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This paper revisits the treatment of the expression of futurity in Spanish foreign language (FL) textbooks. We analyzed twenty college-level Spanish FL textbooks to determine and quantify how futurity is represented. Variationist research has shown the periphrastic future (PF) to be the most frequent variant of futurity followed by the simple present (SP) and the morphological future (MF). Our findings reveal that, despite over two decades of communicative language teaching, Spanish FL textbooks still do not completely present the reality of the expression of futurity. Introductory texts present all three variants of futurity. However, there is a dramatic difference in the formal representation of these three variants in intermediate texts. The PF is formally presented in only four of the ten intermediate texts analyzed. Interestingly, all ten intermediate textbooks include a formal section on the MF. From a formal treatment perspective and unlike native speaker usage, the MF continues to be the futurity variant most often presented to learners, followed by the PR and the SP, respectively.
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1. Introduction

The creation of the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) in 1959 marked the formal beginning of a meaningful "liaison between the academic world of linguistics and the practical world of language education and language-related concerns" (http://www.cal.org). The collaborations forged by CAL incited the development of linguistically sound materials first for teaching English as a second language (TESOL) and, subsequently, for foreign language (FL) instruction. Similarly, the critical need for textbooks in sociolinguistics geared toward teacher education first addressed the field of TESOL with the publication of Wolfson's Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL in 1989 and later with McKay and Hornberger's (1996) Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching. Silva-Corvalán's (2001) Sociolinguística y pragmática del español, although not entirely geared toward the education of...
Spanish as a FL teachers, constitutes the first volume written in Spanish that deals with sociolinguistic issues. Moreover, Salaberry and Lafford’s (2006) co-edited volume *The Art of Teaching Spanish: Second Language Acquisition from Research to Praxis* attempted to explore the “extent to which the art of teaching L2 Spanish has been informed by the scientific (theoretical and empirical) research on SLA (and other relevant fields)” (xi, emphases in original). These early efforts helped to alleviate the gap between sociolinguistic scholarship and FL teaching and materials development. Nevertheless, additional empirical research is needed to ascertain (a) whether FL materials, such as Spanish language textbooks, accurately reflect native speaker discourse or natural speech; and, more importantly, (b) if learner output resembles native speaker (NS) usage. Most would agree that grammatical representations of the FL, as described and illustrated in FL materials, should reflect the linguistic reality of native speakers’ target language usage. However, some have argued that this is often not the case (Bragger and Rice 2000; Dorwick and Glass 2003; Gutiérrez and Fairclough 2006).

The study of the relationship between native speaker usage and its representation in Spanish language textbooks and language instruction is by no means a new endeavor. Neither is research on the presentation of the expression of futurity in Spanish FL textbooks. Three decades ago, noticing a disparity between native speaker usage and textbooks, van Naerssen (1983) called for appropriate textbook representation of the Spanish expression of futurity. In a follow-up study, van Naerssen (1995) renewed her claims for a more accurate presentation of the expression of futurity reflecting shifts in native speaker usage. This paper has a manifold purpose. One of its main objectives is to help mitigate the divide between natural speech and what is presented in L2 teaching materials. We revisit the treatment of the expression of futurity in Spanish FL textbooks as we bring together findings in variationist studies with second language acquisition (SLA) issues. Moreover, we examine the current status of the expression of futurity first by surveying the sociolinguistic literature on this linguistic variable throughout the Spanish-speaking world and, second, by examining how futurity is currently presented in Spanish FL textbooks. The paper concludes with a discussion of our findings and delineates implications for FL teaching and materials development.

1.1 Expressing futurity in Spanish

As discussed by Orozco (2007b, 103; 2009, 99), futurity in the indicative mood is expressed in Spanish by means of a linguistic variable consisting of three interchangeable variants: the morphological future (MF), the simple present tense (SP), and the periphrastic future (PF), illustrated in (1), (2), and (3), respectively.
(1) *Cantaré mañana.* 'I will sing tomorrow.' (MF)
(2) *Canto mañana.* 'I sing tomorrow.' (SP)
(3) *Voy a cantar mañana.* 'I’m going to sing tomorrow.' (PF)

The PF is formed by the simple present indicative of *ir* ‘go’ + a ‘to’ + infinitive. It is equivalent to the English periphrastic form *to be going to* + *infinitive* and to periphrastic future forms used in numerous other languages.

