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Abstract

The present Master’s thesis aims to be a comparative study of two corpora regarding textbooks used to teach Spanish as an additional language. Corpus 1 includes 20 textbooks that are used in Italy and Spain (10 textbooks for each country), while Corpus 2 includes 20 textbooks that are used in the United States and Canada. My investigation analyzes how course-book authors decide to explain the complex grammatical topic of the Spanish subjunctive. The research questions that drive my investigation are related to three different aspects of the explanation. The first regards what features textbook writers emphasize, the second concerns the use of visual elements and layout, and the third one analyzes the use (or lack) of context in order to present the target construction. Results show that textbook writers in Europe address a different kind of student population than those of the US and Canada. Therefore, the approaches that are reflected in the corpora present more differences than similarities. This Master’s thesis ends with a suggestion for textbook writers in the United States, Canada, Italy, and Spain, and for future studies.
Lay Summary

The instructional materials that students in Canada use are not free from a similar monolingual pedagogical approach that students in the United States are exposed to. What textbook authors seem to ignore is that most of the Canadian students willing to learn Spanish bring with them a heterogeneous language background. This is the case of the University of British Columbia’s students where the majority who are enrolled in Spanish beginner courses are international students, with rich multilingual backgrounds. Yet, they learn with US-made instructional materials, like textbooks. So, why shouldn’t we try to connect both worlds, Europe and the United States, with the aim of enriching Canadian students’ knowledge of Spanish? Also, as a response to both the realities and goals that the University of British Columbia presented in the last decade, according to the UBC’s International Strategic Plan of 2011, this study will bring a variety of skills and perspectives, while focusing on strategies that better accommodate international students.
Preface

The following thesis has been completed by Giulia Cortiana. As the student, I was in charge of collecting the corpora, analyzing them and reporting data collection to my supervisor once a week.
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1 Introduction

The introduction will cover some fundamental knowledge about Spanish and English, and what topics scholars have identified as cross-linguistic differences between the two languages. As Spanish and English are not typologically related languages, Anglophone students may find that some aspects of the Romance language appear more challenging than expected. Learning an additional language that does not correlate make use of the same grammatical concepts or conceptualize the different notions, can be challenging for language learners to comprehend, and for teachers to teach. Furthermore, instructional materials such as textbooks display similar challenges while explaining contrasting grammatical notions such as the Spanish subjunctive. This is why I have found myself asking the question of what a Spanish textbook should include and which aspects should be emphasized, in order to explain the subjunctive clearly. Is it better to use a table, a picture, or something else?

Spanish language pedagogues in Europe and those in the United States appear to address multilingual environments differently while teaching an additional language. While European teachers tend to embrace the linguistic and cultural diversity that students bring to the classroom (Common European Framework of Reference), language educators in the United States lean towards a more monolingual paradigm, in which English is the only predominant language (Ovando, 2010; Veltman, 1983). The European approach could be defined as welcoming of cultural, social and linguistic differences, as it seems that it more so appreciates the variety of linguistic backgrounds that students come with in the classroom setting. On the other hand, the United States tends to avoid interaction with other languages (Cummins, 2007; García, 2005; de Wit, 2002), whilst reinforcing Anglophone cultural and social settings. These contrasting approaches to the teaching and learning of Spanish are also reflected in instructional materials (e.g., textbooks) that are available for students.

More precisely, in the case of European textbooks for teaching Spanish as an additional language, explanations are entirely presented in Spanish (i.e., there is no translation into English). Learners
comprehend the function of morphosyntactic constructions from the semantic material included in each definition. This is due to the large linguistic diversity that can be found in the European context. Thus, Italian books that explain Spanish grammar avoid dialogues translated into English. Even though sometimes they do rely on students’ mother tongue for translated dialogues and/or exercises, they prefer to use the target language (i.e. Spanish) while giving examples and teaching grammar rules. North American textbooks seem to lack this inclusion of meaning as attention is largely given to formulaic explanations of structures. Additionally, Spanish textbooks published in the United States present Spanish content translated into English to aid students’ comprehension. The use of English translation in Spanish textbooks displays the assumption that all Spanish students in North America are monolingual Anglophones, and respond best to this style of content. This is probably the reason why North American textbooks use English to explain Spanish grammar, refer to English dialogues, and use English examples.

This difference between incorporating the meaning (or not) while explaining the Spanish subjunctive in Spanish textbook definitions is important. According to cognitive linguists, meaning is the key aspect of language that transcends between each language so speakers can comprehend each other without using a linguistic code (e.g., use of gestural language, Guidetti & Nicoladis, 2008; Mayberry & Nicoladis, 2000; Pika, Nicoladis & Marentette, 2006; Talmy, 2000). The importance of including meaning in grammar explanations, especially with those topics that have been identified as a crosslinguistic difference between the mother tongue and Spanish, is argued by Wierzbicka (1992, 1999, 2003) that if an explanation includes its meaning, learners will succeed more, despite all of the differences between the two languages.

Regarding the teaching of Spanish in the Canadian context, one can argue that it is a mix of both worlds. Canada seems to resemble Europe due to the cultural and linguistic diversity seen in Spanish learners who study at the post-secondary level (Barnett, Yarosz, Thomas, Jung, & Blanco, 2007; García, 2005; Gutiérrez, 2017). Conversely, the majority of the textbooks used in the Canadian universities are produced in the United States. On the Canadian West Coast, the teaching and learning of Spanish at the postsecondary level happens primarily in a classroom context. Following the trend in English language instruction, we refer to Spanish as an additional language (SAL) in place of the traditional and
likely more controversial foreign language label. Regardless of what triggers a decision to study Spanish, students end up learning the language from an instructor and instructional materials, while being graded by certain program objectives. The same occurs in instructed learning of English as an additional language (Long, 1983). There is perhaps consensus that the effect of instruction also holds for Spanish. The classroom is a safe space where students gradually develop the linguistic skills to comprehend and produce Spanish especially in the early stages.

This entails that the instructional materials that students in Canada use are not free from a similar monolingual pedagogical approach that students in the United States are exposed to. What textbook authors seem to ignore is that most of the Canadian students willing to learn Spanish bring with them a heterogeneous language background (Arnott, et al. 2017; Prasad, 2014). This is the case of the University of British Columbia’s students where the majority who are enrolled in Spanish beginner courses are international students, with rich multilingual backgrounds. Yet, they learn with US-made instructional materials like textbooks. So, why shouldn’t we try to connect both worlds, Europe and the United States, with the aim of enriching Canadian students’ knowledge of Spanish? Wouldn’t it be better for English native speakers who are willing to learn Spanish to be taught the same way Europeans are?

The linguistic context of the Spanish classroom is in fact an important aspect to consider. The idea that in Canada and the United States the student population is primarily Anglophone still remains (Wiley Senior Marketing Manager, personal communication, March 04, 2016). Thus, textbooks and ancillary materials should combine the presentation of Spanish language and cultural contents with English translations. What this means is that students who intend to continue both languages and language processing mechanisms actively, result in frequent code switches and borrowings. In addition, as a response to both the reality that the University of British Columbia (UBC) presented in the last decade, and according to the UBC’s International Strategic Plan of 2011, this study will bring a new perspective with a variety of learning goals, which focus on strategies that better accommodate international students. A secondary, but no less important goal of my study, is to find ways to support students’ navigation through the learning of Spanish, as well as give more information and strategies to teachers and textbooks writers work with international
students from different educational backgrounds, in order for everyone to benefit from the diversity that reins at UBC and in most North American universities.
2 Literature review

In this section, I will offer theoretical perspectives and previous research findings related to the present study. The goal is to review published literature that encompasses the notion of instructional resources in general, and then specifically language textbooks and how their authors from the United States, Italy and Spain define the organization and elements included by following each country’s pedagogical approach. An essential part of the investigation, is to disclose the differences that exist between the instructional materials for the learning and teaching of Spanish as an additional language that learners and instructors have available in the United States and the ones that are available in two European countries (i.e., Italy and Spain). These differences arise due to the dissimilar educational visions that the United States and Europe textbook writers hold when it comes to organizing and creating a textbook that will be used to teach an additional language. This will be further be discussed in section 2.3 and 2.4 of this chapter.

2.1 The idea of instructional material resources

According to the early definition proposed by David Merril, Leston Drake, Mark Lacy and Jean Pratt (1966, p. 5), all materials that will make the learning experience and the acquisition of knowledge and skill “more efficient, effective and appealing” are considered “instructional material.” However since then, the concept of instructional material they offered has changed, “partly due to a change in educational philosophies and beliefs, and partly in response to advances in information technologies, which have made new methods of instruction both possible and necessary – necessary to take advantage of the new instructional capabilities offered by the technologies” (Relgeluth, 1983, p. IX). Deborah Loewenberg Ball and David Cohen defined instructional material as “concrete and daily. They are the stuff of lessons and units, of what teachers and students do. That centrality affords curricular materials a uniquely intimate connection to teaching” (1996, p. 6). If we think in terms of the broad range of possible activities and
supporting elements that teachers include in lessons and units for the teaching of the Spanish language, Loewenberg and Cohen’s definition of instructional resources seems to be all-inclusive. Resource creators adhere to some basic principles, as will be explained next.

Instructional material is created according to a specific theory: “an instructional-design theory is a theory that offers explicit guidance on how to better help people learn and develop. The kinds of learning and development may include cognitive, emotional, social, and spiritual” features (Relgeluth, 1983, p. 5). There are four elements that the theory should be able to answer to. These are: offering clear information, offering a thoughtful practice, offering informative feedback, and offering strong intrinsic or extrinsic motivation (Relgeluth, 1983, p. 6).

Studies completed by Relgeluth (1983) and by Perkins (1992) seemed to suggest that well-done instructional material provides ways to support and facilitate learning, otherwise called “methods of instructions” (Relgeluth, 1983, p. 6). Perkins also added that “good teaching demands different methods for different occasions” (1992, p.45). In his study, the researcher also divided them into units, offering a more insightful view of each component of the method; according to his findings, a well-written method of instruction needs to clarify students’ goals, monitor processes, offer demonstrations, provide some linkage between the old concepts and the new ones, and legitimize a new concept by means of principles that students already know (Ibid., 1992, pp. 53-54).

However, the study carried out by Catherine McLoughlin (1999) seemed to suggest that “instructional material often remains fixed, unvaried and static, adaptive to individual need in only minor ways, if at all” (p. 223). Her study suggested that the possible reason behind this phenomenon had to be looked for in the “often neglected source of information on individual differences in the growing body of research on learning style and strategies, which explains how individuals learn, process new knowledge and represent information” (Ibid., 1999, p. 223).

McLoughlin’s study also offered insight into the different approaches that instructional material can take. Her investigation seemed to suggest that the learning-centered approach “can be identified as a distinct stream of style-based research that differs from the psychological orientation of cognitive-
perceptual research” (1999, p. 225). She based her study on a previous investigation carried out by Riding and Rainer (1998), in which they suggested educationists address “the diversity of the environment in which learning takes place” (as cited in McLoughlin, 1999, p. 225). McLoughlin was able to highlight that “the focus has shifted from concentrating on the constructs of intelligence and processing information to an increasing interest in learners’ active response to the learning task and to the learning environment” (*Ibid.*, 1999, p. 225).

It is important to note the main difference between the European approach to the creation of textbooks and the North American one, which was made clear by McLoughlin’s investigation (1992) and by Loewenberg and Cohen’s study (1996). As previously demonstrated by Biggs (1979), Entwistle and Ramsden (1983), and Trigwell and Prosser (1999). Much of the learner-centered research approach “has been carried out in Europe and has focused on approaches to study” (McLoughlin, 1992, p. 226). According to Yasemin Nuhoglu Soyal and Hanna Schiller, in the 18th and the 19th century most European countries transformed their textbooks such that they would be “part of the process of nation-building and the creation of social cohesion in the interest of the emerging industrial society” (2005, p. 1). As pointed out by Assmann in 1993, education also changed in the fields of both science and the humanities. A new role was given to education, thanks to the concept of citizenship that was created and developed (Graves, 2001; Hen & Selden, 2000; Soyal & Schiller, 2005). It is noticed “it is no coincidence that the rise of the academic […] is concomitant with the institutionalization of the nation-state as the dominant model of political organization” (Soyal & Schiller, 2005, p. 2). This also means that textbooks, that are one of the tools that allow education to spread, became the key element “through which national and citizenship identities are projected and constructed vis-à-vis a wider world” (*Ibid.*, 2005, p. 2).

Specifically, for the European countries that will be analyzed in this present study, education played a fundamental role in creating a collective social mentality: what education should accomplish is the transformation of Europe into an idea of a nation, not only in economic and political aspects, but as well in cultural and educational ones. Miguel Pereyra and Antonio Luzón present their idea of how “official knowledge, by and large based on the content of school textbooks, reflects a set of political, economic, and
cultural interactions legitimating a specific view of knowledge and culture organized and systematized by each country, hence its relevance” (p. 164, as cited in Soyal & Schiller, 2005).

On the other hand, in the United States the learning approach is “consistent with American individualism” in which “textbooks, and the commercial and political considerations that shape their production, are viewed as a conservative influence.” The development of any instructional material is not a stand-alone phenomenon, as Relgeluth pointed out: “interrelationships between instruction and such other areas as student motivation and assessment are also powerful. Learning is related to the climate or culture within which it occurs” (Relgeluth, 1983, p. 3). That is, in the current political, cultural and socio-economic situation that characterizes the United States, language textbooks are supposed to help maintain the status quo, and the supremacy of the English language (Loewenberg & Cohen, 1996, p. 6). This difference will be further analyzed later on.

