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#### Abstract

Studies on compulsory foreign language (L2) education in Japan often highlight inconsistencies between English textbooks and the policies defined by the Ministry of Education, criticising the way EFL is taught. In order to represent L2 education in a broader way, this article investigates a wider corpus with a double framework. To get a clearer view of L2 education in Japan, a corpus of textbooks for English and French as foreign languages was collected. The contents of the textbooks were examined through language teaching methodology and discourse analysis, to outline the main features of the materials, as well as the implicit representations of the students and the world that they convey. This analysis delves into several issues, such as how foreign languages are studied in Japan and for what reasons, how high schoolers are implicitly portrayed in Japanese L2 textbooks, what is expected from them, and whether or not those expectations depend on the language at issue (English/French). The preliminary findings presented in this paper also seem to suggest that behind a superficial didactic contradiction, a deeper connection with Japanese fundamental education laws can be seen.
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[^0]
## 1. Introduction

'Foreign language' teaching in Japan is often perceived as a synonym of the teaching of 'English as a foreign language' (EFL), especially when it comes to compulsory education. However, English is not the only foreign language to be taught in schools, especially in high schools. For this reason, focusing on EFL in order to describe the situation of L2 education contributes to reinforcing the paramount place of English and underrepresentation of other foreign languages. This article stems from a larger PhD research that was nourished by the aforementioned consideration. The research aims to provide a broader picture of L2 education in Japan through a comprehensive analysis of textbooks conceived for Japanese high schools. The compulsory nature of high school education and the undiscussed importance of textbooks in the teaching context, especially as far as EFL goes ${ }^{1}$, should allow for more representative results than a case study on specific class activities. In order to discern if the patterns found in L2 textbooks depend on their nature (language teaching materials) or on the language itself (e.g. English), this paper will consistently compare a corpus including textbooks of both English and French as a foreign language (FLE, Français Langue Étrangère). The analysis and comparison of both should allow for a clearer definition of their characteristics and the purposes that each of them seems to serve, providing observations that could inform L2 teaching in general.

Addressing more specifically the subject of EFL, research has been pointing out issues in the way it has been taught in Japan ever since the late 80s. Scholars especially denounce the inconsistencies between an inefficient EFL teaching and the guidelines provided by the Japanese Ministry of Education (MEXT) for L2 teaching. Even if the latter has been fostering

[^1]communicative approaches since 1989, the implementation of new curricula appears to be hindered by multiple factors, with both academia and the media criticising Japanese English education. To understand the reasons behind these inconsistencies, a more comprehensive study needs to be conducted first, in order to define whether the patterns found in EFL textbooks present homogenous features or if said features depend on the language in question. For this reason, this article will focus on bringing to light the global features of L2 textbooks in Japan both from a didactic and a discourse point of view. Further analysis on the way EFL textbooks' most salient features can or cannot be linked to MEXT's guidelines will not be discussed here (for more details, see Ronci, 2020). Hopefully, choosing an unprecedented cross-L2 textbook analysis drawing on both didactics and linguistics methodologies will represent the situation of foreign language teaching in Japan in a broader way and help discern the main features of the textbooks for further analysis.

## 2. Literature review

In the last decades, English education in Japan has been at the centre of debates both in the academic world and in the public discourse. Global proficiency comparisons highlighted the nation's low ranking in EFL tests, which led to the shared belief of Japanese English education being "a fiasco" (Miyake, 2019). New courses of studies were implemented in order to improve the country's results and to raise international standards, with mild consequences and criticism from the academic sphere. Ever since Gorsuch’s pioneering study (1998) and Browne and Wada's survey (1998) on EFL in Japanese high schools, many scholars have analysed English education in Japan, investigating education policies (Hatori, 2005; Kikuchi \& Browne, 2009; Aspinall, 2013) and the situation of EFL. Overall, studies point out difficulties in implementing a communicative approach in EFL teaching, sometimes questioning their suitability and criticising the impact of English on national curricula, sometimes taking this fact as a given
and trying to suggest possible solutions.

Recently, textbook analysis has been increasingly adopted in the field of Japanese EFL studies, with scholars describing the diachronic evolution of learning supports (Weir \& Ozasa, 2010; Honda \& al., 2018) and synchronic studies analysing the portrayal of culture (Kawano, 1982; Reimann, 2009), gender (Lee, 2016, 2018) and diversity (Otlowski, 2003; Hanashiro, 2016) in the textbooks. Studies that link the political and textual spheres, describing new textbooks as contradictory in relation to the government's guidelines (Browne, 1998; Humphries, 2013; Glasgow \& Paller, 2014) also informed this research.

While research on EFL in Japan is prolific, less attention has been paid to the teaching of other L2 outside of university contexts (with the exception of recent remarkable works on FLE by Mogi \& al., since 2017). Despite high schools providing courses in foreign languages other than English being uncommon, their existence cannot be denied and should serve as a means of comparison to get a better and wider view on L2 education in Japan. According to the Japanese government, the most studied foreign languages (other than English) in high schools are Chinese, Korean and French, the latter of which counts thrice the students of Spanish or German (MEXT, 2019a: 21). While some studies focused on the comparison of EFL textbooks from different Asian countries (Takeda \& al, 2006; Wang, 2012), a cross-L2 analysis of Japanese textbooks produced for the same public seems to be unprecedented. Given that dealing with discourse analysis tools requires a deep knowledge of the language and culture at issue to provide a reasonable interpretation of the results, the choice was quickly restrained to English and French (that also happen to be the two most-studied Indo-European languages in the country). Naturally, other studies encompassing more foreign languages would be welcome to further represent the overall situation of L2 education in high schools.

## 3. Data and methods

To portray a broad picture of L2 education in Japan, the question of choosing representative textbooks for a research corpus became a delicate one. Out of the 800 textbooks selected by the ministry for high schools, a list of English publications is provided and catalogued in multiple categories (MEXT, 2019b). Titles were chosen from each category (except "basic English communication"), incorporating different publishing companies in the analysis. Despite the lack of a designated list of French textbooks in MEXT's guidelines, the active participation of high school teachers in conferences and academic research made it possible to get an insight into FLE teaching and to draw up a list of currently used supports. Figure 1 shows the textbooks collected for the main corpus of this study.

| EFL |  |  | FLE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TITLE | REF. | PUBLISHING COMPANY | TITLE | REF. | PUBLISHING COMPANY |
| MY WAY (New Edition) | MW1 | Sanseidō | En Scène I | ES1 | Sanshusha |
| CROWN 1 (New Edition) | CR1 | Sanseidō | En Scène II | ES2 | Sanshusha |
| NEW ONE WORLD (Revised Edition) | NOW | Kyōiku | Mon premier vol Tokyo-Paris (Nouvelle édition) | VTP | Surugadai |
| PROMINENCE | PRO | Tokyō Shoseki | Amélie et Kenzo | A\&K | Asahi |
| CROWN 2 (New Edition) | CR2 | Sanseidō | Moi, je... | MJE | Alma |
| Unicorn | UNI | Bun-Eido | Navi.fr | NAV | Asahi |
| Vision Quest Standard (Revised Edition) | VQ1 | Keirinkan | Destination Francophonie | DFR | Surugadai |
| My Passport | PAS | Bun-Eido | À la découverte | ALD | Daisan Shobō |

Figure 1. Textbooks in the corpus ("REF" stands for the way the texts will be referred to)

Then, in order to compare similar sets of data, the same theme was chosen from every textbook.
Comparing textbooks in terms of topics proved to be very useful, as only 'food/gastronomy' was found to be a common theme between the EFL and FLE textbooks. Although the larger research this article draws from analyses more than just one theme, for the purposes of this paper the results presented here will be related to the food lessons only. Once the common theme was found, every lesson in both EFL and FLE textbooks was analysed through two lenses: the didactic framework provided by Littlejohn (see Figures 2 and 3) and the linguistic
framework in Figure 4.

