native or non-native, so these conversations are not used in the analysis.
Unit 1: Conversation 1: Maria = Ambiguous, Junko = NN, Ricardo = NN; total = 3 speakers (**unusable**). **Conversation 2:** Young Il = NN, Illeana = NN, Tammy = N; total = 3 speakers. **Unit 2: Conversation 1:** Jill = N, Jose' = NN; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 3: Conversation 1:** Detective Stye = N, Detective Frye = N; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 4: Conversation 1:** Moderator = N, Mr. Taylor = N, Ms. Marin = N; total = 3 speakers. **Unit 5: Conversation 1:** Jim = N, Frida

= NN, Woman = N, Man = N; total = 4 speakers. **Unit 6: Conversation 1:** Hans = NN, Tom = N; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 7: Conversation 1:** Omar = Ambiguous, Lane = N; total = 2 speakers **(unusable)**. **Unit 8: Conversation 1:** Chris = N, Zora = NN; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 9: Conversation 1:** Juan = NN, Greg = N; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 10: Conversation 1:** Receptionist = N, Yuka = NN: total = 2 speakers

Unit 11: Conversation 1: Lea = N, Steve = N; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 12: Conversation 1:** Esther = N, Mina = Ambiguous; total = 2 speakers **(unusable)**.

Top Notch 2:
Note: In this textbook the researcher discovers that the directions of the *Sound Bites* section also imply if the conversation is between native speakers or non-native speakers. All of the dialogues that involve 2 native speakers have the directions "Read along silently as you listen to a natural conversation." All of the dialogues that have 2 non-native speakers have the directions "Read along silently as you listen to a conversation in a (hotel/car rental agency/meeting) in (Spain/Germany/Brazil)." The use of *natural*, or not, seems to show which conversations are between native speaker and which are not beyond the 4 criteria utilized.
Unit 1: Conversation 1: Ed = N, Keith = N; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 2: Conversation 1:** Lisa = N, Dan = N; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 3: Conversation 1:** Guest = NN, Clerk = NN; total = 2 speakers. **Note**: The picture of the Guest is an Asian woman. She has an Asian accent on the CD. The conversation takes place in Spain. Thus, she is identified as a non-native speaker. The picture of the clerk appears to be a mixture of Caucasian and Hispanic. He has a Spanish accent on the CD. The conversation takes place in Spain. Thus, he is identified as a non-native speaker. **Unit 4: Conversation 1:** Renter = NN, Agent = NN; total = 2 speakers. **Note:** The Renter's name is Koji Oinuma. The picture of the Renter is an Asian man. He has an Asian accent on the CD. The conversation takes place in Germany. Thus, he is identified as a non-native speaker. The picture of the Agent is a Caucasian woman. She has a German accent on the CD. The conversation takes place in Germany. Thus, she is identified as a non-native speaker. **Unit 5: Conversation 1:** Meiko = NN, Noor = NN; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 6: Conversation 1:** Terri = N, Iris = N; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 7: Conversation 1:** Tracy = N, Sarah = N; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 8: Conversation 1:** Joe = N, Emma = N; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 9: Conversation 1:** ron22 (Ron) = N; dpike (Deb) = N; total = 2 speakers. **Note:** This is an instant message conversation so the screen names are given as ron22 and dpike but both "speakers" identify themselves in the conversation as Ron and Deb. **Unit 10: Conversation 1:** Matt = N, Paul = N; total = 2 speakers.

Interchange 2:

Note: In this textbook, the conversations are accompanied by cartoon drawings. Thus, criteria 1, 3 and 4 are used for classification of the speakers.
Unit 1: Conversation 1: Ted = N, Ana = NN; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 2: Conversation 1:** Erica = N, Clerk = N; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 3: Conversation 1:** Brain = N, Terry = N; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 4: Conversation 1:** Steve = N, Kathy = N, Waiter = N; total = 3 speakers. **Unit 5: Conversation 1:** Julia = N, Nancy = N; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 6: Conversation 1:** Mr. Field = N, Jason = N, Mrs. Field = N, Lisa = N; total = 4 speakers. **Unit 7: Conversation 1:** Jenny = N, Richard = N; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 8: Conversation 1:** Jill = N, Emiko = NN; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 9: Conversation 1:** Tanya = N, Matt = N; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 10: Conversation 1:** Dan = N, Brad = N; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 11: Conversation 1:** Kelly = N, John = N; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 12: Conversation 1:** Pete = N, Gina = N; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 13: Conversation 1:** Roger = N, Carol = N; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 14: Conversation 1:** Ron = N, Emily = N, Peter = N; total = 3 speakers. **Note:** The three native speakers talk about a non-native speaker named Raj from India. **Unit 15: Conversation 1:** Phil = N, Pat = N; total = 2 speakers. **Unit 16: Conversation 1:** Albert = N, Daniel = N; total = 2 speakers.