Finally, following the idea of instructional material, it is fair to include textbooks, CDs, online websites, slides, and online material. Richards’ investigation in 2015 demonstrated that “textbooks […] doubtless continue to play an important role in language teaching and provide a useful resource for both teachers and learners” (p. 6). Not only should textbooks be seen as a guideline for teachers, rather than reflecting a deficiency on their part, but “textbooks should be regarded as one of the many resources teachers can draw upon in creating effective lessons” as well (Ibid., 2015, p. 6). In other words, textbooks should allow inexperienced teachers to be more confident and more secure about their teaching techniques and styles, while also presenting a solid basis from which they could start creating their own lessons, and therefore adapting the textbook to the group of learners. However, in the humanity field, while students are learning an additional language they can only rely on two main factors: the textbook and the teacher. The textbook provides students with information about what they are learning, what they are expected to know and in what order; and the teacher provides students with additional information, personal suggestions and advice, as well as specific notes on students’ learning and improvement.
2.2 The notion of language textbook and its relationship with teachers

According to *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (2014), an educational textbook, specifically, is “a manual of instruction in any branch of study.” In this research, I adhere to the definition proposed in the study by Tom Hutchinson and Eunice Torres (1994). These authors noted that “the term textbook is used in the broad sense of an organized and pre-packaged set of teaching/learning materials. The materials may be bound in just one book or distributed in a package, such as the familiar course-book, workbook, teacher’s guide, and cassettes” (p. 328). Of course, in the time since Hutchinson and Torres proposed this definition for textbooks and materials, technology has made an important contribution. For instance, cassettes have been replaced by CDs and podcasts. In addition, learners have exposure to audiovisual materials through the internet: online exercises, websites, interactive practices, and modules, to name a few. All in all, the array of ancillary materials is ample and rich. As a result, learners have access to a much richer target language and cultural input. In the present study, I focus attention on textbooks that language teachers use. Formally defined, language textbooks are “used as a standard source of information for formal study of a subject and an instrument for teaching and learning” (Graves, 2000, p. 175). A study by Jack Richards in 2015 presented textbooks as the single element among instructional materials that “provide basis for the content of the lessons, the balance of skills taught and the kinds of language practice the students take part in” (p. 1).

The investigation carried out by Hutchinson and Torres presented textbooks as “an almost universal element of […] teaching” (1994, p. 315). Nevertheless, as pointed out by Loewenberg and Cohen, “although many innovative materials were developed in the late 1950s and early 1960s, classroom use was spotty because innovation tended to overlook teachers” (1996, p. 6). Textbooks have also been identified as the main tool students rely on, as “much of the teaching that occurs throughout the world today could not take place without the extensive use of commercial textbooks” (Richards, 2015, p. 1). However, Swan demonstrated that “the danger with ready-made textbooks is that they can seem to absolve teachers of responsibility. Instead of participating in the day-to-day decisions that have to be made about what to teach
and how to teach it, it is easy just to sit back and operate the system, secure in the belief that the wise and virtuous people who produced the textbook knew what was good for us. Unfortunately, this is rarely the case” (Hutchinson and Torres, 1994, p. 33). As I will further discuss in the following paragraphs, language textbooks are created and organized in two divergent ways, depending on the country that produces them. It seems legitimate to acknowledge that in the four countries taken into consideration in this study, there are teachers who rely more on the textbooks they pick and put little effort in creating their own instructional material. It is also fair to point out that there are teachers who only use the textbooks to assign homework and activities, while they explain the grammatical topic using their own agenda.

As will be further analyzed in the section 2.4 of this chapter, a recent study by Rod Bolitho (2005) showed how most of the language textbooks available in European countries that signed the Common European Framework of Reference for Language are created, organized and written by a team that includes teachers, authors and publishers. His study does not undermine authors’ authority, as he stated “most of the successful authors of globally successful course-books started out as teachers and their ideas are rooted in classroom practice” (Ibid., 2005). His study suggests that people who have direct experience with teaching, exercises, practicing activities and different students’ learning methods should write a successful language textbook.

It is important to mention that a language textbook is not “merely a collection of texts drawn from different genres, but it reflects a particular pedagogic point of view arrived at by the textbook designers after taking into account the broad educational objectives that inform the curriculum followed in a particular context” (Misra, 2014). Another item worth mentioning is that in the context of the present study, I use the terms ‘instructional material,’ ‘textbook’ and ‘course-book’ roughly as synonyms, as textbooks are one of the many instructional materials that both students and teacher can rely on.

Richards’ research also concluded that textbooks are not always helpful as “sometimes they present inauthentic language since texts, dialogs and other aspects of content tend to be specially written to incorporate teaching points and are often not representative of real language use” (2015, p. 2). The reason
for this negative aspect is sometimes textbooks potentially offer what was also mentioned in Loewenberg and Cohen’s investigation as the existence of a gap “between curriculum developers’ intentions for students and what actually happens in class” (1996, p. 6). According to their results, teachers have tried to bridge this gap in two ways: either teachers “do not follow the textbook” (Ibid., 1996, p. 6) or “they make their own curriculum” (Ibid., 1996, p. 6). Even so, there is a missing relationship that was echoed by Allwright in 1981: he saw the classroom and the lesson as an interaction of three elements, being the teacher, the learners and the material. His insight showed that textbooks do not only provide “input into classroom lessons in the form of texts, activities, explanations and so on” (Hutchinson & Torres, 1994, p. 317), but also assigned textbooks a further dimension to their role in teaching and learning. This further dimension can be associated with the results that Bolitho’s studies highlighted: a collection of all the factors involved when a student faces the learning of any additional language.

Research carried out by Cunningsworth in 1995 offered four criteria to evaluate textbooks. The first one concerns the accomplishment of aims, goals, and objectives that the language program presents; the second is in regard to the uses that learners will make of the language they are studying and if the textbook effectively helps learners’ purposes. The third one and fourth one respectively focus on the learning process, as textbooks should not impose a rigid teaching method, but support the learning as they act as mediators between the target language and the learners. However, Richards (2015, p. 5) pointed out that textbooks “do not represent the process of learning itself:” his study indeed suggested that textbooks should “adapt and transform” (Ibid., 2015, p. 5) to better suit learners’ needs, goal, aims, and objectives. Language textbooks usually depend on two main commercial factors: the author and the publisher. The former is “generally concerned to produce a text that teachers will find innovative, creative, relevant to their learners’ needs, and they will enjoy teaching from” (Ibid., 2015, p. 3). However, the publisher’s interests lay in the “financial success” (Ibid., 2015 p. 3) of the textbook selling. As pointed out by Loewenberg and Cohen’s (1996), neither factor takes into consideration teachers’ opinion, even though teachers are the ones using textbooks. The aim of the present study is not to judge a textbook that teachers and students have available in the United States or in Italy and Spain when learning Spanish, but to compare them and
determine if they respect (or not respect) what previous studies have pointed out about language textbooks and their organization, structure, and approaches. Most of all, I focus attention on the treatment authors of Spanish language textbooks give to the presentation of grammatical constructions. In particular, and as it will become clearer further below, I am interested in learning about the underlying profile of a language learner that authors appear to have, judging on the way they present, explain, and offer practice of grammatical contents.

In what follows I will provide more detailed information about language textbooks that teachers and learners have available when approaching Spanish as an additional language. The first section will cover information about Spanish textbooks in the United States. In the second section, I will discuss Spanish textbooks currently used in Italy and Spain.

2.3 Spanish course textbooks in the US and in the Canadian university context

According to Willem de Reuse (1997, pp. 117-118), language textbooks available in the United States can be divided into three main categories. The first category includes language textbooks that “teach native speakers something about the grammar of the language or teach them to read and write.” These textbooks, for the most part, exclude two other linguistic and communicative aspects that the Common European Framework of Reference for Language marks as fundamental: speaking and listening. One can see that these textbooks help Hispanophones to develop literacy in their first language. This is particularly useful in the case of the community of illiterate immigrants to the United States or second-generation children (i.e., Heritage speakers). The second category concerns language textbooks that “teach the language to speakers of other language, but avoid grammar to some extent.” The third and last group includes language textbooks that use the principles employed by the first group to instruct the audience of the second.
Another study completed by Loewenberg and Cohen (1996) showed that “in the United States, at least, individual teachers shape the curriculum in fundamental ways. One root of this is that o system typically lacks strong curricular guidance” (p. 6). This seemed to imply that teachers’ beliefs and understanding of the material are not taken into consideration as they should, because “curriculum designers aim to create particular kinds of learning experiences for students and they can only anticipate partially what students need” (Ibid., 1996, p. 6). This assumption can be accurate if we consider that in the United States, alike to the Spanish textbooks included in the present investigation, the majority of language textbook authors are not language teachers or instructors.

According to the investigation carried out by Young and Oxford (1993), “choosing a textbook for a first-year language program is a fundamental part of the teaching plan, yet it is one that is made on the basis of a range of conscious and unconscious factors” (p. 593). As for the conscious factors, it is fair to consider as such the year of publication, the digital/printed version, whether the material covered in the textbook aligns with the topics the instructor would like to teach. On the other hand, under the label of unconscious factors, it is square to include teachers’ expectations, concerns, and beliefs about the language and the teaching itself. However, the idea that the research accomplished by Loewenberg and Feiman-Nemser presented was “dismal” (Ibid., 1993, p. 402): “workbooks and practice materials are badly designed, often confusing rather than helping students” (Ibid., 1993, p. 402), as previously showed by a study conducted by Sykes in 1985. In the past two decades, language textbooks have changed and it seems reasonable to think that they have changed for the better, as the number of students willing to learn Spanish has increased. Yet, the path towards to ‘perfect’ language textbook is not complete.

This phenomenon led a longitudinal study of learning to teach and the preservice curriculum, whose results showed how “many instructors promoted the idea that good teachers do not use textbooks and teachers’ guides but develop their own curriculum instead” (Loewenberg & Feiman-Nemser, 1988, p. 402). The investigation was not only concerned with teachers’ opinions of their textbooks, but the students’ feelings as well, saying “teachers should […] help their students learn the important ideas in the disciplines, developing their own units, lessons, and materials” (Loewenberg & Feiman-Nemser, 1988, p. 407; my
emphasis), if they think that textbooks “had serious deficiencies” (Ibid., 1988, p. 407). An important result that emerged from Loewenberg and Feiman-Nemser’s investigation was that when students are allowed to write critiques about textbooks style, they do “know what to look for and have the knowledge needed in order to do it” (Ibid., 1988, p. 410).

In their study, Young and Oxford explained why students’ feelings and attitudes towards the instructional material they use to learn an additional language can have an impact on how they relate to the culture, the language, and the society they are starting to study. However, as made evident by the results Loewenberg and Cohen gathered, instructional textbooks available in the United States in the last decades may have not what it takes to positively influence students’ perspectives. This is also because very few studies regarding instructional material are available for both students and professors in the United States have been performed. All the results form Loewenberg and Cohen’s investigation seemed to point to what they called “American individualism” (p. 6): not only are teachers not taken into consideration by textbook designers, but in addition, “curriculum materials are seen to constrain and control both knowledge and teaching, limiting students’ opportunity to learn” (Apple & Jungck, 1990; Elliot, 1990; Loewenberg Ball & Cohen, 1996, p. 6; Loewenberg Ball & Feiman-Nemser, 1988). The investigation that Loewenberg and Feiman-Nemser conducted seemed to suggest that “students […] came to believe that good teachers avoid textbooks and develop their own lessons and units. Some teachers […] said that they felt most motivated when they created their own curriculum, that their teaching was most meaningful to students when they did their own thing” (Loewenberg Ball & Feiman-Nemser, 1988, p. 416).

The dominant school of thought in the United States sees textbook designers and teachers as antagonists, not as partners: “the relationship between textbooks and teachers has rarely been taken up with much care or imagination” (Loewenberg & Cohen, 1996, p. 7). This mindset led to the assumption that “curriculum materials can operate independently on students” (p. 7; Dow, 1991), mainly because teachers and textbooks designers “have little or no regular conversation with one another” (Loewenberg & Cohen, 1996, p. 7), also previously pointed out by Ben-Perez in 1990.
Regarding Spanish textbooks used in the North American university context, Terrell (1990) studied seventeen textbooks used to teach Spanish in a North American college setting and he later examined them according to five parameters including communication activities, meaningful exercises, open exercises, contextualized activities, and interactive exercises. The following year, Swaffar considered a variety of textbooks used to teach French and Spanish regarding grammar explanations, illustrations of the target constructions she identified beforehand, uses of learners’ native language and uses of target language, by reading exercises and sentential activities. Regardless of the results that these investigations outlined, what matters for the present research project is that both studies showed that textbooks are lacking in some contextualization and grammar explanation aspects. This is a characteristic that researchers have found in language textbooks in general that are used in a North American university setting, which seems not to appear in that of European universities. In other words, North American students should be inserted into a learning environment that offers them the possibility of contextualization, i.e. the possibility to independently and inductively understand the language thanks to the context, as Europeans are. In the United States, both in the classroom environment and in the instructional material that is available for teachers and learners, the language is presented as an element separate from the context, as the language alone would not provide all the tools necessary for communication. Yet, in reality, it is the opposite. Human beings communicate with one other due to languages, even when lacking context can create disconnected sentences.

A more recent study conducted by Ryuko Kubota and by Theresa Austin (2007) demonstrated how much “the language education in the United States is in need of critical scrutiny” (Ibid., 2007, p. 73), as “learning language other than English is framed in pragmatism” (Ibid., 2007, p. 73). Their study highlighted three rationales, but due to the aim of this current study, only the third one is relevant: Kubota and Austin defined the language situation in the United States as full of “ethnocentrism, monoculturalism, and English-only monolingualism” (Ibid., 2007, p. 73). What Kubota and Austin’s investigation presented was a clear critique regarding the terminology that has been used in the United States since the seventies: “historically, teaching languages other than English as been called foreign language education, which continues to evoke
an ideology of *one nation one language* reflective of a 19th-century concept of modern society or nationalism to define the boundaries of who is an insider or outsider” (*Ibid.*, 2007, p. 74). A research conducted by Walker in 2003 showed that our world, especially the United States’, educational situation has been largely influenced by what Kubota and Austin called “shifting social, political, and economic conditions that shape discourse on what purpose language learning serves, what benefits language learning provides, and which language is more important to learn than others” (*Ibid.*, 2007, p. 75).

In the United States, language textbooks showed “one major topic to consider as problematic” (Kubota & Austin, 2007, p. 76); the assumption that “standard form of language or authentic cultural phenomena are often presented in textbooks and taught in classroom as the only correct code and knowledge to learn” (*Ibid.*, 2007, p. 76). The root is found in the presumption (one that is spreading on the North American continent) that English is the dominant international lingua franca, while the discussion should be presented in a liberal pluralism environment (Jenkins, 2006; Kubota & Austin, 2007; Train, 2006). What most textbook authors seem to forget when it comes to organizing and creating a course-book is the results that emerged from the previously mentioned investigations: “language teaching in schools by nature is in a complicit relationship with the political will to establish and preserve a clear boundary that determines who is the legitimate speaker of the language and bearer of cultural heritage” (Delpit, 1995; Freire & Macedonian, 1987; Kubota & Austin, 2007, p. 76). This is true especially for languages like Spanish and French, which have been classified as legacies of colonialism and diaspora (Valdés, Gonzáles, García & Marquéz, 2003).