Because of the multi-linguistic nature of the corpus, data were collected in English, French and Japanese. Given the qualitative nature of the approach ${ }^{2}$, the corpus presenting multiple writing systems was not problematic: for the didactic analysis, the differences between L1 and L2 instructions or contents were considered irrelevant. Regarding the linguistic analysis, the main phenomena at issue being of a translingual nature, items were first classified together regardless of the language ${ }^{3}$, then analysed in more detail to understand how each language was portrayed in the corpus. Of course, some exceptions and limitations were also considered and will be concisely presented when needed.

The choice of the methodological frameworks was also important to try and get the most comprehensive view of the textbooks as possible, so a multi-method approach was adopted. With respect to the didactic methods, Littlejohn's framework (2011) for the analysis of foreign language textbooks proved to be particularly useful because of its comprehensive criteria as well as its detailed and empirical nature. This study will focus on the section of Littlejohn's framework that deals with the analysis of tasks, presented in terms of turn-take, focus and mental operation, as can bee seen in Figure 2.

[^2]| I. What is the learner expected to do? |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. Turn Take |  | B. Focus |  |
| Initiated |  | Language system (rules or form) |  |
| Scripted response |  | Meaning |  |
| Not required |  | Meaning/system/form relationship |  |
| C. Mental operation |  |  |  |
| Repeat identically |  | Compare samples of language |  |
| Repeat selectively |  | Analyse language form |  |
| Repeat with substitutions |  | Formulate language rule |  |
| Repeat with transformations |  | Apply stated language rule |  |
| Repeat with expansion |  | Apply general knowledge |  |
| Retrieve from STM/working memory |  | Negotiate |  |
| Retrieve from LTM |  | Review own FL output |  |
| Formulate items into larger unit |  | Attend to example/explanation |  |
| Decode semantic/propositional meaning |  | Research |  |
| Select information |  | Express own ideas/information |  |
| Calculate |  | Translate |  |
| Categorise selected information |  | Learn by heart |  |
| Hypothesise |  | Dictation |  |
| II. Who with? |  |  |  |
| Teacher and learner(s), whole class observing |  | Learners in pairs/groups; class observing |  |
| Learner(s) to the whole class |  | Learners in pairs/groups; simultaneously |  |
| Learners with whole class simultaneously |  | Learner individually outside the class |  |
| Learners individually simultaneously |  |  |  |
| III. With what content? |  |  |  |
| A. Input to learners |  | B. Output from learners |  |
| Form | Graphic | Form | Graphic |
|  | Words/phrases/sentences: written |  | Words/phrases/sentences: written |
|  | Words/phrases/sentences: oral |  | Words/phrases/sentences: oral |
|  | Extended discourse: written |  | Extended discourse: written |
|  | Extended discourse: oral |  | Extended discourse: oral |
|  | Graphic |  | Graphic |
|  | Words/phrases/sentences: written |  | Words/phrases/sentences: written |
|  | Words/phrases/sentences: oral |  | Words/phrases/sentences: oral |
|  | Extended discourse: written |  | Extended discourse: written |
| Source | Materials | Source | Materials |
|  | Teacher |  | Teacher |
|  | Learner(s) |  | Learner(s) |
|  | Outside the course/lesson |  | Outside the course/lesson |
| Nature | Metalinguistic comment | Nature | Metalinguistic comment |
|  | Linguistic items |  | Linguistic items |
|  | Non-fiction |  | Non-fiction |
|  | Fiction |  | Fiction |
|  | Personal information/opinion |  | Personal information/opinion |
|  | Song/Clip |  | Song/Clip |

Figure 2. Framework for the analysis of language textbooks

The first section checks whether the students are asked to initiate speech (e.g. free discussion), to answer following a script or whether no response is required. The second one explores what the textbooks expect the students to focus on, be it the language system (e.g. grammar exercises), the meaning or the link between both (e.g. textual cohesion). Finally, the third one encompasses a large variety of activities the researcher can choose from (see Appendix 3 for examples). Littlejohn then suggests differentiating the participants of each activity and, finally, detailing the contents' inputs and outputs in terms of form, source and nature. Littlejohn's framework can be presented through a series of questions outlined in a table with a number of columns equivalent to the exercises and activities of each lesson (plus one, for the questions). For the analysis that served this research, each activity was scrutinised, with one or multiple squares being ticked depending on what could be observed (as in Figure $3^{4}$ ).

|  | L.ESSON 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Task number: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |
| L. What is the learner expected to do? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A. TURN TAKE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initiate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  | X |
| Scripted response |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not required | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |  | X | X | X | X |  |
| B. FOCUS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Language system (rules or form) |  |  |  | X |  |  |  | X |  |  | X | X |  |  | X | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| Meaning | X | X |  |  | X | X |  |  | X | X |  |  | X | X |  |  | X |  |  | X |  |
| Meaning/system/form relationship |  |  | X |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  | X |

Figure 3. Part 1 of 3 of the analysis of New One World using Littlejohn's framework

Some simple quantitative data were collected in order to compare multiple pages of results more easily. Summing every "x" as a " 1 " allowed for an immediate examination of the trends of each textbook and an easy comparison of the EFL/FLE corpus (as shown in Appendix 2). When coupled with the linguistic ones, these results proved to be significant in portraying the

[^3]characteristics of each set of L2 textbooks.

In addition to Littlejohn's framework, discourse analysis was needed in order to provide a better understanding of the message and the cultural dimension of the textbooks. Although the reflections behind the linguistic analysis of the corpus were informed by research from both the English-speaking and French-speaking world, a complete and detailed report of such a study would not fit the scope of this publication. For the sake of brevity, the results will be presented starting from Hyland's framework for stance and engagement in academic discourse (2008), edited so that it separates mentions from the categories of stance and engagement, and include Kerbrat-Orecchioni's categories (2014) for the analysis of attitude markers. This comprehensive framework can be seen in Figure 4. Appendix 1 provides definitions and examples both from the scholars and from this analysis.


Figure 4. Hyland's edited framework for academic writing and Kerbrat-Orecchioni's for attitude markers

The very large nature of the operating notions that Hyland draws upon allows for an overall view of linguistic features in both EFL and FLE textbooks that should serve to answer the research question about the characteristics of both. If the corpus presents the same features in English and French, those elements could be considered as typical of the 'foreign language textbook' genre. However, wherever peculiarities come up, they could be used to differentiate
each L2 textbook more clearly and possibly inform language teaching in general. Before going into detail, it should be noted that some adjustments have been made to Hyland's original framework in order to adapt it from the analysis of academic writing to that of language textbooks (cf. Appendix 1).

Regarding the analysis of attitude markers, although the framework provided by Martin \& White (2005) also informed this research, the results will be presented using KerbratOrecchioni's classification. In her works on enunciation, the scholar labels adjectives as classifiants ('objective' adjectives, such as "blue") and non-classifiants (subjective ones), further dividing the latter into three categories (cf. Appendix 1 for definitions and examples). Although her distinctions resemble Martin \& White's, their classification of reaction in the appreciation range seemed somewhat problematic (for instance in categorising occurrences such as "surprising" that belong to both). The framework provided by the French scholar appeared to leave less leeway to the researcher's subjectivity, so it was used to analyse items in both EFL and FLE textbooks.