The expression of simple futurity constitutes a prime example of linguistic variation leading to ongoing language change. The attestation of the MF in medieval Spanish written texts (Penny 2002, 210) suggests that it was already present in vernacular speech since earlier days as Vulgar Latin evolved into Hispano-Romance on its way to becoming Castilian, and subsequently, Modern Spanish. The SP, according to Elcock (1960, 105), was already used in Late Latin to express futurity and this usage has obviously been preserved. The use of the PF to indicate futurity appears to have been possible since as early as the 13th century (Aaron 2006, 268). However, its widespread usage as a futurity marker in both spoken and written Modern Spanish appears to be a 20th century development. Thus, variation has led to ongoing change in the expression of futurity as Spanish and the modern Romance languages have evolved and reached their current configurations.

1.2 Distribution of future variants in native speaker usage

The Spanish expression of futurity has received increased scholarly attention by sociolinguists for at least half a century. The earlier studies, rather qualitative in nature, either reported on researchers’ ethnographic observations or were based on data from literary works. Recent empirical analyses using data culled from oral corpora, as is customarily done in sociolinguistic studies dealing with synchronic variation, have quantitatively validated the initial reports. This latter wave of variationist research has also explored the linguistic and social constraints that condition each of the variants of futurity. In general, sociolinguistic investigations of the expression of futurity report the virtual disappearance of the MF (Lope Blanch 1972; Montes Giraldo 1962; 1985), the overwhelming predominance of the PF (Blas Arroyo 2008; Silva-Corvalán and Terrell 1989), or both (Gudmestad and Geeslin 2013; Orozco 2004; 2005; 2007a; 2007b; Osborne 2008).

The figures in Table 1 illustrate the distribution of variants in the speech communities where the expression of futurity has been sociolinguistically analyzed in terms of the tripartite linguistic variable discussed in Section 1.1. Three of these communities (Morelia, Mexico City, Southwest US) include speakers from Mexico,
the world's largest Spanish-speaking country. Another three (Southwest US, New York Puerto Ricans, New York Colombians) belong to the largest, most intense and most studied situation of linguistic contact involving Spanish. Speakers from yet two other communities included in Table 1 (Barranquilla, Colombia, and New York Colombians) are originally from the nation with the world's second (South America's first) largest Spanish-speaking population. The speakers of Andalusian Spanish represent the region that leads the evolution of Peninsular Spanish (Penny 2000, 118). Finally, Caribbean speakers represent the variety considered to lead the evolution of modern Spanish (Orozco 2009, 110).

As shown in Table 1, the MF invariably registers the lowest usage frequencies as a future marker in both monolingual and bilingual speech communities. While it still maintains respectable levels of usage in Colombia and Mexico City,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>PF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Silva-Corvalán and Terrell 1989)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Silva-Corvalán and Terrell 1989)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest United States</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gutiérrez 1995)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Puerto Ricans</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Orozco forthcoming)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Silva-Corvalán and Terrell 1989)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Silva-Corvalán and Terrell 1989)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morelia, Mexico</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gutiérrez 1995)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan, Puerto Rico</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Claes and Ortiz 2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Colombians</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Orozco 2007a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico City</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gutiérrez 1995)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barranquilla, Colombia</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Orozco 2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andalusian Spanish</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Osborne 2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average frequencies</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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its frequency has dropped to less than 15% in all other communities, averaging only 11% worldwide. These values corroborate reports of the MF being a receding form in the Americas (Escobar 1997), Colombia (Montes Giraldo 1962; 1985), and Mexico (Moreno de Alba 1970), as well as the account that the morphological future has almost completely disappeared in Argentina, Chile, Ecuador, and Mexico (Lope Blanch 1972, 144). Conversely, the figures for the SP indicate that it is consistently used more than the MF to express futurity, with robust frequencies of usage in Spain, Colombia, and Mexico. Besides validating the status of the SP as an established means to express futurity, its usage frequencies suggest that it will continue to be used as an alternative to the PF.

Empirical sociolinguistic scholarship has demonstrated that the PF is overwhelmingly preferred over both the MF and SP in all future-time contexts. Thus, the PF’s consistent dominance of the expression of futurity throughout the Spanish-speaking world (see Table 1) is congruent with reports that this form has become the default expression of the future in all varieties of Spanish (Blas Arroyo 2008; Escobar 1997; Silva-Corvalán 1988, 1994; van Naerssen 1983, 58; 1995; Zentella 1997, 190; among others). More specifically, the higher average frequency of the PF (70.8%) is consistent with accounts of its most frequent occurrence in monolingual varieties of Spanish (cf. Bauhr 1989; Westmoreland 1997; among others), Caribbean Spanish, Chile (Silva-Corvalán and Terrell 1989), Venezuelan Spanish (Sedano 1994), and Andalusian Spanish (Osborne 2008). The figures in Table 1 are also consistent with the fact that the PF usually occurs more frequently when Spanish is in direct contact with other languages. Thus, the PF has also been found to occur more frequently in communities where Spanish is in contact with English (Orozco forthcoming; Silva-Corvalán 1994; Villa Crésap 1997; Zentella 1997) and in situations of contact with Quechua (Escobar 1997; Niño-Murcia 1992).