As shown in the investigation carried out by Yasaman Nuhoglu and Hanna Schissler (2005), in the post-Second World War textbooks were considered as the element “through which canonized understandings and representations of the nation and national history have been transformed” (*Ibid.*, 2005, p. 2). This phenomenon happened both in Europe and in the United States, but in incongruous ways. In Europe, the goal was “the creation of the European awareness” (Pereyra & Luzón, 2005, p. 164), in political, economic, social, cultural and educational aspects. Europe also “witnessed the celebration and codification of cultural standards that adhered to the principle of ‘different but equal’ – the right to one’s own identity”
(Nuhoglu & Schissler, 2005, p. 3). Yet, the United States saw increasing developments in “social-scientific approaches rather than promoting ethno-culturalist interpretations” (Ibid., 2005, p. 3). The main, current thought that governed the United States was based on the assumption that Western culture was the “widely accepted model for development” (Ibid., 2005, p. 5); an assumption that is still reflected in the way language textbooks are written.

Another point that needs to be taken into consideration is the bond between language and culture and its representation in the instructional material that is available for North American learners. A study conducted by Herman in 2002 showed that Spanish textbooks are more focused on diversity: as Kubota and Austin would add later, the representation of this bond “advocates continual critique of the images created by instructional material and, at the same time, makes constructive suggestions that would enable students to develop an alternative worldview” (2007, p. 78). Hornberger appears to be in agreement, as in 2006 he argued that teaching additional languages in the United States is primarily a matter of national security promotion. A study carried out first by Ramírez and Hall in 1990 and later replicated by Deborah Herman in 2002 showed that despite the wide range of diversity (both cultural and geographical) of the Spanish-speaking world, Spanish textbooks available in the North American university context lack in the deeper treatment of such diversity that got reduced to food, fun, and fiestas.

Now, please allow me to continue with the European Spanish language textbooks that are used in Italy and in Spain to teach Spanish as additional language at the university level.

2.4 Spanish course textbooks in two European university contexts

Most European countries have collaborated to create the Common European Framework of Reference for Language in order to accommodate learners’ goals and teachers’ needs. As Byram, Michols and Stevens (2001) identified and as Guilherme (2002) confirmed, in the Common European Framework of Reference for Language the multilingualism that characterizes Europe is largely present and is used to
bridge a critical gap in “promoting not only cross-cultural understandings but also critical cultural awareness” (Kubota & Austin, 2007, p. 79).

Even though Neil Jones and Nick Saville (2009) presented the Common European Framework of Reference for Language as the instrument Europe designed to promote “centralization and harmonization” (2009, p. 51), seen as a matter of “political identification” (Davidson & Fulcher, 2007, p. 234), they also argued that the Common European Framework of Reference for Language helps “to develop contextualized, practical ways […] for teaching and learning” (2007, p. 51). The results that the investigation carried out by Bialystok (1981) might suggest that contextualization holds an empowered position regarding communicative activities. Another study developed by Terrell, Bancroft, and Perrone (1987) demonstrated that without contextualization, first-year university students were not able to identify the right verbal mood in free conversation and, later, to apply it. Rod Bolitho’s study (2015) showed that in the European countries that have previously acknowledged the Common European Framework of Reference for Language in their educational system, their language textbooks are not created by authors that are not related to the academic world, but by what he calls “teacher-writers.” The reason lies in “the belief that many teachers, with their immediate chalk-face experience, have the potential to write good materials and on the perceived need to break into a ‘close shop’ and broaden the local base of expertise and capacity in the area of textbook authoring” (Bolitho, 2015). Rethinking what has been mentioned about language textbooks in the North American university context, the present study seems to suggest that what characterizes North American language textbooks is the non-cooperation between authors, publishers and teachers, which seems to be the most crucial point in the European university context. This disparity can possibly be explained looking back at the role of teachers, and at the purpose of learning a new language. That is, in Europe every language is considered as important as the others, with no supremacy of the English language and, it is only a mere assumption that publishing companies know how important it is for learners to independently master a language in order to be able to move around Europe. On the other hand, it seems that in the United States, the dominant language for communication i.e., political, economic, social and cultural, is English, even though there is an increasing number of foreign speakers. Canada’s situation
seems to look like the European one: official bilingual, with an increasing number of foreign speakers whose native languages are recognized and valued. Another reason, as explained further in Chapter 4 (Methodology), could be that the United States have a narrowed number of well-trained textbook authors.

Furthermore, Fred Davidson and Glenn Fulcher (2007, p. 232) demonstrated that the Common European Framework of Reference for Language is “fallacious only if its users see it as inflexible.” What would make a language textbook renowned, according to the suggestions that the Common European Framework of Reference for Language provides, is the teamwork of teachers, authors and publishers. According to Byrd (1995), Hidalgo (1995), Cunningsworth (1996), Tomlinson (1998) and especially Bolitho (2015), “this team approach enables rapid progress to be made where the need for new textbooks is urgent.” Furthermore, the team mentioned beforehand will share the workload, so that no single portion involved in the writing process is overwhelmed, while offering an assortment of different views of the learning process, which will allow them to “cater for the varying learning and thinking styles of the students who will use the textbook” (Bolitho, 2015).

The studies completed so far, and mentioned beforehand, showed that multilingualism in Europe is inherently present in the culture, and that the Council of the European Union in 2003 decided “English was not enough” (p. 7). The statement “reflected the concerns of some member countries to counteract the increasingly dominant role of English as a lingua franca seen to threaten other traditionally important languages” (Jones & Saville, 2009, p. 53). According to the studies conducted by the Council of Europe in 2005 and in 2006, all the countries who agreed on using the Common European Framework of Reference for Language for languages textbooks, tests, curricula, certifications, showed a “major impact at the level of policy” (Ibid., 2009, p. 53). As previously presented by Coste (2007), Fulcher (2004, 2008), Davies (2008), and Saville (2005), the Common European Framework of Reference for Language works as a valid tool for “learning, teaching, and assessment that its title claims to” (Jones & Saville, 2009, p. 54).

What these studies have shown is that “the specific context […] determines the final meaning” (Jones & Saville, 2009, p. 55) of the target construction. In addition, research conducted by Saville (2009), Chalhoub-Deville (2008), Alderson and Wall (1993) and Hawkey (2006) showed that as result of the
contextualization, coming from understanding of the consequences and effects of assessment, students “gain better understandings of the way” in which a language works (Jones & Saville, 2009, p. 55). Instead of presenting a language through monotonous drills, as seems to happen in textbooks published in the United States, Europe stakes the communicative-based teaching approach which has largely spread among teachers and instructional materials, providing the fluency of an additional language (Little, 2005).

Since some European countries have embraced the Common European Framework of Reference in their daily teaching and learning routine, language textbooks have also changed and adopted the Common European Framework of Reference as guidelines. As suggested by Martyniuk and Noijons in 2007, language textbooks that fit the Common European Framework of Reference requirements seem “to have a major impact on language education” (2007, p. 7). This current of thought on teaching and learning has not only helped teachers in preparing strategic language policies and practical teaching instructional materials, but also “undeniably contributed to more transparency and coherence in general” (Ibid., 2007, p. 7). One of the main goals that Europe wanted to accomplish when signing the Common European Framework of Reference was the creation of a “common basis for the elaboration of language syllabi, [...] textbooks across Europe” (Byram & Parameter, 2012, p. 2). However, it is worth mentioning that the Common European Framework of Reference does not impose a specific language learning approach or method; textbooks authors are invited to use it as an instrument of reference, as the name itself says, not to strictly apply it. What the Common European Framework of Reference suggests is that language textbooks have “an intercultural approach, [...] a central objective of language education to promote the favourable development of the learner’s whole personality and sense of identity in response to the enriching experience of otherness in language and culture” (Ibid., 2012, p. 3).

The Common European Framework of Reference for Language includes four abilities, both in tests and in textbook’s organization: reading, listening, writing, and speaking (Jones and Saville, 2009, p. 59). The goal of the Common European Framework of Reference for Language has been proved twofold. On one hand, it focuses on “a scaled summary of what it calls ‘qualitative aspects of spoken language use’ – range, accuracy, fluency, interaction, and coherence” (Council of Europe, 2001, pp. 28-29). On the other
hand, it also provides a “scaled description of general linguistic range, vocabulary range, vocabulary control, sociolinguistic appropriateness, flexibility, turn-taking, thematic development, coherence and cohesion, spoken fluency, and propositional precision” (Council of Europe, 2001, pp. 110-129). The researchers’ findings clearly showed that there is a possibility to “contribute to the empirical construction of the Common European Framework of Reference for Language as a practical multilingual framework” (p. 59). According to the results from Chalhoub-Deville (1997), Fulcher (2004), and Fulcher and Davidson (2007), the Common European Framework of Reference for Language provides “the language and communication abilities necessary to undertake” (Davidson & Fulcher, 2007, p. 234) the learning of an additional language.

According to David Little (2005), the books based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Language are “learner centered and learner self-assessment” (2005, p. 321) created. As defined by Nunan (1982, p. 2), the learner centered approach is “a collaborative effort between teachers and learners,” which not only helps students achieve their goals but also “opens up wider perspectives on the learning process” (Little, 2005, p. 322). The Common European Framework of Reference for Language has been created with the aim of “promoting the development of learner autonomy, self-assessment, which plays a central role in shaping and directing the reflective processes on which such development depends” (Ibid., 2005, p. 322).

It is important to underline that all of the studies that have been conducted until now do not specify how instructional materials, textbooks, or additional material should present explanations. Thus, the goal of the present investigation is to compare Spanish textbooks published in the United States and used in the North American university context vis-à-vis those published and used in Italy and Spain. Specifically, if they deal or do not deal with the gap between instructional material design and students’ needs when it comes to explaining the Spanish subjunctive.
2.5 A comparative view of Spanish textbooks in the US/Canada and in two European countries

After summarizing the information about Spanish language textbooks that are available in the North American university context, it appears that the production of textbooks lack a collaboration between authors and language teachers who, with their direct and personal experience, could enrich textbooks and transform them according to the increasingly multilingual student population that they serve. On the other hand, Spanish language course-books in Italy and Spain, following the guidelines that the Common European Framework of Reference for Language recommends, primarily focus on the contextualization of the topics, leaving aside the grammar explanations and the morphological structure. Another big difference between the patterns that each the United States and Italy and Spain display is the following: while in the United States the English language still seems to be the dominant language, culturally, politically, economically, and socially speaking (even if there is an increasing number of other languages’ speakers), in the Old World, every language is appreciated and esteemed for its own quality, with no language dominating the others (Soyal & Schiller, 2005).

It is important to mention that this study takes place in Canada, where students learning Spanish for the very first time have to deal with instructional materials that come from the United States, mainly for geographical and cultural reasons. This is relevant if one considers that the Canadian ethnographic distribution resembles that of Europe. That is, Canada is a very multilingual and multicultural country\(^1\) where communities of speakers of an array of typologically different languages generally cohabit harmonically.

\(^1\) According to the Statistics Canada website, the percentage of people having more than one mother tongue raised from 1.9% in 2011 up to 2.4% in 2016. In addition, data show that the percentage of people living in Canada and speaking more than one language increased from 17.5% in 2011 up to 19.4% in 2016. Finally, 70% has a mother tongue that is neither English or French.
3 The present study

This research project is a preliminary approach to establishing a description and comparison of Spanish language textbooks published in the United States and those published in Europe for the presentation, explanation, and practice of the Spanish subjunctive. The design of the study is a mixed method as I report both qualitative and quantitative data that emerged from my analysis of a corpus of current textbooks. It is worth mentioning that a study of this nature seems not to have been conducted before; that is, there appears to be a gap in the published literature with respect to a study that takes a comparative perspective to describe how Spanish language textbooks from two different educational contexts are written, organized and structured for the teaching of a complex grammatical content.

The goal of my research is twofold. Firstly, I want to identify and report pedagogical and typographical styles that are available in European and US Spanish textbooks. I will argue that such differences are a reflection of dissimilar pedagogical principles and motivations held by the authors and educators. Additionally, I would like to provide an explanation of the target construction, i.e. the Spanish subjunctive, which combines notions from North American and European textbook designs. Such an outcome will be particularly relevant for Spanish learners who study the language at an institution of tertiary education in Canada. As mentioned earlier, the diverse linguistic and ethnic student community that can be found in Canada resembles that of Europe. Furthermore, many students already have some knowledge of another language when they face learning Spanish in a classroom environment.

According to the Statistics Canada website, in a report prepared by Jean-Pierre Corbeil, in 2011 more than 200 languages were classified as mother tongue or as the language spoken at home. As the statistics of his study showed, the percentage of Spanish speakers in Canada has grown 32% from 2006 to 2011. While in Montreal the percentage of people speaking Spanish is around 15%, in Edmonton the Spanish language is surprisingly included in the top five foreign languages, spoken by 47% of the population. What this data shows is that the Canadian situation regarding the learning and speaking of the
Spanish language continues to augment. In the United States, the linguistic background is even more multilingual and, in 2007, Spanish speakers accounted for 35 million out of the total population. In addition, as established by the Immigration Act of 1965, the Spanish language is considered the second most spoken language in the country (García, 2015, pp. 102-105). And yet, English is still considered the dominant language, both in academia and outside of it.

Canada seems to have more and more Spanish speakers and learners, like the United States, with an increasing appreciation for the multilingualism that characterizes the country. Yet, in Canada most of the textbooks using for teaching Spanish as additional language come from the United States, where it has been demonstrated, as previously shown in Chapter 2, that textbooks lack the semantic component and have an approach that sometimes does not suit students with a multilingual background.

As further outlined in chapter 7 (Conclusion), I advance a proposal for an enhanced explanation of the Spanish subjunctive drawing on the presentation styles employed both by European textbook writers and those from the USA. The goal of presenting such an explanation is to combine some of the features that my investigation highlighted in the European approach, with some of those discovered in the American approach. I believe that this combination will improve the learning of Spanish as an additional language in a country that values multilingualism, such as Canada.