The analysis was conducted manually: every lesson was studied and every relevant linguistic marker duly noted in a table sheet where the items would be divided following Hyland's keywords, then presented with their co-text, highlighted, and commented. Every marker was then presented in a more comprehensive table (with only the occurrences and the immediate co-text) to discern general trends, discrepancies and heterogeneous characteristics ${ }^{5}$. An example of this can be found in Figure 5: this table easily allows to see that attitude markers are very common in all EFL textbooks except one: only four occurrences were found in the

[^4]third book.

| Stance | My why | CROWN I | Quest | NEW ONE WORLD | UNICORN | PASSPORT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1/2 <br> Attitude <br> markers <br> Modalités <br> appréciatives, adjectifs non classifiants | - tratitional faod culturon <br> , culebrating importert events with good faod (p.74) <br> , people chacse wine which goes well with the dishes <br> , Mexican dishen have a long hiatary (p. 74) <br> , What is special about wanhoku? [p.74] <br> - washoku unes freoh ingredenta $\{p, 76$ ) <br> - puople curefully choane sesumonal ingredienta of the local area (p. 76) <br> - ingreacienta are uned in a variaty of waya to bring out their tasten (p.76) <br> , warhoku ia well-brilancod <br> , a typical wanhaku meal <br> , manhoku loaka benutiful. The colers of the food show the benuty of nature (p.76) <br> , washoku in an important part of arenual everta (p.76) <br> , Garrilies tracitionally coak <br> , the warld is becoming manaler [p.78] <br> , Japan importa much of ito Soad [p.78] <br> , in a typical lapanese breaklant the piece of salmon might be from Narway (p.78) <br> - many diahes which are papuiar amang dapanese prople have rocta outhide Lapan ( p .78 ) <br> , rich cutural exchango [p.78] <br> , peoplo who are warried about chargen (p. BD) <br> , mary schoals tench studerts hom to cook tenditional dishes (p. BO) <br> , it is hard to ntap [changel/p. 80] | - Surpluan food p.63, 66, 69 <br> , Their lives were nat envy p. 63 <br> , Mary men became alcolhalics <br> , Stapping drinking is nat nany <br> , Several ynars later p. 63 <br> , the right "toala" p. 63 <br> , it is hardito get off the atrents <br> " I had a lot of "head knowledgo" about hameleneness, but leched "heert knowledge" p. 63 <br> , I experienced homelenuness and new hungry people evary day <br> , To my murprine, my neightoun did not lons hape. p. 64 <br> , They helped me in mary differant wayn <br> , Mary did nome kind of work, wech an <br> , live below the relutive poverty line p. 65 <br> , Sar the elderty this number is mare than <br> , 23 million puoplo in Japan do not heve errough vafe, mutritioun food nench dey <br> , a single mother who had twa amal children <br> , whe had ta ank the older child to give up a meal so that the amaler ane could eat <br> , nuch thinge happen mevery day <br> , What fid the mather with temo hungry children have to do? <br> , Truat is very impartant in eur wark. When you have truat, food and financial support naturally follow $p .67$ <br> , We think of them an equal partnern <br> , NPO's are still new in Japan <br> , grow and bucome mare profesrianal <br> , thery can play a bigger role in society <br> , warting to do something gaod <br> , the important thing is haw you run your NPO p. 67 <br> , Second Harvest dapmen is unique <br> , "Helping" others is not eary <br> , sametimes we send the wrong mertugn <br> , We mean well, but p. 68 <br> , You are not OK p. 68 <br> , Thave some tools und patchen <br> , You need to be carotul when yau nay <br> , I amp panionate about making thene matchare. p. 69 <br> , It in what makas my job so much fun | , I really anjayud all the foad here <br> , Soundra grumt <br> , Sarmuthing swoot like chocolate <br> , The l...] uunder alno sounds. grod | [BBC] a diet heary on foie gras, crearny nauces p. 72 <br> [BBC] a henaltoy meal of whine fah [...] with plain yoghurt [BBC] the fridge is devoid of fixy drinks p. 72 <br> . [BBC] a carafo of orlinary witer $p 72$ <br> , [BBC] yau will see no tamptation at all p. 72 <br> , restaurante fraçaia de heut nivens <br> , de nambreux fruits et ligumes uniquer p. 142 <br> , lees produìta de houto qualité <br> , ["] wort en train de deverir populairen p. 136 <br> , Lengagoment [comminmera! den Japonair pour lo qualité <br> , \|les] púculimition du payn/du terrmaire p. 138 <br> , lagriculture japonaine ívalue <br> , colerful fruits grown in Japan <br> , Garaign cauntry p. 136 <br> , You may be wuprined p. 136 <br> , the gorgeoun appenarance of the truits p. 136 <br> , such premium-pricod fruits <br> , fuits and veget. grown in Japan are gaiving popularity in international marketap. 136 <br> , Why do they attract eurtomern in spite of <br> , heavy mork lead and the leck of nuccemars 9.136 <br> - Hawever, Japanese agriculture in... <br> , new courne with high potential of mucomen p. 136 <br> , Jmpanses farmland is relativaly amal <br> , Farmers have taken grent paina ta grow better ard mare benutitel products to overcams the disedvantage of their farmland <br> , put a paper bag an anch apple by hand p. 138 <br> , sechnological developments ofter same new wayn of growing crape <br> , one stem produces many red tamateen p. 138 <br> , The trev-like stem <br> , extend thourande of manll roots <br> , They absarbs sufficient amourka of mutritioun watar p. 13 B | - \|SD| anly grawing p. 108 <br> - [SDl gunatically identical plantap. 108 <br> , [SD\| that give the grentent yield p. 108 <br> - [SD\| tha breeding peogram requires a large and diverse gene poal p. 108 <br> , $\operatorname{ISD} \mid$ when you finally come up with p. 108 <br> , [SD] the mout bauntiful wheat p. 108 <br> - [SD] the fevared varisty p. 108 <br> , [SD\| the fivered variety avernhelime the wheat gene pool which resulta in the dismppearance of ancient typen p. 108 <br> - [SD\| breed a naw variety p. 108 <br> - $[S D]_{\text {t there is low divarsity ramaining p. } 108}$ <br> - [SD\| a atory well bramen p. 108 <br> , $\|S D\|^{\text {"misernble loaking whent" } p .108}$ <br> - $\|S D\|$ a critical autbrak of atripe ruat p. 108 <br> - $[S D \mid$ we hever ancther atary p. $108+$ yet anothur biter apinodu p. 109 <br> - [SD] the leaf blight'is wide impact p. 108 <br> - ISD\| impravamarta in bereating p. 108 <br> - ISD\| Sa marry of the farmern planted the sume improved breed p. 108 <br> - $\|S D\|$ a "monoculturn" of genetically identical plerth, all equally muaceptoble to the surre disease p. 108 <br> - $\|S D\|$ anothar bituer apinode demoratrating the danger of maneculhure <br> , [SD\| same Eelgian farmers p. 109 <br> , [SD] all the potatoun in Europe wern paisoned p. 109 <br> - [SD\| the people ate mainly potatoen p. 109 <br> - [SD\| much of the ather foad [...] wan controlled for export p. 109 <br> , [SD\| Anathur 1 million amigrated p. 109 <br> - ISD\| faced a future marked by pormerty and denpair p. 109 <br> , ISD\| fermern who ware uttlering p. 109 <br> , ISD\| velund'e manvive darnage p. 109 <br> - [SD\| the maral $\mid$...\| in obvioun p. 109 <br> - ISD \| hain froxen in a tairyland p. 109 <br> - [SD\| the largent islend p. 110 <br> , [SD\| the rock hard mow-cormed tundra <br> , $[S D$ \| they are not tume and friendly p. 110 <br> , [SD\| the bectime starieen p. 110 <br> - $\|S D\|$ They are fierce, sometimen murderoun p. 109 <br> , [SD\| the jegged coantlines p. 110 <br> - $\|50\|$ idenl legion of guarcians p. 110 <br> - $[S D]$ the treanure of seeds p. 110 <br> - [SD] "the Duormaday Vaulk" p. 110 <br> - [SD\| ane of nature's twesurn p. 110 | Queationa de CO: <br> 2) Why does the boy think the cafaturia is gaod? <br> - A) An expersive lunch ia served <br> , By ht at achoal <br> - CJThe food ia not expensive <br> - Dl Tipping is песинаяry <br> , 3) Why does the munc like to have lunch at thim restaurant? <br> - A) His farmīy alwayn meeta him there <br> - B) Hin family līens this restaurant <br> - CIThe price of the Goadis reanonable <br> , 미 The food is ranly good <br> Culture Tak 10: <br> , It is true that <br> Japanese dithes <br> , dishas [...\| wre popular in forevign courtrise <br> , special techriquen <br> , But there are some Japanese dishas you can make exily <br> , Tis fun to mabe <br> - letín makn okonomiyakj togetherl <br> - Chap I...]finuly <br> - mix tagether tharoughly <br> - put seme sliced park on it |

Figure 5. EFL textbooks, attitude markers (1/2)
The number of occurrences itself was not vital for the sake of the analysis, but counting them provided a more comprehensive view of the corpus and allowed for easier comparisons of patterns and differences.