APPENDIX 2

Poulou's (1997) framework

Key for this framework: NM = native male, NF = native female, NNM = non-native male, NNF = non-native female, AF/AM = Ambiguous (speaker status) female/male, AA = ambiguous person (no speaker or gender classification possible), E = expert (occupational role), NE = non-expert (personal relationship role)

Person to Person 2:

Unit 1: Conversation 1: Occupational/personal relationship roles: Pete Wilson (NM) classmate (NE), Liz Wu (NNF) classmate (NE) **Note:** classmate is used when characters state they have met in class or are seen socializing in a classroom setting or discussing school issues, whereas friend is used when characters state they are friends or are seen socializing outside of a classroom setting or discussing personal issues. **Conversation 2:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Luis (NM) classmate (NE), Liz Wu (NNF) classmate (NE), Eun-joo (NNF) friend (NE). **Unit 2: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Sandy (NNF) friend (NE), Mari (NNF) friend (NE). **Conversation 2:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Clerk1 (NM) (information) clerk (E), Mari (NNF) customer (NE), Woman1 (NF) customer (NE), Man (AM) customer (NE) **(unusable AM data)**. **Note:** Clerk 1 and Woman1 are being used here as there are more than one clerk and woman characters in the textbook, but these characters are not meant to be the same clerk or woman. **Unit 3: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Jo (NF) friend (NE), Hong-an Li (NNM) friend (NE), Mrs. King (NF) friend's mother (NE). **Conversation 2:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Voice (NF) secretary (E), Woman2 (NF) secretary (E), Hong-an Li (NNM) future student (NE). **Unit 4: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Jane (NF) classmate (NE), Pat (NM) classmate (NE), Jim (NNM) classmate (NE). **Conversation 2:** Occupational/ personal relationship roles: Jim (NNM) friend (NE), Tamara (NF) friend (NE**). Unit 5: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Young-hee (NNF) classmate (NE), Jung-soo (NNM) classmate (NE). **Conversation 2** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Young-hee (NNF) friend (NE), Yumi (NNF) friend (NE). **Unit 6: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Li-Wei (NNF) classmate (NE), Jay (NNM) classmate (NE).

Conversation 2: Occupational/personal relationship roles: Pharmacist (NF) pharmacist (E), Jay (NNM) customer (NE**). Unit 7: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Denise (NF) friend (NE), Terumi (NNF) friend (NE). **Conversation 2:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Denise (NF) friend (NE), Terumi (NNF) friend (NE). **Unit 8: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Agent (NNM) (travel) agent (E), Julie (NNF) customer (NE), Lisa (NNF) customer (NE). **Conversation 2:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Julie (NNF) customer (NE), Clerk2 (NNM) (hotel) clerk (E), Lisa (NNF) customer (NE). **Unit 9: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Sang-woo (NNM) tourist (NE), Guide1 (NNF) guide (E). **Conversation 2:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Sang-woo (NNM) tourist (NE), Guide2 (NF) guide (E). **Unit 10: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Mariko (NNF) friend (NE), Bob (NM) friend (NE). **Conversation 2:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Mariko (NNF) classmate (NE), Rosa (NF) classmate (NE). **Unit 11: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Max (NM) friend (NE), Shigeo (NNM) friend (NE). **Conversation 2:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Max (NM) friend (NE), Shigeo (NNM) friend (NE). **Unit 12: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Angie (NF) friend (NE), John (NNM) friend (NE). **Conversation 2:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Angie (NF) friend (NE), John (NNM) friend (NE).

World Link 2:
Unit 1: Conversation 1: Occupational/personal relationship roles: Maria (AF) friend (NE), Junko (NNF) friend (NE), Ricardo (NNM) classmate (NE) **(unusable AF data)**. **Note:** classmate is used when characters state they have met in class or are seen socializing in a classroom setting or discussing school issues, whereas friend is used when characters state they are friends or are seen socializing outside of a classroom setting or discussing personal issues. **Conversation 2:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Yong Il (NNM) acquaintance (NE), Illeana (NNF) acquaintance (NE), Tammy (NF) acquaintance (NE). **Note:** even though Yong Il and Tammy say they are colleagues, the context of this conversation is first introductions with Illeana, so all the characters are classified as acquaintances. **Unit 2: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Jill (NF) partner (NE), Jose' (NNM) partner (NE). **Note:** the characters