It is worth mentioning the importance that the present study holds, since there is relatively not much known about textbooks (particularly language textbooks). It can be argued that there is a lack of information regarding how Spanish language textbooks are produced, what they should emphasize, and what visual aids they should use and in which way. It is important to clarify that the goal of this study is not to argue the importance, the value, or the help of language textbooks. Yet, there is a need of information regarding the way textbooks organize language content for presentation and practice. Even more importantly, there are significant differences with respect to the educational guides that language educators receive in the United States and in Europe. While the latter group is motivated to conceptualize language and language
proficiency within a multilingual and multicultural paradigm, language educators appear to receive a different kind of motivation.

While in Europe, most countries have signed The Common Framework of Reference and most language textbook writers rely on it in order to create, organize and structure their Spanish language textbooks. In the United States, most textbook authors rely on the guidelines provided by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. Scholars, in response to the need of identification for the most effective tools for language learning and teaching, created the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. It is based on the five areas of communication, and on the assumption that knowledge for an additional language is to be expanded upon any other knowledge that learners might already have (Byram & Parameter, 2012).

As for the reason behind the choice of the Spanish subjunctive as the grammatical topic to analyze in this study, it has to be pursued in the studies I came across. Investigations related to the Spanish language “have been limited thus far to object pronouns, the preterit tense, and the ser/estar contrast” (Farley, 2001, p. 290). Only two studies focused on the Spanish subjunctive and how learners processed its knowledge; the first one having been carried out by Andrew Farley in 2001 and the second one by Xavier Gutiérrez in 2017, which is primarily based on Ellis’ outcome that “most knowledge is tacit knowledge; most learning is implicit; the vast majority of our cognitive processing is unconscious” (2005, p. 306). This will be a crucial point to keep in mind when results will be presented, as explanations taken from course-book included in Corpus 2 seem to offer the Spanish subjunctive as stated, explicit, and conscious.

According to the study performed by Farley (2001), the Spanish subjunctive presents more linguistic and psychological complexity when compared with the ones that have been investigated in the studies conducted so far (p. 290). Farley also pointed out that “one cannot conclude from these studies alone what effects processing instruction might have on a more complex grammar point” (ibid, p. 290). Moreover, according to the study developed by Xavier Gutiérrez in 2017, some grammatical topics do need explicit knowledge for a more inclusive comprehension. In his investigation, Gutiérrez stated that the Spanish
The subjunctive verbal mode has been given ample attention in terms of the instructional materials teachers and learners have available (p. 2), as “the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic rules […] are quite complex and far from straightforward” (Montrul & Perpiñán, 2011, p. 94). His study focused on the Spanish subjunctive and demonstrated that the 46 participants developed an explicit knowledge of the target construction, even if “it is difficult to acquire as implicit knowledge” (Gutiérrez, 2017, p. 2).

In the corpus Gutiérrez analyzed, he asserted that the Spanish subjunctive appears “in noun clauses that express notions such as emotion, volition, influence, or doubt” (p. 3). However, he pointed out that the target constructions seem to be presented with a “long list of verbs, expressions, and conjugations that require the subjunctive and others that may or may not need it” (p. 3). While Farley also pointed out that “further experimentation regarding […] the acquisition of the Spanish subjunctive is needed” (p. 291), Gutiérrez stated that “few studies […] have looked at the […] knowledge on the Spanish subjunctive” (p. 4). These are the motivations for the present study.

The research questions that motivated my study are the following:

Research question 1: What aspects of the Spanish subjunctive do textbooks published in the US emphasize compared with those published in Europe?

Research question 2: To what extent do textbook authors rely on visual elements and textbook layout in order to support the explanation of the Spanish subjunctive in textbooks published in the US vis-à-vis those published in Europe?

Research question 3: How much do textbook writers in the US and in Europe consider bringing in the semantic component so that learners can comprehend the differences of the subjunctive between English and Spanish?
4 Methodology

This chapter focuses on describing the methodology with which the study was conducted. I begin describing in detail the corpora of Spanish textbooks selected for analysis. I then proceed to explain the procedure followed to collect and analyze the data.

4.1 Corpus of Spanish textbooks

The corpus of Spanish language textbooks was compiled from texts to which I had access both in Canada and in Europe. All textbooks were designed to teach first-level Spanish. These were the same course-books available on the market and that teachers could use to teach Spanish as additional language to adult learners at the tertiary level in Canada, Italy, Spain, and the United States. From a grand total of 60 textbooks collected, I randomly selected forty and they became the source of data collection. More precisely, all textbooks were analyzed with respect to the way they presented the Spanish subjunctive mood (see 2.4.4.). The first selection that narrowed down the corpora to 40 textbooks was random, as I wanted to avoid picking a textbook I already knew. That is, I wanted to be the most impartial. However, not all the decisions I made after, i.e. regarding keeping the same edition of a course-book or the range of publication years, were random.

Fifty percent of the textbooks (N = 20) consist of a random selection of textbooks to teach Spanish in Italy (N = 10) and Spain (N = 10). Hereafter, I will refer to these 20 textbooks as Corpus 1. The other fifty percent of the corpus was also randomly selected from those published in the United States and Canada, and are currently in use at colleges and universities in both countries. Hereafter, I will refer to this group as Corpus 2.
It is important to mention that the textbooks selected were published during the period 2000-2018. Delimiting the publication year to this specific time range was an arbitrary decision. It also aimed to focus the study on current teaching instructional material, visual elements and examples, tables, comics and textbook layout that students could relate to. I acknowledge that my decision could be a potential source of bias as I disregarded other pertinent examples published in earlier years. Not just that, my selection of textbooks largely considers those produced at a time when Information and Communications Technology (ICT) has made its most salient contribution. Like never before, textbook authors can facilitate sources of Spanish language and cultural input via online platforms, multimedia resources, etc.

4.1.1 Corpus 1

From the textbooks used in an Italian university context, four were published in the last decade, while the remaining six were published before 2010. Regarding textbooks used in Spain, seven textbooks were published in the last decade, while three before 2010. Among the textbooks from Italy, it also emerges that eight were published in Italy, while two were published in Spain, while among the textbooks from Spain, all of them were published in Spain. It is noteworthy that only one textbook was published in Barcelona, while all the others were published in Madrid.

Among the textbooks used in Italy, there are two editions of the same book, *Grammatica Spagnola* published by Editori Laterza: the first one was published in 2009, while the second one in 2011. The decision to leave in both editions was based on the fact that the second edition differs from the first one in some crucial aspects. These features include, but are not limited to, some examples that the writer used in the first edition that are not present in the second one and the change in the order of the subjunctive explanation from the 2009 edition to the 2011 edition. These distinguishing marks are going to be more detailed in the Results chapter.
As for the textbooks used in Spain, there are two editions of the same book, *Uso de la gramática española. Nivel intermedio*, published by Edelsa, in 2010 and 2011. Once again, the reason for keeping both editions lies in the crucial differences that both editions showed during the data collecting. In this case, the characteristics that changed from the 2010 edition to the 2011 include the use of visual elements, as the 2011 edition presents more comics and sketches, most of which were substitutes for tables. Among the textbooks used in Italy, the major publisher companies happen to be Zanichelli and Editori Laterza, with two textbooks each. Among the textbooks used in Spain, the major publisher company is Edelsa, with four textbooks.

4.1.2 Corpus 2

All the textbooks used in the USA and Canadian university context were published between 2003 and 2018: out of these, 50% of the textbooks were published in the last decade. As for the textbooks in Corpus 1, this was a decision to narrow down the decades of publication. The first observation of the corpus showed that *Dicho y hecho* appeared three times, as in three different editions of the same textbook: the first one in 2008, the second one in 2012 and the third and last one in 2015. Likewise with textbooks from Corpus 1, it was a decision to include the three different editions in the corpus because of the differences they showed. It is notable that the textbook writer changed the names of the characters involved in the examples Laila M. Dawson proposed, even if this change would not make a significant difference in students’ learning of the subjunctive. Dawson also decided to replace some comic strips with tables, probably aiming for a better and clearer organization of the explanation. Finally, the textbook author keeps modernizing the examples she proposed, including more and more frequent, contemporary references to students’ life and surroundings. In Corpus 2, it appears that the major publishing company is McGraw Hill, with five textbooks published, followed by Thomson Heinle, with three textbooks, then Prentice Hall, with two textbooks. For matters of clarity, the publisher Wiley was counted only for three textbooks, meaning
that the three different editions of *Dicho y hecho* were not counted as such in this preliminary observation. Also, nineteen textbooks were published in the United States, while one was printed in Toronto, Canada.

4.2 Further information regarding both Corpus 1 and Corpus 2

From a preliminary observation of the general information collected from Corpus 1 and from Corpus 2, it looks like textbooks writers in the United States actually write for more than one publishing company, as some textbooks happen to have the same team of authors and writers. In Corpus 2, seven authors wrote more than one textbook each. This means 14% of the authors from Corpus 2 have written more than one textbook. For example, textbook writers Ana Jarvis, Raquel Lebredo and Francisco Mena-Ayllón have collaborated on *¿Cómo se dice?*, however they also teamed up with Mercedes Rowinsky-Geurts and with Rosa Stewart for *Hola, amigos*. This is similar to textbook writer Laila M. Dawson appears with all three editions of *Dicho y hecho* and in a collaboration with María Concepción, Lucas Murillo and Donna Shelton for the 2017 *Con brío* edition. Lastly, Thalia Dorwick and Marty Knorre worked together on *¿Qué tal?* and on *Puntos de partida*. It might be argued that the textbooks used in the USA and Canadian university context sometimes have the same authors or the same group of authors, which indicates tendency to be hesitant to change, modernize and upgrade the material that is available for students. This could also indicate that learning Spanish in Anglophone North America is less frequent than in Europe, for a variety of reasons that do not strictly influence the outcome of this study\(^2\), but that implicates a smaller number of well-trained, skilled and qualified textbooks authors compared to Europe.

---

\(^2\) One of these reasons lies in the divergent high school systems: according to the EuroStat, while in Europe it is mandatory for students to learn a foreign language, this is not the case of the United States. The data presented in the 2016 EuroStat convention presented Spanish as the second language most learnt in high school all over European countries, following French. According to the General Social Survey, in 2006 only one person out of four in the United States claimed to be able to speak another language rather than English.
In fact, this phenomenon does happen in Corpus 1, but with less frequency. In the first subtotal, the one regarding the textbooks used to teach Spanish at the Italian university level, only a team of authors seems to repeat itself. Carla Poletti and José Pérez Navarro have collaborated in *Las reglas del juego* and in *Adelante*, both published by Zanichelli, an Italian publisher company. This refers to 15% (N=10) of the first subtotal presented in Corpus 1. In the subtotal concerning the textbooks used to teach Spanish as additional language in Spain, the textbooks author, Francisca Castro Viúdez, wrote the two editions of *Uso de la gramática española. Nivel intermedio* and its following-up textbook, *Uso de la gramática española. Nivel avanzado*, and *Gramática española avanzada. Teoría y práctica*, even though different Spanish publisher companies published them. This refers to 6% (N=10) of the second subtotal presented in Corpus 2. Finally, it is worth mentioning that two textbooks used in the Italian university context are published by two Spanish companies, Edelsa and Difusión, being 20% (N=10) of the first subtotal shown in Corpus 1. All textbooks used in Spain were published in Spain. As well, all textbooks presented in Corpus 2 were published in the United States.

4.3 Organization of the explanation of the Spanish subjunctive in Corpus 1

Regarding the sequence and ordering of concepts inside the textbooks, among the textbooks used in the Italian university context, the Spanish subjunctive is always presented before the imperative mode. This order of presentation makes most sense as the Spanish imperative mode is constructed on the subjunctive for the third person singular pronoun (e.g., *Déjela que hable* ‘let her talk!’), the plural personal pronoun (e.g., *Comamos* ‘let’s eat!’), and the formal second personal subject (e.g., *Hable* ‘you speak!’). It also appears that the most frequent organization regarding present and past tense of the subjunctive mode is very similar in all ten textbooks: the present tense of the subjunctive mode, in fact is the first tense that is presented, along with its corresponding exercises, while the past tense always follows.
For example, in the book *Amigo sincero*, the 13\textsuperscript{th} unit explains the present tense of the target construction and it offers a couple of pages of exercises; then, the 14\textsuperscript{th} and the 15\textsuperscript{th} units offer an explanation about the past tense in relation to *oraciones temporales\textsuperscript{3}* and *oraciones finales\textsuperscript{4}*. On the other hand, in the book *Las reglas del juego*, present tense and past tense are illustrated in the together in the 5\textsuperscript{th} unit, before the textbook introduces the imperative mode, the -ing mode, the *oraciones temporales* and reported speech.

It appears to me that in the first subtotal of Corpus 1, the target construction tends to be presented in a grammatically logical sequence\textsuperscript{5}. In Spanish, the informal imperative mode is constructed on the indicative mode, while the formal imperative mode is constructed on the subjunctive mode. In both editions of *Grammatica Spagnola*, the target construction is divided into two units. While the first unit strictly brings out the grammatical rules and uses, the second unit presents similarities and differences with the Italian subjunctive. It can be argued that the grammar order in which authors present the Spanish subjunctive verbal mode is important for students’ learning, as they should be approaching the learning of Spanish as an additional language in the more cohesive way.

In Corpus 1, this is the only case of a contrasting explanation about the subjunctive in the Spanish language or in any other language. As for the organization in textbooks analyzed in the second subtotal of Corpus 1, the tendency mostly reflects the one already offered for textbooks presented in the first subtotal of Corpus 1. The target construction is presented within a grammatically logical order of explanations, before the author(s) start describing the imperative mode, and any other construction that needs the subjunctive mode to be used.

\textsuperscript{3} By this term, I refer to subordinated clauses that depend on the main sentence and that express the time of the action. In Spanish, there are cases when this kind of subordinated clauses require the subjunctive verbal mode.

\textsuperscript{4} By this term, I refer to subordinated clauses that depend on the main sentence and that express the goal of the action. In Spanish, there are cases when this kind of subordinated clauses require the subjunctive verbal mode.

\textsuperscript{5} In the current study, ‘grammatically logical sequence’ means that in order to be able to enunciate sentences in the imperative mode, learners should know first the subjunctive mode.
4.4 Methodological approaches of textbooks in Corpus 1

Regarding the methodological perspective taken, authors of the textbooks used in Italy do not provide any information about the approach they use in creating and organizing the Spanish textbook. On the very first page, in ten textbooks out of ten, being 100% of the textbooks, authors just state the laws concerning textbook copyrights and textbook material distribution. They also claim that they would appreciate any comments or warning of mistakes that readers could find, as no book has ever been printed with no mistakes. The author gives no explanation as for the reasons why Grammatica Spagnola is the only textbook used in the Italian university context that presented the target construction in a language, other than Spanish. The authors of Amigo Sincero, the other textbook used in the Italian university context that presented both languages, the target one and Italian, also gives no explanation regarding their decision to use both languages. Among the textbooks used to teach Spanish in Spain, authors claim that as the textbooks address Erasmus students, for the most part, the language used in explanations is the target one, for the sake of truly benefiting learners to a full immersion in the Spanish language.