Interestingly, when we compare the frequencies from Barranquilla, Colombia and Puerto Rico to those of Colombians and Puerto Ricans in New York City, respectively, we can see in both cases simultaneous increases in the use of the PF and reductions in the use of MF in New York. If we interpret these facts in light of Silva-Corvalán’s observation (1994) that language contact situations accelerate the speed of changes already in progress before the inception of contact, we can assume that what has happened in bilingual communities will soon take place in the rest of the Spanish-speaking world. That is, while the PF has overwhelmingly taken over the Spanish temporal future, the MF’s usage as a variant of futurity is fast becoming a thing of the past.

Additionally, studies that have focused only on the PF and the MF also show the former as the most frequently occurring variant of futurity (Table 2). Obviously, the results of such studies should be considered with the caveat that they report higher frequencies for both the MF and PF (cf. Blas Arroyo 2008;
Table 2. The future in other Hispanic speech communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>PF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexico City</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lastra and Butagüeño 2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caracas, Venezuela</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sedano 1994)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castellón, Valencia, Spain</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Blas Arroyo 2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. The future in other Romance languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>PF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quebec French</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Poplack and Turpin 1999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal written Brazilian Portuguese</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Poplack and Malvar 2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal spoken Brazilian Portuguese</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Poplack and Malvar 2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lastra and Martín-Butagüeño 2010; Sedano 1994; among others) than studies incorporating SP as a futurity marker.

The PF also appears consistently as the most frequent futurity marker in other Romance languages, as shown in Table 3. This situation reflects a pattern that occurs not only in the descendants of Latin but crosslinguistically, where there has always been more than one way of expressing future reference (Dahl 1985, 110; Fleischman 2009 [1982], 1; van Naerssen 1995, 461; among others). The most frequent occurrence of PF has parallels in other Romance languages, including most varieties of spoken French (Poplack and Turpin 1999), Brazilian Portuguese (Poplack and Malvar 2007; Thomas 1969), Lisbon Portuguese, and creole languages (Fleischman 2009 [1982]).

Thus, the current overall distribution of the variants of futurity reflects a shift from the preferential use of the MF to that of the PF. As part of this shift, the PF has undergone grammaticalization on its way to becoming the default expression of future time in Spanish. In a larger context, the expression of futurity provides a prime example of the effects of the crosslinguistic evolutionary process of cyclicity, which affects verbal morphology, triggering multiple internal syntactic and morphological adjustments. Gutiérrez (1995, 214), Orozco (2007a, 327), and Silva-Corvalán (1994, 52), among others, have discussed this large historical cycle as it affects Spanish. In this cycle, the language changes from being primarily synthetic to predominantly analytic and eventually becomes synthetic again (Fleischman
2009 [1982], 152; Schwegler 1990). Additionally, research on L2 variation in Spanish has experienced considerable growth in recent years with studies across a range of learning contexts, linguistic variables, and proficiency levels (Geeslin 2011, 303 and references therein). A recent strand of this scholarship has explored the expression of futurity showing that (a) MF learner usage frequencies are consistently higher than those of NSs, and (b) learner PF frequencies are invariably below NS patterns (Gudmestad and Geeslin 2013, 68). These findings demonstrate that learners have internalized variation as evidenced by their production of all three variants of futurity. However, their usage of futurity lacks the sociolinguistic competence that goes hand in hand with native-like command. With this in mind, we now turn our attention to the ways in which FL materials shape course content and reflect (or not) the ever-changing linguistic realities of the FL.

1.3 The role of the textbook in FL teaching and learning

Over the past several decades, FL education and SLA researchers have conducted numerous empirical studies that analyze the ways in which textbooks are used to facilitate FL teaching and learning. Some of the topics investigated include comparing the form-focused versus communicative nature of the activities typically found in FL textbooks (Aski 2003; Parry 2000; Terrell 1990; Wong and VanPatten 2003), how cultural issues are represented or addressed (Bateman and Mattos 2006; Kramsch 1987, 1988; Ramírez and Hall 1990), how instructors interpret and implement FL textbooks in their teaching (Allen 2008; Bell and Gower 1997; Wildner-Basset 2000), among other topics.