are labeled as partner as it is not clear if they are romantically involved or just friends but their relationship is social in nature. **Unit 3: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Detective Stye (NM) detective (E), Detective Frye (NF) detective (E). **Unit 4: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Moderator (NA) moderator (E), Mr. Taylor (NM) politician (E), Ms. Marin (NF) politician (E) **(unusable NA data)**. **Unit 5: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Jim (NM) customer (NE), Frida (NNF) customer (NE), Woman (NF) customer (NE), Man (NM) (store) clerk (E). **Unit 6: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Hans (NNM) friend (NE), Tom (NM) friend (NE). **Unit 7: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Omar (AM) friend (NE), Lane (NF) friend (NE) **(unusable AM data)**. **Unit 8: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Chris (NM) friend (NE), Zora (NNF) friend (NE). **Unit 9: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Juan (NNM) friend (NE), Greg (NM) friend (NE). **Unit 10: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Receptionist (NF) receptionist (E), Yuka (NNF) customer (NE). **Unit 11: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Lea (NF) daughter (NE), Steve (NM) father (NE). **Unit 12: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Esther (NF) friend (NE), Mina (AF) friend (NE) **(unusable AF data)**.

Top Notch 2:
Unit 1: Conversation 1: Occupational/personal relationship roles: Ed (NM) acquaintance (NE), Keith (NM) acquaintance (NE). **Unit 2: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Lisa (NF) partner (NE), Dan (NM) partner (NE). **Note:** the characters are labeled as partner as it is not clear if they are romantically involved or just friends but their relationship is social in nature. **Unit 3: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Guest (NNF) (hotel) guest (NE), Clerk (NNM) (hotel) clerk (E). **Unit 4: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Renter (NNM) (car) renter (NE), Agent (NNF) (car rental) agent (E). **Unit 5: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Meiko (NNF) businesswoman (E), Noor (NNF) businesswoman (E). **Unit 6: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Terri (NF) friend (NE), Iris (NF) friend (NE). **Unit 7: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Tracy (NF) friend (NE), Sarah (NF) friend (NE).

Unit 8: Conversation 1: Occupational/personal relationship roles: Joe (NM) friend (NE), Emma (NF) friend (NE). **Unit 9: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: ron22 (Ron) (NM) friend (NE), dpike (Deb) (NF) friend (NE). **Unit 10: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Matt (NM) friend (NE), Paul (NM) friend (NE).

Interchange 2:
Unit 1: Conversation 1: Occupational/personal relationship roles: Ted (NM) acquaintance (NE), Ana (NNF) acquaintance (NE). **Unit 2: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Erica (NF) customer (NE), Clerk (NM) (airport information) clerk (E). **Unit 3: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Brain (NM) friend (NE), Terry (NM) friend (NE). **Unit 4: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Steve (NM) customer (NE), Kathy (NF) customer (NE), Waiter (NM) waiter (E). **Unit 5: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Julia (NF) friend (NE), Nancy (NF) friend (NE). **Unit 6: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Mr. Field (NM) father (NE), Jason (NM) son (NE), Mrs. Field (NF) mother (NE), Lisa (NF) daughter (NE). **Unit 7: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Jenny (NF) friend (NE), Richard (NM) friend (NE). **Unit 8: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Jill (NF) friend (NE), Emiko (NNF) friend (NE). **Unit 9: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Tanya (NF) friend (NE), Matt (NM) friend (NE). **Unit 10: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Dan (NM) friend (NE), Brad (NM) friend (NE). U**nit 11: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Kelly (NF) hairdresser (E), John (NM) customer (NE). **Unit 12: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Pete (NM) friend (NE), Gina (NF) friend (NE). **Unit 13: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Roger (NM) partner (NE), Carol (NF) partner (NE). **Note:** the characters are labeled as partner as it is not clear if they are romantically involved or just friends but their relationship is social in nature. **Unit 14: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Ron (NM) friend (NE), Emily (NF) friend (NE), Peter (NM) friend (NE). **Unit 15: Conversation 1:** Occupational/personal relationship roles: Phil (NM) partner (NE), Pat (NF) partner (NE). **Note:** the characters are labeled as partner as it is not clear if they

are romantically involved or just friends but their relationship is social in nature.

Unit 16: Conversation 1: Occupational/personal relationship roles: Albert (NM) friend (NE), Daniel (NM) friend (NE).

John Eric Sherman joined the faculty of the Department of English Language and Literature of Hongik University in Seoul, Korea, in 2005, where he teaches courses in conversation, composition and American Studies. He has previously taught at the Korean Military Academy and Indiana State University. His areas of research interest have focused on materials development, bias in materials, language variety and intercultural communication. He served as an academic adviser for Sounds Great levels 1-4, Impact Conversation level 1 and English Firsthand level 1. His work has appeared in Indiana English, with an upcoming article to be published in December 2010 in RELC Journal.