4.5 Ancillary materials of textbooks in Corpus 1

As for ancillary materials, none of the textbooks presented in the first subtotal nor in the second subtotal of Corpus 1 offer any. In other words, students do not have access to audiovisual samples of Spanish input or additional practice exercises the way students in the US do. I now turn to information regarding the order of appearance of the subjunctive in textbooks of Corpus 2. I also explain methodological considerations adhered to by authors and finish by describing relevant information regarding the ancillary materials of Corpus 2.
4.6 Organization of the explanation of the Spanish subjunctive in Corpus 2

Regarding the organization among the textbooks used to teach Spanish in the USA and Canadian university context, it appears that the target construction, the Spanish subjunctive, is mostly presented in the last units of the textbooks. In *Hola, amigos*, which has 6 units in total, for example, the target construction is slightly anticipated in unit 5 and then fully reported in Unit 6, before the explanation of the formal and informal commands, i.e. the imperative verbal mode. In *Aventuras*, the Spanish subjunctive is explained in units 12, 13, and 14, right after the explanation of the formal command, but before the explanation of the informal. In *Dímelo tú*, once again the target construction appears at the end of the book, in units 13 and 14. In unit 13, the Spanish subjunctive is explained regarding its use with persuasion verbs and right before the formal commands, while in unit 14 it is explained when it is used with verbs that express doubts, emotions, denial and uncertainty.

On the other hand, in *Arriba*, the Spanish subjunctive is explained in the middle of the textbook: units 9, 10, 11 present the target construction according to the kind of verb that requires the subjunctive. Unit 9 explains the Spanish subjunctive when it is used with influencing verbs, unit 10 with emotional and feelings verbs, unit 11 with adverbial preposition. In this case, the formal command is presented together with the Spanish subjunctive in unit 10.

4.7 Methodological approach of textbooks in Corpus 2

As for textbooks included in Corpus 2, the writers’ annotations at the very beginning show different approaches. Out of the 20 textbooks included in Corpus 2, only *Con brío* (5%) presents a practical approach whose design is research-based and offers a one-to-one engagement, as stated by textbook authors themselves. The term ‘engagement’ has been defined by Storch (2008, p. 99) as the “quality of the learners’
“meta-talk,” which explains why it appears that linguistic or language-related behaviors and attitudes might facilitate language learning (Taylor & Francis, 2009, p. 2). According to these authors, the one-to-one engagement approach to a language “could be operationalized as degree of willingness, purposefulness and autonomy […] thanks to which the students are engaging willingly and deriving some pleasure from their achievements” (pp. 9-10, my emphasis). Only one textbook, Plazas, being 5% of the total, also presents a Five Cs approach, where the acronym stands for ‘communication, communities, connections, comparisons, culture’. This approach has been labeled as “social engagement” by Taylor and Francis (2009) and it is “essentially linked to interaction and to learners’ initiation and maintenance (or not) of it” (p.12). Two writers present their textbooks as flexible, Arriba and Aventuras, which in this study remains either for target language based or for tasks based. Hola, amigos, the 2015 versions of Dicho y hecho, and Mosaicos present a 4-skills approach, such as listening, reading, speaking, and writing. Four textbooks out of 20, Así lo veo, Dímelo tú, Qué tal?, and the 2012 version of Dicho y hecho, ¿Cómo se dice?, 20% of Corpus 2, present a communicative approach, in which students’ extensive critical thinking and self-assessment are highlighted, as well as interpersonal, interpretive and presentational exercises are used as for practice. Pura vida, Entrevistas, Revista, Tú dirás, being 15% of the textbooks, present a cultural approach, either cross-cultural or stereotypical perceptions rival, or award-winning short films based. Textbooks included in Corpus 2, such as the 2008 version of Dicho y hecho, Gente, Punto de partida, reflecting 30% of the total, present a student-friendly or student-centered approach, with early in-context vocabulary practice. According to the study carried out by Taylor and Francis (2009), thanks to this approach, the learner works “purposefully on expanding the vocabulary” (p.10), as it seems that the learner is driven by “intrinsic interest of topics and texts” (Taylor & Francis, 2009, p. 10). Surprisingly, one textbook, Apúntate, being 5% of the total, does not present any indication of the approach that the textbook writer chose.
4.8. Ancillary materials of textbooks in Corpus 2

As for any additional material that textbooks from Corpus 2 come with, three out of 20, 15% of the total, present no additional material. Four textbooks out of 20, 20% of the total, present a CD-ROM as additional material, which comes along with the textbook purchase. 30% of the textbooks present online exercises as additional material, which come included in the textbook purchase. 35% of the textbooks included in Corpus 2 present an activities manual as additional material, but it has to be ordered upon request. As explained in Chapter 7, Limitations, in the present investigation include that I did not have access to the ancillary material. It is possible that the additional material provides more explanations, examples, practices, activities of the Spanish subjunctive than those shown in the textbook.

The next paragraph will provide detailed information about how I collected and organized the data.

4.9 Procedure

This section reports on the data collection procedure employed in Corpus 1 and Corpus 2 respectively. The sequence of steps that I followed is the following.

The first step was to verify whether all textbooks contained an explanation of the subjunctive mood. In order to do so, I reviewed how the explanations were presented. For instance, I first looked in the index for ‘Subjunctive Mode’ and then I looked at the specific unit(s) where the target construction was detailed or analyzed.

My second step was to verify whether the explanations were supported by any visual elements and textbook layout. For example, I paid attention to the use of images, comics, tables, and graphics. I was
especially motivated to determine whether these visual, typographical elements made the explanations more transparent, confusing, or whether no apparent effect was visible.

My third step was reading each explanation of the subjunctive in order to determine whether authors contextualized the examples. More precisely, my reading of the explanations aimed to determine whether learners could grasp the meaning of the subjunctive from examples, dialogues, or any other form of context. For example, I searched to see if any author had a dialogue with verbs conjugated in the subjunctive verbal mode before offering the explanation. I also looked for any exercise that came before the actual explanation, as a test for learners’ previous knowledge. Moreover, I looked for comics that would present the target construction in a contextualized story, or images that would present the Spanish subjunctive in use.

My fourth step was to record the language in which the explanations, examples, and practice exercises were shown in each text. As already mentioned, some textbooks in both corpora included information about the subjunctive in a language other than Spanish. I distinguished explanations that were written in the target language (i.e., Spanish), from those written in either Italian or English. Regarding explanations not given in the target language, I included dialogues and examples that were presented in Italian for corpus 1 and English for corpus 2. As for the explanations given in Spanish, I incorporated dialogues and examples as well.

Finally, all pertinent information was inserted in an Excel spreadsheet that would function as my database. I subsequently labelled the data according to the language used, the visual elements, textbook layout and the semantic component.

In the chapter that follows, I report all the results. I will now provide a brief explanation of the order of presentation of the results. I will first analyze the results I have collected from the textbooks included in Corpus 1: starting with Spanish language textbooks that are used in the Italian university context, I will show some examples of the Spanish subjunctive explanation. I will later move on to the results that derive from the analysis of Spanish language textbooks included in Corpus 1 and used in the peninsular university...
context. The second part of the results chapter regards my findings from Spanish language textbooks included in Corpus 2. I will here provide examples of how the target construction is explained and what exercises authors decided to include for practice. Finally, I will compare those results.
5 Results

Results from the analysis performed on the 40 textbooks are reported in this chapter. The results are divided according to the three research questions that drove my investigation. Each question has two parts. The first part reports the results of the analysis performed on the textbooks included in Corpus 1, while the second part regards the results collected from textbooks included in Corpus 2. For the sake of clarity, results are presented following each research question. It is also worth mentioning that the examples provided are not the entire set. The reader should know that for copyright reasons, it was not possible to include scan copies or photos from the textbooks. The reader should also be aware that a table and a chart showing the results will be presented at the end of each chapter.

5.1 Results for question 1

Research question 1: What aspects of the Spanish subjunctive do textbooks published in the US emphasize compared with those published in Europe?

Before analyzing in detail the results I have collected in order to answer the first research question, it should also be clarified that during the data collection, I found five recurring aspects that drove my comparison about what aspects of the Spanish subjunctive textbooks authors emphasize. These five features are:

- Use of a language other than Spanish for providing examples of the subjunctive i.e., whether or not textbooks writers decided to translate dialogues, examples, activities, in another language;
• Regular and irregular verb conjugations displayed together or not i.e., whether textbooks authors decided to present regular verb conjugation (e.g., bailar, ‘dance’) with irregular verb conjugation (e.g., entender, ‘understand’; pedir, ‘ask for’; tener, ‘have’) or whether they prefer to display them separately;

• Order of the explanations shown in the different textbook units, i.e. whether textbooks writers decided to insert the Spanish subjunctive explanation, specifically either before or after the imperative mode;

• Comparison between the subjunctive mode and the indicative mode, i.e. whether textbook authors present the Spanish subjunctive in comparison with the indicative mode (the former expresses doubt, wish, emotion, while the latter refers to a fact);

• And an explanation of the differentiation between verbs that require the subjunctive mode and verbs that do not. For example, verbs or expressions that express doubt, wish, opinion, emotion, and request (e.g., pensar ‘think’; pedir ‘ask’; rogar ‘beg’; desear ‘wish’; aconsejar ‘advise’; es necesario que ‘it is necessary that’; es importante que ‘it is important that’, etc.) from verbs and expressions that convey a fact (e.g., decir ‘say’; declarar ‘declare’; afirmar ‘affirm’, etc.).

5.1.1 Results regarding aspects of the Spanish subjunctive collected from textbooks in Corpus 1

5.1.1.1 Spanish textbooks used in Italy

From the textbooks used to teach Spanish as an additional language in the Italian university context, only three textbooks present a translation of Spanish dialogues into Italian. These dialogues are used in the explanation of the Spanish subjunctive. This evidence demonstrates that for the majority of textbook writers, there is no need to provide learners with a translated version of a grammatical explanation. It seems
that an explanation of the subjunctive constructed entirely in Spanish would benefit students who already have grammatical and morphological knowledge of the subjunctive mode. Moreover, it might be argued that the kind of student population that these Spanish language textbooks address has sufficient knowledge of the Spanish language to the point that the explanations may not require translation from Spanish into Italian, or any other language for that matter\(^6\).

From a total of 10 textbooks, writers of seven (70\%) textbooks emphasize the Spanish subjunctive explanation of both regular and irregular verbs within the same unit, while three (30\%) decided to explain in different units how the conjugation of regular verbs and irregular verbs work. This evidence shows that the majority of textbook writers do not believe that regular verbs and irregular verbs should be treated differently.

As for the order of where in the textbook explanations of the Spanish subjunctive tended to appear, 100\% of books presented a similar arrangement. The mode is explained after the present tense and the past tense (both indicative and the imperfect). Explanations of the subjunctive also appear before the imperative mode (both formal and informal) and in the affirmative and negative forms (e.g., ¡Habla! ‘you speak!’ and ¡No hables! ‘don’t speak!’). It should be specified that both the affirmative form and the negative form of the Spanish formal command (e.g., the Usted ‘you’ command) are built on the present tense of the subjunctive mode (e.g., ¡Hable Usted! ‘you [formal] speak!’), and ¡No hable! ‘Do not speak’[formal]). The affirmative form of the Spanish informal command (i.e., the tú ‘you’ command) uses the conjugation of the third singular person in the present tense of the indicative mode (¡Habla! ‘you speak!’). The negative form of the informal command, on the other hand, relies on the present tense of the subjunctive mode (¡No hables! ‘don’t speak!’). This evidence reveals that textbook writers in Italy consider the indicative mode as a grammatical topic that should be explained before the subjunctive. It seems that the imperative mode is

\(^6\) Italian and Spanish are known to be really close and similar languages. Of course, the linguistic similarities that those languages share may have a role in how textbook writers approach. However, in my very own experience as a German, French, and Portuguese learner, all the textbooks I have used tend to avoid translated dialogues and/or exercises while explaining grammatical points.
presented as a grammatical topic that requires the subjunctive explanation to be properly understood. As I will explain later on, authors from the textbooks used in Spain do not follow a similar textbook organization.

Likewise, 10% (N=2) of course-books present a chapter where textbook authors point out the uses of the indicative mode, comparing them with the uses of the subjunctive mode. This evidence shows that for the majority of textbooks, the difference between the indicative and the subjunctive mode can be better understood by learners thanks to examples provided, which are rich with contextualization. I will go back to these specific features later on in this chapter after I provide the data regarding the use of contextualization to explain the target construction, the Spanish subjunctive.

As to a differentiation in verbs that require the subjunctive from those that do not, no textbook presents a separated explanation of the main clause verb. That is, the explanation of the subjunctive was not divided according to the verb of the main clause. Verbs like dudar ‘doubt’, pensar ‘think’, and creer ‘believe’ are not treated differently than verbs like aconsejar ‘advise’, sugerir ‘suggest’, rogar ‘beg’. Nevertheless, the explanation of the Spanish subjunctive does require an introductory clarification about its uses regarding affirmative and negative forms of verbs that express an opinion in the main clause. In the affirmative form (e.g., yo pienso ‘I think’), the verb in the subordinated clause requires the indicative mode (e.g., que hoy es un buen día ‘that today is a beautiful day’). However, in the negative form (e.g., yo no pienso ‘I do not think’), the verb in the subordinated clause requires the subjunctive mode (e.g., que hoy sea un buen día ‘that today is a beautiful day’). Textbook authors provide such elucidation when comparing uses of the indicative and the subjunctive modes, respectively.

I now turn to report the results for the five features found in the textbooks used in Spain.
5.1.1.2 Spanish textbooks used in Spain

Among the textbooks used in the Spanish university context, none of the textbooks presents a translation of Spanish into another language in the explanation of the Spanish subjunctive. As explained in Chapter 4, these course-books are for learners living in Spain, such as immigrants, international students, and Erasmus students. This means that for textbook writers, it would be impossible to know what kind of linguistic background learners may have if they were to decide on a language for translation of the explanations or examples.