While the aforementioned studies have investigated a diverse range of issues regarding FL textbook use and content, many researchers and practitioners agree that FL textbooks are one of the most important FL program components in various educational contexts. Kramsch (1988, 63) indicated that FL textbooks are "the bedrock of syllabus design and lesson planning," and Roberts (1996, 375) referred to them as "the fundament" of FL teaching and learning. Moreover, Angell, DuBravac, and Gonglewski (2008, 563) indicate that instructors in FL programs "routinely consign major decisions about what is taught and how it is taught and tested to commercial materials developers and authors." In large, multi-section, college-level Spanish programs across the United States, that offer both elementary and intermediate Spanish courses, syllabi and much of the course content (e.g., exams, readings, form-focused or communicative activities) are primarily based on the grammar presented in the FL textbook. In sum, the FL textbook and its grammatical content, by default, serve as the primary vehicle by which the FL is taught.

In addition to serving as a way to ensure uniformity in the delivery of content in multi-section FL programs, textbooks also serve as a guide for instructors who
may lack either teaching experience or ample grammatical knowledge about the target language. In college FL programs, many lower-level language courses are taught by graduate teaching assistants (GTAs). For this kind of instructor, the FL textbook often constitutes "an important tool mediating instructional planning" (Allen 2008, 5). One could elaborate on this notion and speculate that for the non-native speaker GTA or adjunct instructor, the textbook also provides valuable information about specific grammatical features and/or how the FL is used in natural, native speaker discourse (Wildner-Bassett 2000). One could further argue that inexperienced instructors — both native and non-native Spanish speakers — who may lack experience providing grammar instruction to American students also benefit from textbook grammar explanations. In other words, the FL textbook can serve as a grammar guide for many instructors.

Finally, textbooks are also important components of student FL learning. Besides their instructor, students often regard the FL textbook as a primary target language input source (Askildson 2008). This is especially true for learners in areas of the United States where it is not possible or feasible to interact with the target language beyond the classroom. As such, learners will rely on the FL textbook and accompanying materials when outside of class to learn more about the FL and its grammar, such as ways in which to express the future. Overall, the FL textbook remains an essential piece of the language learning and teaching puzzle. However, despite advances in SLA research and FL teaching methodologies, the content in many FL textbooks "remains either remarkably the same or is just slightly altered" (Dorwick and Glass 2003, 593) over time. This paper explores that issue by bringing together sociolinguistic research with FL materials development.

1.4 Bridging the divide between sociolinguistic research and FL teaching materials

As previously mentioned, the study of the relationship between native speaker language usage and its representation in Spanish FL textbooks and language instruction does not constitute a novel research area. In her study, van Naerssen (1983) called for appropriate representation of the PF as the primary way to express futurity in Spanish. In the 16 Spanish FL textbooks van Naerssen analyzed, the MF was formally presented and explained more often than the PF. In two texts, the PF was mentioned only as a note under sections dedicated to the MF. Similarly, the majority of exercises across the 16 textbooks that allowed students to practice expressing futurity were dedicated to the MF rather than the PF. Van Naerssen's (1995) follow-up study revisited the issue by analyzing 16 university-level Spanish FL textbooks to determine whether the presentation of the expression of futurity had changed in light of FL teaching methodological trends during the 1990s that
favored a communicative approach (van Naerssen 1995, 467). The researcher hypothesized that due to the growing influence of communicative language teaching methodologies, where the focus was on assisting "the student in communicating more naturally" (van Naerssen 1995, 462), Spanish FL textbooks might present the PF more as a possible way to express futurity versus what was found in her earlier study (van Naerssen 1983). Of the 16 new Spanish FL textbooks analyzed, van Naerssen (1995) found that the MF continued to be presented more frequently as a formal lesson (100% of the time) when compared to the PF (62.5% of the time). Despite this change in representation over the 12 years since her original study, van Naerssen renewed her claims for a more appropriate and accurate presentation of the expression of futurity, reflective of shifts in native speaker usage.

Interestingly, the disparity between native speaker usage and textbook representation of the expression of futurity also extends to grammar books (Blas Arroyo 2008, 86; Orozco forthcoming). For instance, the MF is presented as the Spanish future tense in the Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española (RAE 1999) and in the Nueva gramática de la lengua española (RAE 2009–2010). Concurrently, the predominance of the PF is acknowledged in each of these comprehensive publications only in the form of a footnote. This tendency is not particular to Spanish, given that it occurs in grammatical descriptions of other Romance languages, namely French and Portuguese (Poplack and Malvar 2007; Poplack and Turpin 1999).