Although it can be easily observed that EFL textbooks tend to have more hedges than boosters, whereas the opposite trend exists in FLE publications, this mere description does not suffice in discourse analysis. For this reason, after organising the linguistic items in categories, it was important to draw bridges between them, in order to explain discourse patterns and better understand how authors build a relationship with readers in EFL and FLE textbooks. Finally, some preliminary interpretations hinting at deeper relationships between EFL textbooks and

Japanese laws and culture were addressed.

## 4. Results

Littlejohn's framework is divided into three main sections: what the learner is expected to do, with whom, and with what content. In terms of expectations, the analysis showed that turntake is mostly not explicitly required, both in EFL and FLE textbooks ${ }^{6}$. The latter tend to present more expression activities (speaking and writing) than the former, although they are usually scripted, while EFL's sparse expression activities are usually initiated and unguided. Concerning the focus of the activities, FLE is often centred on the form and the linguistic items (e.g. learning a vocabulary list), while EFL's biggest concern seems to be the proper understanding of the meaning through language (with fewer exercises about language items and more reading questions or content-related activities). Some similarities could be found in the category of mental operations (see Appendix 3): for instance, regardless of the operation at hand, both EFL and FLE tend to rely on short-term memory for their questions and exercises; however, learners are mostly asked to repeat identically or with substitutions in FLE, while in EFL repetitions come with a transformation, which can be more complex ${ }^{7}$. Another characteristic of EFL is that students are assigned a larger amount of comprehension tasks and research; they are also sometimes expected to express personal opinions and even to translate texts in their L1 to check their understanding of the contents.

When reflecting on the students' interactions (as explicitly mentioned in the textbook), it can be noticed that both EFL and FLE learners work mainly individually and simultaneously.

[^5]Specifically, EFL instructions also reflect a class practice of taking turns in front of the whole class (for individual responses or student-teacher interactions). In FLE this trend does not exist, but there are multiple explicit mentions of pair work.

Additional distinctions came to light regarding the contents of the textbooks in terms of input and output, as mentioned in Littlejohn's framework. For example, FLE authors seem committed to balancing the text, audio and pictures in their volumes. The same cannot be said about EFL textbooks, whose main input is the written text: its importance is emphasised throughout the books and even listening exercises are accompanied by a text (keywords, transcriptions, translations). The vast majority of pictures in EFL is used to accompany a long, written text or to elucidate vocabulary and not as the core of an exercise. Another difference is that FLE supports tend to be extremely short (sometimes just a couple of lines), while EFL features extended texts (usually multiple pages). This can be partially explained by the level gap between them; however, it should be noted that junior high EFL supports also include texts spreading over multiple pages and that older FLE books used to have more extensive ones as well ${ }^{8}$. In terms of sources, it can be noticed that while FLE textbooks give students access to the entirety of their resources, audio tracks and additional external supports for EFL are meant for teachers exclusively. Finally, although most inputs in both EFL and FLE are of a linguistic nature, those used in English lessons tend to be non-fictional, while French ones follow the opposite pattern. Concerning output, FLE textbooks maintain a positive balance between speaking and writing, whereas EFL students are predominantly required to write. FLE expression exercises are short, while EFL offers both short and long productions, some of

[^6]which include external contents (i.e. personal information, research) that do not usually appear in FLE textbooks.

To summarise, EFL and FLE textbooks share some common traits: students are mostly not required to initiate speech, they predominantly use short-term memory for exercises and tasks, and they tend to work individually. Other features, often diametrically opposed, could be considered as characteristic of two distinct genres: EFL textbooks and FLE textbooks (and not 'L2 textbooks' in general). In EFL textbooks, Littlejohn's framework shows that the interest lies within understanding written non-fictional material, while FLE textbooks display a decisive interest in balancing their sources, but the understanding of written contents is not paramount (as will be confirmed through Hyland's framework). Some of the reasons explaining these characteristics will be presented in the Discussion.

The linguistic analysis provided outcomes of a different nature compared to the didactic ones. First, even when presented with the same theme, we are faced with significantly different interpretations. On the subject of 'food', FLE textbooks opt for a common framework: the lessons revolve around gastronomy, cooking, food culture in general, as one would find in most European L2 textbooks. EFL textbooks show the topic through a different lens: food and food culture function as a means to introduce a number of subjects (e.g.: agriculture, technology, social issues), giving the 'theme' a wider meaning.

By comparing the linguistic markers found through Hyland's edited framework (as in Figure 6), EFL textbooks would appear to favour an author-oriented discourse (presenting higher occurrences of stance) to the reader-oriented one seen in FLE publishing (richer in engagement occurrences).


Figure 6. Graphic comparison of linguistic markers in EFL and FLE textbooks
In terms of stance, a different 'voice' is shown: EFL textbooks display more hedges (e.g. inverted commas, epistemic modality) than FLE ones. On the other hand, boosters can be perceived as preponderant in FLE publishing and as almost non-existent in EFL, resulting in a more cautious voice in English, opposed by an enthusiastic - sometimes very direct - voice in French.

Attitude markers are extremely frequent in both EFL and FLE, but the former has almost twice as many occurrences as the latter and of a more diversified nature. The main results to be drawn from the analysis of attitude markers are that most markers can be described as axiological (expressing either judgment or appreciation), with most of them being connected with the term "good" (whether it be in English, French or Japanese). Figure 7 delineates some examples of the findings for each category, organised by absolute frequency.

| Category |  | Example | Reference <br> MJE, 39 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Affective | (1) | Oui, j'aime beaucoup le chocolat [Yes, I really love chocolate] |  |
|  |  | - Olivier, il y a du fromage. <br> - Humm... j'aime le fromage ! <br> [ - Olivier, we have cheese. <br> - Mm... I love cheese!] | ALD, 19 |
|  |  | - Qu'est ce que vous aimez comme boisson? <br> - J'adore la bière. <br> [- What kind of drink do you like? <br> -I love beer.] | ES1, 56 |
| Axiological | (4) | Mochiron, oishii osake no aru tokoro ni wa, oishii tabemono ga aru [Of course, where there is good alcohol there is good food] | A\&K, 39 |
|  |  | Au Maroc [...] on peut manger du bon couscous [In Morocco [...] we can eat a good couscous] | DFR, 26 |
|  | (6) | ... celebrating important events with good food | MW1, 74 |
|  | (7) | ... people carefully choose seasonal ingredients of the local area | MW1, 76 |
|  |  | Traditionally, Japanese farmers have grown products unique to their local area, and have offered the delights of the season to the local consumers | NOW, 142 |
|  |  | C'est un peu lourd, mais délicieux [It is a bit heavy, but delicious] | ES2, 2 |
|  |  | Il faut l'essayer [le couscous] ; c'est vraiment délicieux ! [You must try [the couscous]; it is really delicious!] | DFR, 32 |
| Nonaxiological | (11) | New challenges for uniqueness... | NOW, 142 |
|  | (12) | ... breed a new variety... | UNI, 108 |
|  | (13) | Their lives were not easy... | CR1, 63 |
|  | (14) | Stopping drinking is not easy... | CR1, 63 |

Figure 7. Some examples from the attitude marker analysis

Of course, appraisal markers tend to cluster (Hunston, 2011: 16), as we can see in examples 1 (the adverb beaucoup, "a lot", strengthening the verb), 4 (where the adverb mochiron, "of course", hints to a doxa), and 6 (where "good food" is associated with the celebration of important events). Although the frequency of a single word might not be statistically relevant, the repetition of synonyms and the association of different linguistic items all tend to point in the same direction: adding value to food culture and gastronomy. In FLE publishing, most attitude markers are related to the notions of liking (more rarely of disliking) something, arguably because of didactic needs (learning to express what one likes/dislikes being one of
the objectives of beginner levels). In EFL textbooks, the characteristics are more varied, as the authors talk about fresh and local ingredients, traditional cooking, food as a means to celebrate and spend time with the family, without omitting potentially negative notions such as danger.