With respect to the second feature, five textbooks presented a separated explanation regarding the conjugation of regular and irregular verbs in the Spanish subjunctive mode. In textbooks in Italy, the majority respective textbook writers do not believe that regular verbs and irregular verbs should be treated differently. Verbs such as *pedir* ‘ask for’, *rogar* ‘beg’, *querer* ‘want’, are not explained in a separate section than verbs like *aconsejar* ‘recommend’, *desear* ‘wish’, and *esperar* ‘hope.

As for the order of presentation of the explanations, 90% (N=9) of textbooks have the same order as featured in textbooks used in Italy. The Spanish subjunctive mode is explained after the present tense and the past tense (both the preterit tense and the imperfect tense of the indicative mode). The subjunctive explanation also appears before the imperative mode, both formal and informal, in the affirmative and in the negative forms (i.e., ¡Habla!, ‘speak!’ and ¡No hables!, ‘don’t speak!’). These findings reveal that authors believe that learners first need to know the indicative mode and later, the imperative mode.

From a total of 10 course-books, 70% (N=7) of them present a chapter where textbook authors decide to point out the uses of the indicative mode, comparing them with the uses of the subjunctive mode (*Nosotros compramos un coche que tiene aire acondicionado* vs. *Nosotros necesitamos un coche que tenga aire acondicionado* ‘We bought a car that has air conditioning’ vs. ‘We need a car that has air conditioning’). This evidence indicates that for the majority of textbook writers, textbooks written by them need to have an explicit clarification regarding the divergent uses of the indicative and the subjunctive mode.
mode. That is, even in the same corpus, authors in Italy and in Spain approach the use of the indicative mode and the subjunctive mode differently. As I discuss in the next chapter, this is relevant because this approach assumes that learners already know the difference of uses regarding the indicative mode and the subjunctive mode.

With respect to the fifth feature, 0% of textbooks present a separated explanation according to the verb of the main clause.

Table 1

Results for research question 1 – Corpus 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus 1</th>
<th>Textbooks used in Italy</th>
<th>Textbooks used in Spain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of language other than Spanish</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular and irregular verbs included in the same explanation</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order of explanation, i.e. after the indicative mode but before the imperative mode</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison between the indicative mode and the subjunctive mode</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs that require the subjunctive mode VS verbs that do not</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. The distribution of the five recurring aspects in textbooks used in Italy and Spain.

5.1.2 Results regarding aspects of the Spanish subjunctive collected from textbooks in Corpus 2

From the textbooks used to teach Spanish as an additional language in the US and in the Canadian university context, 90% (N=18) of textbooks present an English translation of Spanish dialogues, explanations, exercises, or activities used in the explanation of the Spanish subjunctive. This evidence demonstrates that for the majority of textbook writers, learners need a translation in what appears to be a support for comprehension. In other words, authors, assuming that students are Anglophone speakers, decode the explanations from the target language and encode them in a language that they assume all students speak. Thus, all students would be able to comprehend the explanation of the subjunctive.

As for the conjugation of regular and irregular verbs, only a single textbook displays both conjugations at the same time. This finding shows that the majority of textbook writers believe that regular verbs and irregular verbs should be treated differently.
As for the order of the explanations, 15% (N=3) of textbooks present the same order that was previously identified as dominant in textbooks included in Corpus 1. In these textbooks, the Spanish subjunctive mode is explained after the present tense, the preterit tense, and the imperfect tense of the indicative mode. On the other hand, in 75% (N=15) of textbooks, the Spanish subjunctive is explained after the present tense, the preterit tense, and the imperfect tense of the indicative mode, as well as after the formal and informal imperative mode. In 5% (N=2) of textbooks, the Spanish subjunctive is also presented as the last verbal mode explained in the course-books, but also after the future tense of the indicative mode, which usually does not even appear in other textbooks. This evidence reveals that the majority of writers for Spanish language textbooks used in the US and Canadian university context consider the subjunctive mode as a grammatical topic that should be explained after the learners have studied the subjunctive creating the positive and negative formal commands.

Among textbooks from Corpus 2, 80% (N=18) of course-books present a chapter where textbook authors decide to highlight the differences in using the indicative mode and the subjunctive mode. Evidence shows that for the majority of textbook writers, the difference between when to use the indicative mode and when to use the subjunctive mode cannot be understood by learners (only) due to examples provided, but rather they also need an explicit clarification.

As for the fifth feature, 100% (N=20) of textbooks present a separated explanation of the Spanish subjunctive according to the verb of the main clause. That is, according to textbook writers, the explanation of the Spanish subjunctive does need to be divided according to the verb of the main clause. In all the textbooks, there are subchapters dedicated to verbs expressing doubt (e.g., dudar ‘doubt’, no creer ‘not to believe, no pensar ‘not to think’), verbs expressing emotion (e.g., querer ‘want’, alegrarse ‘be happy about’), and verbs expressing desire (e.g., desear ‘wish’, esperar ‘hope').
Table 2

Results for research question 1 – Corpus 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of language other than Spanish</th>
<th>90%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular and irregular verbs included in the same explanation</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order of explanation, i.e. after the indicative mode but before the imperative mode</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison between the indicative mode and the subjunctive mode</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs that require the subjunctive mode VS verbs that do not</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. The distribution of the five recurring aspects in textbooks used in the United States and Canada.
5.2 Results for question 2

Research question 2: To what extent do textbook authors rely on visual elements and textbook layout in order to support the explanation of the Spanish subjunctive?

It should be noted that the term ‘visual elements’ refers to the following elements that I found in the explanations of the subjunctive in both corpora: tables, images, comic strips. The label ‘textbook layout’ refers to typographical treatment. Tables appear in the textbooks mainly to provide learners with graphical examples of verb conjugations in the subjunctive mode. For copyright reasons, it should be noted that it was not possible to include any pictures of such textbooks.

The reader should be aware that images and comic strips are primarily employed in the clarification of positive and negative verbs expressing an opinion, in the exemplification of the uses between the indicative mode and the subjunctive mode, and in the explanation of specific adverbial and adjectival grammatical constructions, such as ojalá ‘let’s hope’, es importante ‘it is important’, es cierto ‘it is true’, es seguro ‘it is certain’, etc. Comprehensive exercises are to control learners’ ability to find the proper verb and its conjugation with no external help. An example is an already given verb between brackets or a group of verbs to pick the right one from. As for the typographical treatments, my data collection points out that four features are principally used. Those are; the use of color, the use of bold font, the use of italics, and the use of highlighting. During this process, I made no differentiation in the language used.
5.2.1 Results of visual elements and textbook layout used in the explanations of the Spanish subjunctive in Corpus 1

5.2.1.1 Spanish textbooks used in Italy

As to the use of tables, all ten textbooks present at least one table. As previously mentioned, tables are used to present the conjugation of verbs in the present tense of the subjunctive mode. It should be noted that the three textbooks whose authors decided to explain regular and irregular verbs separately, presented a table for regular verb conjugations and another one for irregular verb conjugations. Tables are also used to present all the grammatical elements, such as adverbs and adjectives. These need the subjunctive mode in the subordinated clause, such as the ones reported above.

As for the use of images and/or comic strips, two textbooks present at least one image and/or one comic strip. This evidence indicates that writers of Spanish language textbooks used in Italy do not rely on images and/or comic strips in order to enhance the learners’ understanding, or make the textbook more appealing.

With regard to the use of any typographical treatment, three textbooks present the explanation of the Spanish subjunctive with no typographical treatment. Four textbooks present the use of bold font either in the explanation of the target construction, or in the exercises to practice it with. As for the use of italics, three textbooks offer an insight of explanations relying on italicized words. It should be noted that no textbook presents the use of highlights or the use of any color. I will now provide some examples taken from three textbooks used in the Italian university context.

In *Gramática didáctica del español*, the Spanish subjunctive is presented with no visual elements, no comics, no tables and included very few examples.

In *Amigo sincero*, a series of tables displays the explanation of the target construction. In addition, some elements inside the tables are written in boldface. These elements demonstrate how a learner can
actually create a sentence using the subjunctive mode. The information displayed on the table helps the learner understand how this mode works.

In the textbook _Las reglas del juego_, the Spanish subjunctive is explained in a very similar way to _Amigo sincero_. The target construction is presented with a table, emphasizing the different uses between the indicative mode and the subjunctive mode. Of equal importance, learners had to read and comprehend the meaning of the subjunctive from examples contextualized in a dialogue written in Spanish, where no verb or grammatical element was typographically treated. This means that comprehension was not aided by the use of a language other than Spanish. The dialogue functioned as a source of input from which learners could infer the meaning of the subjunctive. I will provide further elucidation regarding the use of contextualization in answering the third research question.

5.2.1.2 Spanish textbooks used in Spain

With respect to the use of tables, six textbooks present at least one table. As previously mentioned, tables are used to present the conjugation of verbs in the present tense of the subjunctive mode. It should be noted that two textbooks do not provide a table, but do explain regular and irregular verb conjugation separately. Three textbooks display a table for verb conjugation in the present tense of the subjunctive mode; however, explain regular and irregular verb conjugation in a separate section. On the contrary, three course-books where textbook writers decided to explain regular and irregular verb conjugations in the same unit, offer a table for such conjugations. Two textbooks that explain regular and irregular verb conjugation in the same lesson do not provide learners with any table. As previously mentioned, tables are used not only for verb conjugation, but also to present all the grammatical elements, such as adverbs and adjectives, which need the subjunctive mode in the subordinated clause.
Concerning the use of images and/or comic strips, five textbooks present at least one image and/or one comic strip. As it was highlighted for textbooks used in Italy, this evidence indicates that writers of Spanish language textbooks used in Spain do not rely on images and/or comic strips in order to enhance learners’ understanding.

With respect to the use of any typographical treatment, two textbooks present the explanation of the Spanish subjunctive with no typographical treatment. Three textbooks present the use of bold font, either in the explanation of the target construction or in the exercises to practice it with. As for the use of italics, five textbooks offer this typographical treatment in the explanation. It should be noted that no textbook displays the use of highlights or the use of any color, apart from black and white, as it was for textbooks used in Italy. I will now provide some examples taken from two textbooks used in the Spanish university context.

In *Uso de la gramática española. Intermedio*, the explanation regarding the target construction is given with no visual material. However, in *Gramática básica del estudiante de español*, the explanation is given with more visual elements, compared to the explanations offered by the textbooks in Italy. This means that learners received some kind of visual support, which aids written explanations. A student can learn the corresponding, morphological changes to use a verb in the subjunctive mode, as result of the presence of arrows that show how the present tense of the subjunctive mode verbs ending in –AR (e.g., *camin-ar* ‘to walk’) will be using the suffix of verbs ending in –ER (e.g., *com-er* ‘to eat’) and in –IR (e.g., *dorm-ir* ‘to sleep’) from the present tense of the indicative mode. The same rule applies for verbs ending in –ER and in –IR: when conjugated in the present tense of the subjunctive mode, these verbs use the suffix of verbs ending in –AR in the present tense of the indicative mode. It can be argued that the use of arrows might help learners understand how the new conjugation works, and what they need to focus on. In that same textbook, in order to explain the difference of uses between the indicative mode and the subjunctive mode, there is a reliance on a comic strip instead of providing a written explanation. For a matter of clarity, the
The goal of the present study is not to scientifically prove which method is more effective, rather to offer a comparison of how the Spanish subjunctive could be presented.

Table 3

*Results for research question 2 – Corpus 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus 1</th>
<th>Textbooks used in Italy</th>
<th>Textbooks used in Spain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tables</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comic strips</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No typographical treatment</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of bold font</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of italics font</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of highlights</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of colors</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3. The use of visual elements and typographical treatments in textbooks used in Italy and Spain.*
5.2.2 Results of visual elements and textbook layout used in the explanations of the Spanish subjunctive in Corpus 2

Regarding the use of tables, four textbooks include at least one. As previously mentioned, tables are used to present the conjugation of verbs in the present tense of the subjunctive mode. It should be noted that the only textbook in which the authors decide to explain regular and irregular verbs at the same time, does not present a single table for regular verb conjugation or for irregular verb conjugation. Tables are also used to present all the grammatical elements, such as adverbs and adjectives, which need the subjunctive mode in the subordinated clause.

With reference to the use of images and/or comic strips, ten textbooks include at least one image and/or one comic strip. This evidence indicates that writers of Spanish language textbooks used in the US and the Canadian university context rely more on images and/or comic strips in order to enhance learners’ understanding.

In terms of the use of any typographical treatment, none of the textbooks considered present the explanation of the Spanish subjunctive without typographical treatment. Nine textbooks present the use of bold font either in the explanation of the target construction, or in the accompanying exercises. As for the use of italics, two textbooks offer an insight to the explanation by relying on words in italics. It should be pointed out that in all the course-books that present an English translation of the Spanish examples provided, the translation is written in italics. As a matter of clarity, the italics font used for the English translation was not counted as typographical treatment. It should be noted that nine textbooks display the use of highlighting, or the use of a color other than black. Specifically, in five textbooks, writers rely on the use of different colors to emphasize the target construction, while four textbook authors use highlighted words.

I will now provide some examples taken from four textbooks used in the US and in the Canadian university context.
In the 2012 edition of *Dicho y hecho*, the textbook author relies on red-colored tables that contain grammatical elements, such as adverbs and adjectives in need for the subjunctive mode, which are written in bold font. Moreover, to explain the grammatical construction of *ser + adjetivo + que* (it is + adjective [+ that]), the author uses a red-colored table, then italicized “*ser + adjetivo*” and the bolded “*que*” ‘that’, to emphasize that ‘que’ cannot be omitted as it sometimes is in English.

In *Aventuras*, the irregular verb conjugation in the present tense of the subjunctive mode is presented in a yellow-colored table, where the Spanish verbs are also written in bold. In this textbook, the author settled upon using a scheme to graphically explain that in the case of a change in subject between the main clause and the subordinated one, the latter requires a verb conjugated in the subjunctive mode. In this scheme, however, the author emphasized the main clause verb and the subordinated clause verb using a bold font.

In *Puntos de partida*, the explanation of the target construction is given with italics font and highlighted words. In particular, the author used italics font for all the grammatical elements in the main clause that require the use of the subjunctive mode in the subordinated one, while the highlighted words were the ones included in the subordinated clause. In the textbook, learners are not provided with any tables, and very few images or comic strips appear in the explanations.