As far as mentions are concerned, a certain amount of inclusive mentions can be found in EFL publishing (albeit they are almost completely absent in FLE), either on a general tone as in "We have another story from which we can draw a moral" [UNI, 108], or explicitly referring to the authors' and readers' nationality: "Japan is a rich country. We are the third largest economy in the world" [CR1, 71]. Exclusive references are twice as frequent as inclusive ones, but they tend to differ depending on the language: in EFL, they are often related to authorities, such as "The government reports that..." [CR1,65], or deliver what is perceived as a common opinion, as in "Some people regard these changes as good" [MW1, 78]. The opinion or piece of information expressed by said external characters assumes great importance in the EFL corpus, while exclusive mentions in FLE textbooks are related to characters whose sentences hold little to no value (with no inquiry about the meaning of their sentences, the focus being solely on the linguistic form).

With respect to engagement markers, many differences can be found. First of all, FLE textbooks tend to feature more directives than EFL, albeit of a less diverse nature, which can also be linked to the 'stronger' voice found when investigating stance markers. Indeed, EFL contents show suggestions such as "washoku should be preserved for future generations" [MW1, 80], while FLE directives are limited to instructions to perform tasks or do exercises. Another distinction concerns questions: almost non-existent in FLE textbooks (exercises' instructions included) but usually employed in EFL to anticipate the content of a text, as well as to check comprehension. The use of knowledge references is also substantially different: the main references seen in FLE books could be deemed stereotypical or cliché. Conversely, EFL
supports tend to convey or imply that authors and readers actually belong to the same linguistic, social and cultural group', reinforcing the 'we' that was created through other linguistic devices. Lastly, asides are very common in FLE and relatively rare in EFL textbooks. As previously stated, French textbooks appear to be more reader-oriented, as is confirmed by the presence of side notes, warnings, translations and comments that the authors provide to help readers in the learning process.

## 5. Discussion

While examining the didactic features of the textbooks through Littlejohn's framework, the most salient features showed a trend in EFL textbooks to expect students to work individually (without initiating speech) on the understanding of written non-fictional material. On the other side, FLE textbooks provided a better balance of inputs and outputs, although the latter were more guided than in EFL and mostly focused on language activities (with meaning never at the core of the exercises).

The linguistic analysis provided information of a different nature, showing divergences in the author-reader relationships in terms of 'voice' and 'independence'. Indeed, linguistic marks of stance show a confident voice in FLE textbooks, while EFL ones tend to present assertions in a more cautious way. However, the latter also show a larger variety of appreciation markers, encompassing positive and negative occurrences as well. While this finding might appear anecdotal, given that in the 'food/gastronomy' units it usually regards the dangers of

[^7]foreign-imported ingredients or traditions, it shows the tendency of EFL writers of underlining the attractiveness of local food culture while warning the readers about foreign countries in a 'us vs them' fashion. The protection of Japanese culture is something that sociologists such as McVeigh explained regarding the Japanese approach to EFL, going as far as to say that in some cases learning English could mean "becoming contaminated by non-Japaneseness" (2004: 215) and be perceived in a negative way. Although the textbooks in question do not point the finger at the English language, foreign (mostly Western) countries are sometimes linguistically linked to the notion of danger, implying that what is threatened (Japan and its culture) has a high value and stressing the polarisation us/them.

In terms of independence, FLE textbooks supply learners with all the materials (as shown in Littlejohn), guiding them through a rich apparatus of asides, notes, suggestions and metalanguage that would help studying autonomously. In EFL teaching, the students would have to rely more on the teachers (who in turn rely on the textbooks and the numerous supports provided by the publishing companies to guide classroom activities).

Combining the results from both frameworks, it is possible to perceive different expectations about the students: EFL ones are required to deeply understand long messages about social issues and draw links with their own society and culture, thus projecting themselves as future citizens. In that sense, learning English is yet another way to form a young person and guide them to adulthood, as other school subjects do. On the contrary, FLE textbooks do not focus at all on understanding messages or meaning, enclosing the students in a fictional universe and with situations mostly related to tourism (in addition to food, all the other themes seem to point in that direction as well). In that way, learning French grammar and vocabulary (the main focus of the textbooks) appears to be solely a means to surviving as a tourist in a French-speaking country. This claim can be supported by the results related to the
engagement category, with EFL authors creating inclusiveness and making their readers feel part of the same community, with similar goals and aspirations on a social level. Conversely, FLE authors appear to be more detached from the students; the contents of the textbooks are also less varied and sometimes superficial or cliché, and the engagement with the students is mostly that of a guide, a teacher (opposite to a fellow citizen in EFL textbooks).

The contrast between the two languages' purposes would be heightened in those learners who are being exposed to both models at once (e.g. in high schools), possibly influencing their perception of the language as more or less 'useful' or 'serious' and thus their motivation in learning it.

Since EFL textbooks need to be approved by MEXT, they usually adhere to laws on education and ministerial directives. For example, one of the objectives of education of the Basic Act on Education clearly states:
(5) fostering the value of respect for tradition and culture and love of the country and regions that have nurtured us, as well as the value of respect for other countries and the desire to contribute to world peace and the development of the international community. (MEXT, 2006)

Similar inputs can be observed throughout the EFL teaching materials, where a specific theme can be approached in a variety of ways. In this case, the theme of 'food' was examined. In FLE textbooks, not bound to follow MEXT's guidelines, this subject is almost exclusively epitomised by lists of French meals. On the other hand, authors of EFL publishing seem to follow a pattern where Japan is first introduced along with its traditions and merits; only at a subsequent time is it compared or accompanied by foreign food culture, often to warn students about it through negative attitude markers and epistemic modalities to plant seeds of doubt (for
instance, by suggesting that "what you eat may come from foreign countries" [MW1,78] in a larger co-text implying uncertainty and danger that oppose a higher quality of national food and ingredients). I argue that this trend could constitute a way of interpreting guidelines from the ministry, especially - here - to the "respect for tradition and culture and love of the country". Drawing from the results of this first comprehensive analysis, a second study was conducted to dig deeper into the intertextual relationships between EFL textbooks and Japanese laws on education (Ronci, 2020).

## 6. Conclusion

The analysis of 'food/gastronomy' lessons in both EFL and FLE textbooks currently used in Japanese high schools hints at a different purpose at the very core of the teachings at issue, with English supports being a means to the development of future citizens and FLE texts being almost completely detached from the students' lives and culture. Differences in the author's 'voice' and learners' autonomy emerged as well. Following the leads that this article hints to, deeper research on the intertextual links between the corpus and previous (or contemporary) discourse on foreign language education would undoubtedly provide an even more accurate and sensible definition of L2 teaching in Japan.
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## Appendix 1

Linguistic framework：stance（S），mention（M）and engagement（E）categories．
In Hyland＇s framework，mentions are not separated from the others：self mentions are included in stance and reader mentions in engagement．Inclusive and exclusive mentions do not appear in his work．

|  |  | Hyland（2008） |  | In this study（adaptations of Hyland and additions from Kerbrat－Orecchioni for attitude markers） |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Category | Definition | Examples | Definition | Examples |
| S | Hedges | Devices which withhold complete commitment to a proposition，implying that a claim is based on the writer＇s plausible reasoning rather than certain knowledge． | －several <br> possible reasons <br> －may <br> －there is a <br> tendency to．．． <br> －could | Markers of epistemic modality providing any kind of attenuation，less commitment to the proposition or some distance with part of it． | －My work is my <br> ＂vote＂， <br> －You may associate．．． <br> －Approximately 2.3 million people |
|  | Boosters | Markers that allow writers to express certainty in what they say and to mark involvement with the topic and solidarity with readers． | －definitely <br> －sure <br> －prove <br> －obviously | Markers of epistemic modality stressing the certainty of the proposition or intensifying parts of it， sometimes even displaying a sense of surprise．Italics were also considered as boosters here． | －I really enjoyed all the food here －is being sold for as much as 50 Hong Kong dollars！ －products will certainly be．．． <br> －使えるよ <br> －dependence on one kind of potato． |
|  | Attitude markers （Hyland） | Markers that indicate the writer＇s affective，rather than epistemic，attitude to propositions，conveying surprise，agreement， importance，frustration． | ＂I find it remarkable that even as proficient．．．＂ ＂unexpected， subtle and self－ evaluative＂ | AffectiveRelating to <br> emotions on <br> a large scale | ＂lovely＂，＂scary＂ <br> －Humm．．．j＇aime le fromage！ |
|  |  |  |  | Axiologica Evaluative <br> markers <br> showing <br> judgment or <br> appreciation  | ＂good＂，＂bad＂ －Au Maroc［．．．］on peut manger du bon couscous －C＇est un peu lourd， mais délicieux |
|  |  |  |  | Non－ <br> axiological Evaluative <br> markers <br> whose <br> meaning <br> depend on <br> the speaker＇s <br> point of <br> view | ＂long＂，＂short＂ <br> －New challenges for uniqueness <br> －Their lives were not easy |
| M | Self mention | The use of first person pronouns and possessive adjectives． | ＂This paper describes our attempt to．．．＂ | The use of first person pronouns and possessive adjectives related to the author（and not to fictional characters speaking with first person pronouns）or verbal forms expressing the presence of the author （in Japanese）． | VERY RARE <br> －Today，I will show you how to make．．． <br> －堪能してみたい <br> －ここはマスタードの本場なのだ（deixis with psychological or affective value of proximity） |
|  | Inclusive mention |  |  | Mentions that allow authors to create a＇we＇ expressing＇I＋You＇（often with a＇we＝the Japanese＇ meaning，sometimes with a larger one，＇we＝human beings＇）． | －We mean well，but we sometimes send the message．．． －Japan is a rich country．We are the third largest economy．．． |


|  | Exclusive mention |  |  | Mentions that exclude both the author and the reader，a ＂them＂representing an out－group，sometimes an authority． | －The government reports that．．． －all the experts agreed that．．． －from a homeless person＇s point of view |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Reader mention | Reader pronouns． However，you and your are rare in academic writing．Instead，there is enormous emphasis on binding participants together through the use of inclusive we． | ＂What we found interesting about this context．．．＂ | Second person pronouns and adjectives，as well as direct mentions of ＂students＂and ＂classmates＂． | －Today，I will show you how to make．．． －Which food in the dishes above do you like the best？ <br> －あなたの意見を発表 してみましょう |
| E | Directives | Markers that serve the purpose of guiding the reader towards other texts， giving instructions on physical actions and suggesting the correct interpretation of what has been stated． | ＂（see Smith 1999，refer to table 2）＂ <br> ＂open the valve＂ <br> ＂note［some argument］＂ | In foreign language textbooks，quotes and references are quite rare，so the directives category encompasses exercises＇ instructions，suggestions， and injunctions expressed in the corpus． | －Let＇s listen to the dialog．Let＇s write about it． <br> －Complete by filling in the blanks －washoku should be preserved for．．． －Now the moral we should draw．．． |
|  | Questions | The main strategy of dialogic involvement． Mostly rhetorical， presenting an opinion as interrogative． | ＂Why did protests center in some shantytowns， but not others？＂ | The presence or lack of any kind of questions was scrutinised．Then，we focused on questions displaying implications or doxa． | －Do people in France celebrate important events with good food？ <br> －What is the danger of only growing genetically identical plants？ <br> －What sort of volunteer work do you do，or would you like to do？ |
|  | Knowledge reference | Explicit signals asking readers to recognise something as familiar or accepted and in so doing construct readers by assigning to them a role in creating the argument， acknowledging their contribution while moving the focus of the discourse away from the writer to shape the role of the reader． | ＂well known＂， <br> ＂obviously＂ | Any marker displaying a relationship between the author and the reader in terms of shared knowledge，consensual ideas，doxa and implications．Markers such as those in Hyland＇s examples were classified in the boosters category． | －When the economy went down，［many day laborers］could not find jobs．$\leftarrow$ reference to the lost decade <br> －various kinds of farmers markets such as those at Michi－no－ Eki． <br> －By eating osechi dishes together， people make family ties stronger． |
|  | Asides | Device that allow writers to address readers directly by briefly interrupting the argument to offer a comment on what has been said． | ＂And－as I believe many TESOL professionals will readily acknowledge－ critical thinking has now．．．＂ | The asides that are frequent in academic writing usually appear in different ways in textbooks，i．e．footers， tables and other elements that are，literally，on the side of the main text． These elements were classified in this category． | Footnotes： －get of the streets $\fallingdotseq$ stop being homeless －N．．B．否定文では，直接補語の前につく部分冠詞は deに変わる －－ O発音注意！nous $^{\text {a }}$ faisons［ヌフゾン］ －Bon appétit！たつ ぷり召し上がれ。（食事をする人に言うあ いさつ） |

## Appendix 2

Results from the didactic analysis of lessons related to 'food/gastronomy' in the corpus, using Littlejohn's framework (2011). This appendix provides quantitative data ${ }^{10}$ for each category.


|  | EFL | FLE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C. MENTAL OPERATION | TOT | TOT | C. MENTAL OPERATION |
| Repeat identically | 2 | 12,5 | Repeat identically |
| Repeat selectively | 0 | 3 | Repeat selectively |
| Repeat with substitutions | 7 | 14 | Repeat with substitutions |
| Repeat with transformations | 14 | 5 | Repeat with transformations |
| Repeat with expansion | 1 | 1 | Repeat with expansion |
| Retrieve from STM/working memory | 61 | 24 | Retrieve from STM/working memory |
| Retrieve from LTM | 21 | 5 | Retrieve from LTM |
| Formulate items into larger unit | 3 | 3 | Formulate items into larger unit |
| Decode semantic/propositional meaning | 12 | 13 | Decode semantic/propositional meaning |
| Select information | 50 | 17 | Select information |
| Calculate | 0 | 0 | Calculate |
| Categorise selected information | 5,5 | 2 | Categorise selected information |
| Hypothesise | 4 | 3 | Hypothesise |
| Compare samples of language | 2 | 1 | Compare samples of language |
| Analyse language form | 0 | 4,5 | Analyse language form |
| Formulate language rule | 0 | 2 | Formulate language rule |
| Apply stated language rule | 37 | 24 | Apply stated language rule |
| Apply general knowledge | 15,5 | 4 | Apply general knowledge |
| Negotiate | 3 | 0 | Negotiate |
| Review own FL output | 0 | 0 | Review own FL output |
| Attend to example/explanation | 0 | 6 | Attend to example/explanation |
| Research | 0,5 | 0 | Research |
| Express own ideas/information | 18 | 6 | Express own ideas/information |
| Translate | 12 | 5 | Translate |
| Learn by heart | 2 | 3 | Learn by heart |
| Dictation | 0 | 5 | Dictation |

[^8]| II. Who with? | EFL |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | TOT |
| Teacher and learner(s), whole class <br> observing | 5 |
| Learner(s) to the whole class | $\mathbf{2 2}$ |
| Learners with whole class simultaneously | 2 |
| Learners individually simultaneously | $\mathbf{9 2}$ |
| Learners in pairs/groups; class observing | 5 |
| Learners in pairs/groups; <br> simultaneously | $\mathbf{1 2 , 5}$ |
| Learner individually outside the class | 5,5 |


| FLE |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| TOT |  |
| 1 | Teacher and learner(s), whole class <br> observing |
| 2 | Learner(s) to the whole class |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ | Learners with whole class simultaneously |
| $\mathbf{3 0}$ | Learners individually simultaneously |
| $\mathbf{0}$ | Learners in pairs/groups; class observing |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ | Learners in pairs/groups; simultaneously |
| 2 | Learner individually outside the class |