In *Pura vida*, the pages where the authors explain the Spanish subjunctive have a yellow background, while the pages where learners can find exercises and activities have a white one. In the explanation, the use of boldface font is highly present for grammatical elements that require the subjunctive, for entire sentences with subjunctive verbs, and for verbs conjugated in the subjunctive mode. I now turn to present the last set of results for the third research question.
Table 4

*Results for research question 2 – Corpus 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus 2</th>
<th>Textbooks used in the US and Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tables</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comic strips</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No typographical treatment</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of bold font</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of italics font</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of highlights</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of colors</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4.* The use of visual elements and typographical treatments in textbooks used in the United States and in Canada.
5.3 Results for question 3

Research question 3: How much do textbook writers in the US and in Europe consider bringing in the semantic component so that learners can comprehend the differences of the subjunctive between English and Spanish?

In the present study, the terminology ‘semantic component’ refers to the meaning. A language is built on a series of elements, such as phonemes, morphemes, and lexemes. These features are linked to each other with syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and context, with the aim of creating a meaningful sentence. In other words, due to the contextualization, the explanation is not just given to learners, however in fact, textbook authors provide learners with tools and resources to inductively comprehend the Spanish subjunctive uses. In this case, the Spanish subjunctive explanation implies the presence of a semantic component, those being elements from which learners can understand not only how the Spanish subjunctive conjugation works, but also the purpose, uses, intentions, and aims of using the subjunctive mode.

What I mean by ‘context’ is the frame that provides learners with the right tools and resources for the most appropriate interpretation of the sentence. Context is implied in textual analysis and it is related to sentences, discourse structures, and their relationship, providing coherence and correlation between them. The assumption behind contextualization is that speakers are able to adapt the language, sentences, and discourse according to the communicative purpose of the situation.
5.3.1 How textbooks from Corpus 1 explain the Spanish subjunctive in context

5.3.1.1 Spanish textbooks used in Italy

Among the ten textbooks that were included in Corpus 1 and that are used to teach Spanish as additional language in Italy, nine present a contextualized explanation. In these textbooks, the contextualization also allows learners to understand the difference of use between the Spanish subjunctive and the Italian one, even if eight of them do not provide the Italian translation. It should be noted that both editions of *Grammatica spagnola* present a contextualized explanation of the Spanish subjunctive.

I will now provide some examples taken from two textbooks used in the Italian and in the Spanish university context.

In *Las reglas del juego*, the textbook writer included practical activities that, thanks to the use of contextualization, help learners figure out when and how to use the Spanish subjunctive. In this case, the textbook author brought in the semantic component creating a communicative situation that learners are required to expand upon, i.e. adding new sentences to the one provided by the textbook. Another activity that implies the use of context is a translation exercise, which is divided into exercise A and exercise B. Exercise A is a translation of a short story, from Spanish into Italian. The story starts, develops, and ends within the paragraph, which allows learners to properly comprehend the whole narration’s meaning and communicative purpose.

In another course-book, *Amigo sincero*, the contextualization is provided thanks to an activity in which learners are required to fill-in-the-blanks. Even if this kind of exercise also appears in textbooks from Corpus 2, there are two differences that I want to highlight. First, the fill-in-the-blanks exercise is not just disconnected sentences, but a whole paragraph, such as a short story, a narration or a literature piece. Second, this fill-in-the-blanks exercise does not provide learners with a list of verbs they have to pick the
proper one from. That is, learners need to rely on their own knowledge, and on the context, to figure out what verb they need and, later, conjugate it in the right tense and mode.

5.3.1.2 Spanish textbooks used in Spain

Among the ten textbooks that were included in Corpus 1 and that are used to teach Spanish as additional language in Spain, seven present a contextualized explanation. As previously stated for textbooks used in the Italian university context, here textbook writers not only provide learners with the explanation, but they also give learners all the tools and resources needed to inductively comprehend the Spanish subjunctive uses. Again, the Spanish subjunctive explanation relies on the presence of a semantic component, being those elements from which learners can induce not only how the Spanish subjunctive conjugation works, but also its purpose, uses, intentions, and aims. It should be noted that both editions of *Uso de la gramática española. Intermedio* present a contextualized explanation of the Spanish subjunctive.

I will now provide some examples taken from two textbooks used in the Italian, and in the Spanish university contexts.

In *Gramática básica del estudiante de español*, a contextualized explanation is given as result of a story that textbook writers started at the very beginning of the course-book. This story, in fact, is present in every chapter of the textbook and allows learners to enhance the uses of the Spanish subjunctive, due to the context the protagonists are settled in. Specifically, the protagonists of the story are a couple of vampires, and in the chapter that regards the Spanish subjunctive explanation, they are dealing with another couple of human beings. While expressing their doubts, emotions, and opinions, learners can comprehend when and how to use the subjunctive, its conjugation, and on which elements it depends on. As for the differences between the indicative mode and the subjunctive mode, the protagonists of the story deal with the presence of a cat in their home. While the wife is sure that is their neighbors’ cat, a grammatical construction that in
Spanish requires the indicative mode because it expresses certainty, the husband expresses doubts that it is their neighbors’ cat, the grammatical construction requires the use of the subjunctive mode.

In *Gramática española avanzada*, textbook writers do not include a contextualized explanation or contextualized exercises and/or activities for students to practice the new grammatical topic. The explanation they offer is structured with several bulleted lists, each of them under a specific subtitle, such as *Grupo 1* ‘Group 1’, *Grupo 2* ‘Group 2’, *Grupo 3* ‘Group 3’, and *Grupo 4* ‘Group 4’. The activities they provide learners with are compiled with disconnected sentences that do not belong together, but must be matched up into creating a proper sentence.

Table 5

*Results for research question 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus 1</th>
<th>Textbooks used in Italy</th>
<th>Textbooks used in Spain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semantic component</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5. The inclusion of contextualization in textbooks used in Italy and Spain.*
5.3.2 How textbooks from Corpus 2 explain the Spanish subjunctive in context

Among the twenty textbooks that were included in Corpus 2 and that are used to teach Spanish as additional language in the US and in Canada, none (N=0) present a contextualized explanation. The explanation is often given with a numbered list, depending on the verb of the main clause, and on the adverbial or adjectival element that may require, or not, the use of the subjunctive mode. Other textbook authors offer the explanation with a bulleted list, according to the kind of verb that is included in the main clause. However, regardless of how they organize the explanation, the examples they provide are not linked to each other. That is, there is no common element in the examples that would create a context which learners could enhance their learning of the Spanish subjunctive.

I will now provide some examples taken from four textbooks used in the Spanish university context.

Exercises from textbook *Con brío* present decontextualized, disconnected sentences on which learners are supposed to work, conjugating the already given verbs in the present tense of the Spanish subjunctive mode. In most of the exercises, the range of verbs learners have to pick from is already organized according to the sentences where the verb is needed, leaving the learners with the task to only conjugate it according to the form of the subject.

In three course-books, specifically the three editions of *Dicho y hecho*, the exercises that textbook writers provide to learners are structured in a very similar way: disconnected sentences with no contextualization to help learners understand on their own how and when to use the Spanish subjunctive.

This chapter focused on the results from the data collection from both Corpus 1, (i.e., Spanish language textbooks used in the Italian and in the Spanish university contexts) and from Corpus 2 (i.e., Spanish language course-books used in the US and in the Canadian university contexts). The next chapter will present a discussion about the results that were presented here, offering insights about what these results might implicate for a learner.
6 Discussion

A discussion about the findings that my research collected is reported here. The discussion will be divided according to the research questions.

6.1 Aspects of the subjunctive found in the corpus of Spanish textbooks

During my investigation, it seemed that Corpus 1 textbook authors, at least the ones who write for the Italian market, spotlighted the differences that exist between the Spanish subjunctive and other languages that learners may already know. Textbook writers assume that European learners already speak at least one other language, which seems to lead to the presumption that it would be easier for them to get a comprehensive understanding of the target construction. This evidence is clearly visible in the way textbooks from Corpus 1 do not present long and specific explanations, but rather self-explanatory and concise ones. Specifically, in the case of the Spanish language textbooks used in the Italian context, my study suggests that writers focused more on highlighting the similarities and the differences between the Spanish and the Italian subjunctive, rather than explaining how the Spanish subjunctive works. The reason behind this approach has to be looked for in the Common European Framework of Reference, which provides recommendations to continue enriching the linguistic diversity that has characterized Europe since it has come together (Byram & Parmenter, 2012, p. 4): “Europe is multilingual and all its languages are equally valuable modes of communication and expressions of identity.” In addition, it is worth mentioning that in most European countries, Italy and Spain included, children are “obliged to learn at least two foreign languages for a part of their schooling” (Ibid., 2012, p. 42).

In the case of Grammatica spagnola, published by Editori Laterza, there is a whole chapter regarding the explanation of the Spanish subjunctive that precisely focuses on the difference of uses between the Spanish and the Italian subjunctive mode. In another textbook used in Italy, Gramática
textbook authors include an exercise where learners are supposed to choose between the indicative mode and the subjunctive mode; furthermore, learners are required to explain why they chose one of the two modes, which seems to lead to a more comprehensive understanding of the target construction. This kind of exercise allows learners to not just mechanically fill-in-the-blanks, but to ponder why they should choose the subjunctive rather than the indicative mode, and vice versa.

On the other hand, in textbooks used in the US and Canadian university contexts, my study seems to suggest that authors present the target construction, assuming that learners start from a very basic and beginner level. To clarify this aspect of my investigation, it was surprising to find in textbooks from Corpus 2 the definition of the subjunctive mode. Before giving the explanation of the target construction, writers take the time to explain that the subjunctive is a verbal mode, such as the indicative or the infinitive, with its tenses, past and present. They also specify that the subjunctive indicates uncertainty, emotions, doubts and willingness, unlike the indicative mode that expresses a fact. My research was not able to find these detailed explanations about the subjunctive being a mode, and not a tense, in any of the textbooks included in Corpus 1. This tendency seems to suggest that Corpus 1 textbook writers assume that learners may already know what the subjunctive mode is and, generally speaking, how to use it. However, this seems not to be the case of the Corpus 2 textbook authors. This assumption does not indicate that textbook authors from Corpus 2 have lower expectations regarding learners’ previous knowledge. On the contrary, their approach seems to indicate that they are aware of some lack regarding grammatical denominations and features. That is, their intent seems to be to bridge the gap existing between learners’ previous knowledge and the one they are initiating. It can also be argued that the similarities the Italian and Spanish subjunctive share are a contributing factor in authors’ decision to not include an explanation of what the subjunctive mode is, and how it works.

Another aspect that my research disclosed is that Corpus 1 textbook writers seem to bring together all the different kinds of verbs that require the use of the subjunctive in one explanation (e.g., *dudar* ‘doubt’, *pensar* ‘think’, *and creer* ‘believe’, *aconsejar* ‘advise’, *sugerir* ‘suggest’, *rogar* ‘beg’), while Corpus 2
textbook authors seem to create sub-categories of the uses of the target construction according to the kind of verb, such as volition, wish, uncertainty, and doubt. The present study might have pointed out that Spanish language textbooks in Corpus 2 emphasize more the grammatical aspect of how learners are supposed to create the subjunctive verbal conjugation: closed-questioned exercises, fill-in-the-blanks, short-answered questions- to name a few of the exercises that are included in textbooks from Corpus 2, aimed at a non-pondered use of the subjunctive verbal mode.

6.2 Visual elements and textbook layout enhancing the comprehension of the Spanish subjunctive

I will now offer a recapitulation of the results of the second research question. Regarding the use of tables, my study suggests that 80% of textbooks included in Corpus 1 present one or more tables that display verbs conjugation in the Spanish subjunctive mode. On the other hand, only 20% of the textbooks included in Corpus 2 present any. As for the use of images, such as comic strips, in Corpus 1 35% of textbooks present them, while in Corpus 2 50% of textbooks have been identified to have at least one comic strip to explain the target construction. Moving to the typographical treatments, my study shows that 25% of textbooks included in Corpus 1 do not use any, while all of the textbooks from Corpus 2 present at least one typographical treatment.

As for the use of colors, in both explanations and exercises to practice the Spanish subjunctive, no textbook included in Corpus 1 uses them, while the 30% of textbooks in Corpus 2 rely on colors in order to explain the Spanish subjunctive. Regarding the use of the bold font, results seem to be surprisingly similar: in Corpus 1, 35% of textbooks present explanations with the bold font, while in Corpus 2 45% of textbooks do the same. As for highlighted explanations, no Spanish textbook included in Corpus 1 presents any, while 18% of textbooks from Corpus 2 present the explanation of the target construction in a
highlighted way. Finally, my study seems to suggest that the use of the italic font is more incisive in Corpus 1, present in the 40% of textbooks, and weaker in Corpus 2, present in the 8% of textbooks. The question that arises deals with the value of this evidence with respect to the way in which textbook authors use visual elements and textbook layout to aid learners’ comprehension of the Spanish subjunctive.

These results reflect the contrasting approaches to the design of a teaching resource (textbooks) for learning Spanish in Europe and in North America. Variations in visual presentation suggest that the authors are addressing a different kind of student population. While on the one hand, it seems that in Europe authors embrace its multilingualism by presenting the Spanish subjunctive in a more independent style, on the other hand, in the United States it seems that textbook authors address a more monolingual student population and, therefore, may rely more on elements that visually help students’ comprehension of the target construction.

More precisely, my study suggests that in the case of European textbooks for teaching Spanish as an additional language, explanations are given in a more independent learning style, with less use of colors, comics and highlights to aid learners’ comprehension. It seems as if authors assumed that learners require fewer visual supporting elements, perhaps because they can rely on their multilingual awareness. That is, the less visual help learners get, the more they need to resolve problems by themselves. On the other hand, my findings show that the textbooks published in the United States tend to guide students through comic strips and typographical treatments, as well as colors and boldfaced fonts. Textbook writers from Corpus 2 try to catch learners’ attention using bright colors, bold and italics, images and comic strips. This style appears to be dominant in course-books from Corpus 2 and suggests that textbook authors do guide learners throughout the explanation more than textbook writers from Corpus 1 do. I also believe that the linguistic background that learners bring into the classroom setting impacts the way textbook writers organize and structure a language course-book, resulting in higher use of visual elements. My investigation found this in Corpus 2, while comparing with Corpus 1. If learners already have knowledge about grammatical, verbal, syntactic, pragmatic, and morphological elements from another language, they do not need textbook writers
to underline verbs conjugated in the subjunctive mode for them, nor do they require textbook authors to organize verbs in colorful tables.