## III. With what content?

|  |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| A. INPUT TO LEARNERS |  |
| Form |  |
| Graphic | TOT |
| Words/phrases/sentences: written | 6 |
| Words/phrases/sentences: oral | $\mathbf{8 7}$ |
| Extended discourse: written | $\mathbf{1 9}$ |
| Extended discourse: oral | $\mathbf{3 3}$ |
| Source |  |
| Materials | 0,5 |
| Teacher | $\mathbf{1 0 4}$ |
| Learner(s) | 16 |
| Outside the course/lesson | 0 |
| Nature |  |
| Metalinguistic comment | 0,5 |
| Linguistic items |  |
| Non-fiction | 5 |
| Fiction | $\mathbf{7 4}$ |
| Personal information/opinion | $\mathbf{5 1}$ |
| Song/Clip | $\mathbf{2 5}$ |


| FLE |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| TOT | A. INPUT TO LEARNERS |
| Form |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | Graphic |
| $\mathbf{5 0}$ | Words/phrases/sentences: written |
| $\mathbf{3 6}$ | Words/phrases/sentences: oral |
| 1 | Extended discourse: written |
| 0 | Extended discourse: oral |
| Source |  |
| $\mathbf{5 7}$ | Materials |
| 5 | Teacher |
| 0 | Learner(s) |
| 0 | Outside the course/lesson |
| $\quad$ Nature |  |
| $\mathbf{1 3}$ | Metalinguistic comment |
| $\mathbf{5 5}$ | Linguistic items |
| 4 | Non-fiction |
| $\mathbf{1 8}$ | Fiction |
| 0 | Personal information/opinion |
| 0 | Song/Clip |


| B. OUTPUT FROM LEARNERS |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Form |  |
| Graphic | TOT |
| Words/phrases/sentences: written | 7 |
| Words/phrases/sentences: oral | $\mathbf{7 9 , 5}$ |
| Extended discourse: written | $\mathbf{3 2 , 5}$ |
| Extended discourse: oral | 4 |
| Source |  |
| Materials | 2 |
| Teacher | $\mathbf{1 0 5}$ |
| Learner(s) | 1 |
| Outside the course/lesson | 13,5 |
| Metalinguistic comment | 3 |
| Linguistic items |  |
| Non-fiction | 3 |
| Fiction | $\mathbf{6 7}$ |
| Personal information/opinion | $\mathbf{5 2}$ |
| Song/Clip | $\mathbf{1 9}$ |


| FLE | Form |
| :---: | :--- |
| TOT | B. OUTPUT FROM LEARNERS |
|  |  |
| 3 | Graphic |
| $\mathbf{3 1}$ | Words/phrases/sentences: written |
| $\mathbf{2 8 , 5}$ | Words/phrases/sentences: oral |
| 0 | Extended discourse: written |
| 0 | Extended discourse: oral |
| Source |  |
| $\mathbf{5 5 , 5}$ | Materials |
| 0 | Teacher |
| 5 | Learner(s) |
| 0 | Outside the course/lesson |
| $\quad$ Nature |  |
| 4 | Metalinguistic comment |
| $\mathbf{5 2 , 5}$ | Linguistic items |
| 5 | Non-fiction |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | Fiction |
| 6,5 | Personal information/opinion |
| 0 | Song/Clip |

## Appendix 3

In his article，Littlejohn（2011）provides a definition and an example for each of the mental operations required from the tasks in the analysis．In this appendix，we added an example from our corpus for each category（all rights reserved to original owners）．Please，keep in mind that each task can require more than one operation simultaneously．

| MENTAL OPERATION | EXAMPLE FROM THE CORPUS |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1．Repeat identically | 単語を確認しながらオーディオトラックを聴き，声に出して繰り返しましょう。 Lisez en écoutant les pistes audio．Répétez． <br> Read while listening to the audio tracks．Repeat．［MJE，36］ |
| 2．Repeat selectively | （1）Est－ce que tu manges du pain le matin？ <br> ずつ使って「tu」で練習してください。次は「vous」で練習してみましょう。 <br> Pratiquez à loral avec un camarade． Parcourez systématiquement les boites de vocabulaire $A$ et $B$ en vous tutoyant，puis <br> 2）Oui，je mange du pain． <br> （2）Est－ce que tu manges du pain le matin？ <br> （1）Non，je ne mange pas de pain． recommencez en vous vouvoyant． <br> （1）Est－ce que tu manges un sandwich le matin ？ <br> （2）Oui，je mange un sandwich． <br> （2）Est－ce que tu manges un sandwich le matin？ <br> （1）Non je ne mange pas de sandwich． <br> ： <br> Practice orally with a classmate．Systematically go through vocabulary boxes $A$ and $B$（first using＇tu＇，then＇vous＇）．［MJE，37］ |
| 3．Repeat with substitutions | Tu connais la cuisine asiatique？ <br> Oui，j＇adore，surtout la cuisine coréenne．C＇est très bon．Et toi？ Quelle cuisine est－ce que tu aimes？ <br> française／japonaise／coréenne chinoise／italienne／espagnole／mexicaine indienne／vietnamienne／africaine <br> ®8® Activite 3 <br> dialogue 3にならって，好きな料理について話しましょう。 Demandez à votre camarade ce qu＇il／elle aime comme cuisine en vous référant au dialogue 3 ． <br> Ask your classmate what kind of food they like，referring to dialogue 3．［ES1，57］ |
| 4．Repeat with transformations | 1 各文を（）内の指示に従って書きかえなさい。 <br> 1．Sam can swim the butterfly．（䌿四文に） $\qquad$ <br> 2．His story can be true．（雷它义に） $\qquad$ <br> 3．Lisa must see a doctor．（yesterday を付け広えた文に） $\qquad$ <br> 4．You must talk to him．（会侘文に） $\qquad$ <br> Rewrite every sentence by following the instructions between（ ）．［for instance， ＇negative＇］［VQ1，37］ |
| 5．Repeat with expansion | Let＇s TRY！ <br> あなた自身について発表してみましょう。 <br> －I will be eating lunch this time tomorrow． <br> －I will be staying with my grandparents this time next month． <br> －I will be studying English harder this time next year． |


|  | Try using these expressions to talk about yourself！［NOW，141］ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 6．Retrieve from STM／working memory | See example n．3：the vocabulary is immediately accessible to the learners，they just have to＂recall items within a matter of seconds＂（Littlejohn）． |
| 7．Retrieve from LTM | Put the Japanese sentences into English． <br> 1．私は，子どるだけでなく年配者だちも大笑いしているのを見た。 <br> I saw $\qquad$ out loud． <br> 2．メアリーが来日した年は2007年だ。 $\qquad$ is 2007 ． <br> 3．おなたはなぜそんなに多くの余剩全䊈が日本にある加知っていますか。 <br> Do you know $\qquad$ in Japan？ <br> Translation exercises usually require recalling linguistic items and vocabulary from a ＂time previous to the current lesson＂（Littlejohn）．For example，the first sentence here should be translated as＂I saw not only children，but also elderly people laughing out loud＂．The language structure＂not only～but also＂was explained in the same lesson（ 7 pages before this one）and the text mentioned children and old people；however，there is no mention of＂laughing＂in the text，meaning the students should retrieve that vocabulary item from their LTM． |
| 8．Formulate items into larger unit | TASK 4 At a conference at the United Nations，you make a speech that explains why it is necessary to collect seeds from around the world．Some countries are against your way of thinking．Explain your opinion and support your ideas with details and examples．Write about 80 to 100 words．You can refer to the WORD BOX below，or use your own words and expressions． <br> WORDBOX <br> agriculture／collect seed／crucial／diversity／food production／future／gene pool／genetic uniformity／monoculture／store seed in a safe［secure］place／unpredictable world <br> ［UNI，113］ |
| 9．Decode semantic／propositional meaning | 英文を聞いて， 1,2 は会話の内容と， 3 はイラストの内容と <br> 合っていればO，合っていなけば×を書きましょう． $\mathbf{1}$  2  3 <br> Listen to the English sentences and mark if they match the content of the text $(1,2)$ and the illustration（3）with $O$ if they do and $X$ if they don＇t．［PAS，30］ |
| 10．Select information | 1．How many main characteristics does washoku have？ <br> 2．Does a typical washoku meal have six dishes？ <br> 3．How do people make family ties stronger during the New Year？ <br> Answer the questions about the text above．［MW1，76］ |
| 11．Calculate | No examples were found in the lessons about＇food／gastronomy＇． |
| 12．Categorise selected information | 2 フランス語の文をよく聴いて，ふさわしい絵を選びましょう 1－23 <br> 1）（ ） <br> （1） <br> （2） <br> 2）（ ） <br> 3）$(\quad)$ <br> （1） <br> Listen carefully to the French sentences and then choose the appropriate drawing． ［NAV，23］ |