6.3 Contextualization to enrich learners’ understanding

My findings seem to suggest that of the textbooks included in Corpus 1, 90% of the textbooks offer a sample of contextualization. On the other hand, of textbooks from Corpus 2, 0% of the textbooks present any. These results seem to suggest that contextualization plays a bigger role in textbooks used in the Italian and in the Spanish university context than it does in the US and Canadian one. Once again, this difference in presenting the explanation of the target construction, the Spanish subjunctive, may depend on the different approaches that textbooks writers have towards learners. We can notice that textbook authors heavily rely on visual support to aid learners’ comprehension of the subjunctive, and they appear to rely minimally on contextualizing definitions so that learners can comprehend the meaning of the subjunctive from usage.

I should mention that contextualization is promoted by the Common European Framework of Reference, whose attention to the role of communicative activities “has directed attention to the breadth of areas of communication and the high value of orality, and this in turn has led to a significant strengthening of orality in foreign languages” (Byram & Parmenter, 2012, p.61). That is, a language is unfulfilled if it does not embrace contextualized communication. Therefore, in textbooks from Corpus 1, there are examples in which textbook writers presented a comprehensive exercise where learners are supposed to fill-in-the-blanks only relying on the contextualization, i.e. they first have to understand the general meaning of the sentence in order to be able to properly conjugate the verb in the right mode and tense.

On the other hand, in Corpus 2, no Spanish language textbook presented contextualized exercises like those in Corpus 1. The explanation and the practice exercises that I found in Corpus 2 presented the
Spanish subjunctive within a random list of disconnected sentences. This kind of exercise and/or explanation of the Spanish subjunctive does not include contextualization, which results in a language with just a series of words. Context allow learners to understand the communicative goal of the situation and, therefore, better comprehend which verbal mode and tense to use. However, contextualization is only possible when sentences are connected to each other, in order to create a set of sentences, a dialogue, or a paragraph that allows learners to have a ‘bigger picture’ of the scenario.

6.4 Integrating two views of the Spanish subjunctive for language textbooks

I will now integrate the most relevant points discussed above, comparing explanations of the subjunctive from two perspectives that tend to differ more than overlap, the importance that this has for learners and the learning of a complex grammatical content.

Both corpora of Spanish textbooks highlight how ‘grammatically powerful’ the Spanish subjunctive mode can be, and how it can be used to express the speaker’s feelings, emotions, doubts, and opinions in a different way than the English language. The Spanish subjunctive carries with itself a whole range of meanings that allow the speaker to implicitly indicate the percentage of certitude: the closer it gets to the 100%, the more the speaker will use the indicative mode. Textbooks from both corpora, Corpus 1 regarding Spanish textbooks used in Italy and Spain, and Corpus 2, Spanish textbooks used in the United States and in Canada, show learners how many shades a sentence can have if they decide to use the indicative mode rather than the subjunctive mode.

In order to embrace the largest number of learners, who may have different linguistic backgrounds, Spanish language textbooks should combine both methods of presenting the Spanish subjunctive, as both approaches have beneficial outcomes:

- They should present the Spanish subjunctive as European textbooks do, with fewer colors, bolded, or highlighted words, in a contextualized paragraph. Even if it can be argued that
these typographical treatments can help learners to better and faster identify the target construction (e.g., visual learners), they can also distract learners. The present study is not against the use of typographical treatments, but it offers an explanation that first attempts to have learners independently understand the target construction. That is, let learners figure out the rule by themselves before seeing it in practical use;

- It could be useful to divide verbs that do require the subjunctive mode from verbs that do not, in order for learners to have a clear image of which verbs they need to remember;
- As for the exercises to include practicing the target construction, they can be either fill-in-the-blanks or comprehension tasks. What should be avoided is offering learners verbs to pick from. That is, learners should rely only on their own knowledge in order to find the right verb to write, rather than presenting verbs as options from which they can choose from.

In the next chapter, Conclusion, I will offer a summary of the present study. Starting with the reasons that led to this investigation, then reporting the most noteworthy results and insights. I will finish this comparative analysis of how European Spanish textbooks, and how US/Canadian ones explain the Spanish subjunctive. I will also include some limitations of the present study and suggestions for future studies.
7 Conclusion

The present study was motivated by interest in exploring how Spanish language textbooks in the US and Canadian university context explain the Spanish subjunctive compared with Spanish language textbooks used in Italy and Spain.

As was outlined in Chapter 2, Literature Review, the United States and Canada have different learning approaches when it comes to language course-books. While most of the textbooks included in Corpus 2 were student-centered textbooks used in Italy and Spain that tend to embrace the multilingualism that learners bring with them when learning an additional language. In the same chapter, the idea that the student population in Canada has more similarities with students in Europe than in the United States was also developed. In Canada, students bring with them a more varied linguistic background, as European students do in Italy and Spain. At the University of British Columbia, where the present study takes place, the diversity of the student population is clear evidence of the multilingualism that characterizes Canada. Anecdotal information shows that most Spanish classes concentrate a high number of students who are already in command of two or more languages. Likewise to Europe, the percentage of plurilingualism at UBC is significant. As a result, these students are more metalinguistic aware than learners who only speak one language. Therefore, it can be argued that for the Canadian student population that starts learning Spanish as an additional language, it would be more beneficial to learn such a language from a course-book that is organized, structured, and contains a style more similar to the ones identified in Corpus 1.

It is worth mentioning that in the textbooks used in Italy and in Spain, there seems to be a more autonomous-learner style, with less comic strips, fewer visual elements, but a richer contextualization of the Spanish subjunctive mode. Conversely, in Corpus 2, textbooks published in the United States presented

---

7 According to the most recent data from the Vancouver School Board, in 2009 more than 120 were identified in the Vancouver area and almost 60% of students speak another language rather than English at home. Most of these students are attending the University of British Columbia as international, as exchange or their family comes from another country.
the Spanish subjunctive in a more dependent style. That is, students are given all the tools such as underlined words, verbs to pick from, and highlighted expressions- to overlap the grammatical explanation of the target construction.

This difference in presentation style of the subjunctive shows that textbooks from Corpus 1 and Corpus 2 address different kinds of Spanish language learners. Underlying the treatment of the subjunctive of books used in Italy and Spain is the idea of a student population who may not be entirely monolingual, but bilingual or even trilingual⁸. Limited use of supporting elements, such as translation from Spanish into another language or typographical treatment, compared with the level of contextualization of examples and explanations, shows that these textbook authors relied more on the students’ previous language knowledge. That is, it could drastically enhance the comprehension of the target construction, the Spanish subjunctive. Textbooks included in Corpus 2 tend to provide the explanation of the Spanish subjunctive in a more bestowed-learning way, reducing students’ work just to understand it, instead of having them cogitate on the explanation, which can benefit learners with a monolingual background.

As mentioned in Chapter 3, the present study, the Spanish subjunctive, has been ascertained as more linguistically and psychologically complex than other Spanish traits on which scholars have focused on. Specifically, Farley suggested that “only a few features of Spanish language have been targeted thus far […] and these features have been less complex in nature” (2001, p. 290) than the target construction. His research also highlighted that meaning-based output instructions and structured activities regarding the target trait were “designed in a way that the Spanish subjunctive was found in the most salient position” (Ibidi. p. 291). According to his outcomes, the learning of the Spanish subjunctive is more effective when the target construction is presented with “meaningful context” (Ibid, p. 291), such as activities, dialogues,

---

⁸ In Europe, 24 languages are considered official, and 60 are considered minority languages. One of the goal that the European Union is trying to achieve is a stronger multilingualism, through the teaching of at least two foreign languages starting primary schools. The reasons behind this positive approach to multilingualism are due to the data collected by the 2012 Eurobarometer survey in which 98% confess that master one -or more- foreign languages has benefits for the entire family.
and exercises. That is, activities where learners are forced to practice the target constructions in the context of communicating opinions, desires, wishes, doubts, and beliefs.

This being said, the study suggests that textbook writers in Europe and in the United States compile explanations of the target construction, and exercises to practice it in different ways. However, my research might have pointed out that there still are similarities in their approaches. Overall, findings show that Spanish language textbook authors in the United States and Canada tend to emphasize the use of the subjunctive in different scenarios, i.e. when it is used in a double-future subordinated clause, when it depends on the subject, when it implies a doubt, an emotion, or a wish. The difference when comparing these explanations and the ones found in textbooks from Corpus 1 is that textbook writers from Corpus 2 have designed different chapters according to the verbs that require the subjunctive. As a result, the subjunctive, as a grammatical topic, extends over more than a single chapter. Moreover, the Spanish language textbooks used in the US and in the Canadian university context do emphasize the differences between regular and irregular verbs. Textbooks from Corpus 2 do not present chapters regarding differences and similarities between the Spanish subjunctive and any other language, not even English, which is the dominant language in the US. This is important if we consider that authors use English to support explanations about this Spanish grammatical topic. At least, one could expect that authors would say something about discourse-pragmatic functions of this mode, morphosyntactic features, etc. in the two languages.

My study highlighted differences in the pedagogical approaches. These reflect the different ways students are treated in Europe and in the United States. It seems that in textbooks published in Europe and used in Italy and in Spain, students learn the target construction more inductively, thanks to the lesser presence of visual elements. While in textbooks published in the United States and used in both the US and Canada, students are more guided towards the solution, due to typographical treatments that deductively and instantaneously present the Spanish subjunctive. This difference in the pedagogical approach that the
present investigation has identified in the corpora is also due to the different attitudes of textbook authors may have towards including students’ previous language knowledge.

Another point that my investigation demonstrated, and that is supported by the study by Gutiérrez, is that “practice through controlled exercises might be useful in order for explicit, declarative knowledge of the target structure” (2017, p. 15). As was argued in Chapter 3, the present study, Gutiérrez’s investigation displayed that the Spanish subjunctive does not require explicit knowledge. That is, learners, thanks to contextualized dialogues, exercises, and practical activities, should understand it.

An additional aspect that the present research has identified is the possibility that Spanish language textbooks are organized and structured in a similar way because textbooks authors actually collaborate with each other between different publishing companies. The relationship between Spanish language textbook authors from Corpus 2 and publisher is stronger than the one present in Spanish textbooks from Corpus 1. That is, in the United States and in Canada textbooks authors tend to publish books under different publishers. This situation could affect the Spanish language textbooks’ structure, organization, content, explanation and activities style. Similar ideas and pedagogical motions would, in fact, be carried over from one textbook to another. On the other hand, this situation does not apply to Spanish language textbooks from Corpus 1, where my study was not able to identify authors that had collaborated on more than one textbook.

7.1 Limitations

During the present research project, I did not have access to the extra additional material, as the textbooks that were used in this study were all instructors’ versions\(^9\). The possibility remains that the lack

---

\(^9\) The main differences between the copy available for instructors and the one learners buy are two. First, the instructor’s copy has all the exercise and activities answers already written, plus one suggestions on the side of the page as to practice the topic. Second, the instructor’s copy does not come with the code for the online ancillary material.
of contextualization in the textbooks from Corpus 2 was compensated for by enriched presentation of the Spanish subjunctive in the ancillary materials.

Also, I do realize that the 40 textbooks taken into consideration in this investigation do not reflect all of the Spanish language textbooks that are available in the United States, Canada, Italy, and Spain. In proceeding years, another comparative study, including wider corpora, could be developed reducing the publishing frame to 2015-2020. Such an investigation would verify to what extent European Spanish language textbooks still present the explanation of the subjunctive mode in a more inductive style, to what extent Spanish language textbooks available in the United States and in Canada have changed their approach, and whether language textbooks from both university contexts present more similarities than the ones my research pointed out. Future studies on the same topic could also include Spanish textbooks coming from non-Romance languages, different levels of courses taught at universities, and different levels of students’ Spanish mastery. It would also be useful to statistically measure whether visual aids and textbook layout really enhance learners’ comprehension of such complex grammatical topics by testing learners’ knowledge when they use a textbook that relies on visual elements and layout versus when they use a textbook that does not.

7.2 Suggestions for textbook authors

The main goal of this comparative study was to identify, present, and argue the differences in 40 Spanish language textbooks, regarding the Spanish subjunctive explanation. My study also aimed to provide some clues, indications, suggestions, in order to combine the US teaching approach and the European, to then propose an enriched explanation of the Spanish subjunctive.

The first step to achieve this goal would be to set what Terrell (1991) described as ‘advanced organization’: according to his studies, if learners are given information about the target construction
beforehand, or generally speaking the target language, they will receive additional aid in processing the input. This can lead to a better comprehension of grammar rules and components, but it can also provide different, but equally successful strategies that “highlight key grammatical elements learners should attend” (p. 58) to accomplish. This step is fundamental as sometimes learners, “even in the case of simplified input, are only able to segment the utterance and grasp meanings to specific forms. A reasonable hypothesis is that any information about how the input is organized might aid the learner in this segmentation process” (Ibid., 1991, p. 58).

My second step while presenting the target construction would be to present a contextualized paragraph or dialogue where learners can inductively see how the Spanish subjunctive conjugation works, and on which verbs, or adverbs, it depends on. This would also help learners in conceptualizing the conjugation, as Spanish subjunctive verbal suffixes refer to a specific subject, with the exception of the first and the third singular, personal subject that share the verbal suffix. Considering there are still “no empirical grounds for emphasizing the importance of the explicit information provided about the Spanish subjunctive” (Farley, 2001, p. 295), studies (Farley, 1991, p. 295) have shown that the meaning-based instructions “had a beneficial effect on the way in which learners processed the input, and this led to some type of internalization in their developing system that led to improvement in production as well.”

My third step would be to provide learners with a contextualized comic strip in which they would need to fill-in-the-blanks, choosing among the indicative mode, the infinitive mode, and the subjunctive mode. In this exercise, verbs would not be provided, and learners would rely primarily on their own knowledge. A fourth step would be to have learners write down the reasons behind their choice of the mode and tense in which they decided to conjugate verbs. This activity would help learners ponder the uses of verbal modes, depending on the context, communicative purpose, and speaker’s goals.

It is my hope that thanks to my investigation and possible future studies along this same research line, textbook authors will realize how they can organize, structure, and present the same content in different
ways. It should be beneficial for learners to combine different styles in presenting a subject, relying on the strengths that the present study pointed out.
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