| 13．Hypothesise | LESSON <br> Collect Everything． Save Everything． <br> by Susan Dworkin <br> 1．What is the danger of only growing genetically identical plants？ <br> 2．What is the Svalbard seed project in Norway？ <br> ［UNI，108］ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 14．Compare samples of language | Enrich Your Vocabulary（）内に適切な驜を入れれしよう。 <br> 1．Rassociate－Rassociation <br> －I always（ ）him with fast cars． <br> －The name Mark has no（ ）for me． <br> 2．图awareness－aware <br> －Are you（ ）of the time？ <br> －People should raise their（ ）about AIDS． <br> 3． Rensumption $^{2}$－consume <br> －The car（ ）a lot of fuel． <br> －Fuel（ ）has risen dramatically these days． <br> Enrich Your Vocabulary｜Enter the appropriate word between（ ）！［NOW，144］ <br> In this exercise，the comparison of similar sentences allows the learner to better understand the difference between nouns，verbs and adjectives． |
| 15．Analyse language form | Pour découvrir 1 （ 05 ） <br> 1．「（～するのは）好きですか」とたずねる表現に下線を引きなさい。 <br> 「好きだ」を表す動詞の原形はわかりますか。 <br> 2．「あまり（好きではない）」という表現に～～～を引きなさい。 <br> To find out more 1 （ $05^{\text {＇}}$ ） <br> 1．Underline the interrogative expressions for＂Do you like（doing something）？＂．Do you know the basic form of the verb＂to love＂？ <br> 2．Draw a munder the sentences that mean＂（I don＇t like）very much＂． <br> ［ALD，18］ |
| 16．Formulate language rule | 4．どんなときに Merci と言っていますか． <br> 4．When do we say merci？［ALD，19］ |
| 17．Apply stated language rule | See example n． 4 |
| 18．Apply general knowledge | Anything more to say？ <br> Do you think that it is the job of the government to be sure that everyone han a place to live and enough to eat？ <br> 14．If yes，how about people who don＇t want to work？If no，how should we help people who cannot take care of themselves？ <br> What is the role of charity in a rich country？ |
|  |  |
| 19．Negotiate | See example n．18，question $n .2$（the fact that the authors already include opposite points of view could suggest to the students that they need to add hedges to their answers and negotiate their own opinion to anticipate and react to different ones）． |
| 20．Review own FL output | In one textbook（Navi．fr），grammar explanations are combined with exercises． Although this combination could lead to students checking their own FL production in a more direct way than with exercises that are separated from the grammar explanation，it was not considered explicit enough to be included in this category． |


|  | No other example was found in the corpus． |
| :---: | :---: |
| 21．Attend to example／explanation | 音声を聞きながら，例文に目を通しましょ <br> う。次に，「Je mange／J＇aime．．．」の構文を学習して，日本語の文をフランス語に訳 しましょう。 <br> Lisez les phrases modèles en écoutant la piste audio．Étudiez la structure « Je mange／J＇aime．．．»． <br> Traduisez en français les phrases exemples． <br> 1 朝はシリアルを食べます。シリアルが好きです。 $\qquad$ <br> 納豆を食べますか？（tuを使って） $\qquad$ <br> 3 納豆は好きですか？（tuを使って） $\qquad$ <br> Read the sample sentences while listening to the audio track．Study the structure＂Je mange／J＇aime ．．．＂．Translate into French the sample sentences．［MJE，38］ In most cases，grammar explanation or examples are not preceded by instructions telling the students to read them．Their importance is implied． |
| 22．Research | Use あなたの学校の規則を，3つ書いてみよう。 <br> （例）We have to wear school uniforms．We must not use cell phones in school． We cannot bring comic books to school． <br> Let＇s try and write three rules for your school！［VQ1，37］ |
| 23．Express own ideas／information | le matin，le midi et le soir． $\begin{array}{l\|l\|l\|l} \text { D'habitude, } & \begin{array}{l} \text { au petit déjeuner, } \\ \text { au déjeuner, } \\ \text { au dîner, } \end{array} & \text { je } & \begin{array}{l} \text { mange } \\ \text { prends } \\ \text { bois } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ <br> Talk to each other about what you usually eat in the morning，at noon and in the evening by using the expressions above［Japanese instructions］．Tell what you usually eat in the morning，at noon and in the evening［French instructions］．［ES1，56］ |
| 24．Translate | 4 日本語に合うように，（ ）内の語を並べかえて英文を完成させなさい。 <br> 1．すぐにジョンに乎維を盽くつもりです。 <br> I（letter／to／write／will／a／John ）soon． $\qquad$ <br> 2．以前は律話で很と話をしたものだ。 <br> （ to／I／talk／him／with／used ）on the phone． <br> 3．外は暗い。散歩に出排けてはいけません。 <br> It＇s dark outside．（had／out／not／go／better／you）for a walk． $\qquad$ <br> Rearrange the words between（ ）to match Japanese and complete the English sentences．［VQ1，39］ |


| 25．Learn by heart | Shopping list．［NAV，21］ <br> In this example，the instruction＇learn by heart＇is implicit，but the students will need the vocabulary in this box for the following exercises，so we could assume that its presence would lead to some kind of repetition and learning． |
| :---: | :---: |
| 26．Dictation | 2． CD を閈いて書きとり，言えるようにしてきなさい。⑦ |
|  | 1） $\qquad$ $-$ ）bien ？ <br> 2） <br> － $\square$ ）．Et vous ？ <br> －Oui，merci． <br> －Je m＇appelle（ <br> 自分の名前 ）． |
|  | 2．Listen to the CD and write down what is said，then go ahead and say it［read it out loud］．［ALD，11］ |
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[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Publishing companies of EFL textbooks go as far as to provide complete scripts of the whole course for the teachers to read (Langham, 2007: 8).

[^2]:    ${ }^{2}$ Some quantitative considerations will also be provided to get a more immediate picture of the results.
    ${ }^{3}$ For instance, modality can be expressed in various ways in English, French and Japanese, but this aspect exists in the three languages, so it is possible to get an overall picture of its presence in L2 textbooks.

[^3]:    ${ }^{4}$ Although the examples in Littlejohn's publication are very helpful in providing a clear definition of what every item corresponds to, the author feels that an experience as L2 teacher is often required for the reliability of the analysis and recognises her own teaching background helped in the interpretation of the tasks.

[^4]:    ${ }^{5}$ That could probably be linked to the author's style more than a general tendency of the textbooks' genre.

[^5]:    ${ }^{6}$ See Appendix 2 for a comprehensive table showing simple quantitative data. See Appendix 3 for examples and explanations for each category of the mental operations.
    ${ }^{7}$ A difference probably explained by the proficiency gap (FLE: beginner, EFL: intermediate), for transformations are more difficult than repetitions.

[^6]:    ${ }^{8}$ According to some authors of FLE textbooks that were interviewed, it seems that the recent trend is to portray French as an 'easy' and fun language by providing shorter and easier texts and audios in the textbooks.

[^7]:    ${ }^{9}$ For instance, FLE textbooks would talk about very expensive restaurants or products (such as wine) as if they were well-known by everyone, reinforcing the image the reader is possibly expecting from French gastronomy: it is delicious and expensive. In EFL textbooks, the authors can talk about recent society phenomena without explaining them, assuming that the reader knows what they are talking about and strengthening their relationship through this mutual understanding.

[^8]:    ${ }^{10}$ Whenever the exercises' instructions were not explicit enough to understand how the students were meant to do the activity, leaving room to multiple interpretations, the possibilities were marked with '/ ' $(0,5)$ instead of ' $X^{\prime}(1)$ in the quantitative tables.