2. Methodology

2.1 Research questions

The following two research questions guided this study:

1. Do Spanish FL textbooks continue to emphasize one variant of futurity, namely the MF, over the others?
2. How accurately does the formal presentation of the variants of the expression of futurity in contemporary Spanish FL textbooks reflect native speaker usage?

2.2 Data sources

To answer the research questions, we chose 20 contemporary Spanish language textbooks typically used in elementary and intermediate Spanish FL college courses in the United States (see Appendix A for a list of the textbooks). One of the researchers, with experience as a Spanish language program coordinator at a Tier I research institution in the U.S., is familiar with the most widely used Spanish language textbooks produced by the major commercial publishers. Thus, we analyzed
textbooks put on the market by a variety of publishers within the past four years (i.e., 2010–2014). In all, six publishers were represented across the 20 Spanish FL textbooks investigated.

2.3 Data analysis procedure

In the same vein as previous studies (van Naerssen 1983, 1995), data analysis involved examining the ways in which FL textbooks present the three variants of the Spanish expression of futurity: SP, MF, and the PE. In accordance with research that has explored the role of the textbook in FL teaching and learning, we focused our analysis on the sections and related activities for each futurity variant in each FL textbook in our sample. Supplementary materials accompanying the textbooks, such as student or instructor websites, or virtual workbooks, are beyond the scope of this project. In general, textbooks constitute the main means of presenting grammatical paradigms to learners, and if a structure is in the main text it is invariably included in the supplementary materials. Though, whereas van Naerssen focused her analysis on beginning-level textbooks, our study includes both introductory- and intermediate-level texts. Our analysis also differs from van Naerssen’s in our inclusion of the SP, in line with recent sociolinguistic investigations of the expression of futurity.

In order for a futurity variant to be considered to be formally represented in a FL textbook, a dedicated section in the textbook needed to be acknowledged. For example, if one of the variants was listed as a grammatical topic to be covered in the scope and sequence section of the FL textbook and, therefore, a section dedicated to the particular variant was included somewhere in the textbook, then that variant was considered to be formally addressed by the textbook. In contrast, if the SP was mentioned as a possible way to express futurity, but that information was presented via a note under a section for the MF or the PE, then it was determined that the particular textbook did not formally present the SP as a way to express futurity. Besides investigating whether each futurity variant was formally treated in the textbooks, we also calculated the number of exercises that accompanied each of the three variants. This additional step allowed for a more detailed account of how each futurity variant is represented in the textbooks analyzed here. We defined an exercise as an activity that allows students to practice the production and use of a specific variant of futurity via a form of output, such as a speaking or writing activity where learners need to respond using one of the variants.

One of the researchers and an assistant determined whether each variant was formally addressed, and they calculated the total number of exercises included in the FL textbooks that provided targeted practice with each of the variants. The researcher and the research assistant used the same criteria to determine what
represented a formal representation or treatment of each of the three variants and what constituted an exercise. The researcher and the assistant separately analyzed each of the 20 textbooks and then compared notes. Inter-rater reliability for calculating both the formal treatment and the number of exercises dedicated to each of the three variants across the 20 textbooks was determined to be 100%.

3. Findings

As we present our findings, we address each of the two research questions investigated in this study starting with the first of these questions. Do Spanish FL textbooks continue to emphasize one variant of futurity, namely the MF, over the others?

Table 4 below provides information regarding whether the three variants (SP, MF, and PF) are formally represented in the 20 Spanish FL textbooks analyzed. As one can see, the majority of the textbooks formally address all three futurity variants (i.e., SP, MF, and PF) in some way. However, the results reveal some striking differences between the introductory- and intermediate-level texts. In the ten introductory texts, the three variants are addressed with almost equal frequency. Specifically, the SP and the PF have a formal, dedicated section in all ten of the texts while the MF is formally presented in nine of them. As a result, one can conclude that introductory texts present learners with information about all three variants of futurity. The fact that only one textbook does not address the MF suggests that introductory books are beginning to strive for a more accurate presentation of the future. This may also be a reflection of authors’ efforts to display "authentic language" and expose students to "the language as it is actually used in everyday conversation" as stated in the online descriptions of ¡Dímelo tú!, 6th Edition and Plazas, 4th Edition, respectively.

However, our analysis of the intermediate texts uncovered a dramatic difference in formal representation of the futurity variants. The SP and the PF, respectively, are formally presented in only three of the ten intermediate texts analyzed. It is worth noting here that the three intermediate-level texts that formally present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant of the Future</th>
<th>Introductory Texts (n=10)</th>
<th>Intermediate Texts (n=10)</th>
<th>TOTAL (n=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morphological Future</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19 (95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Present to express Future</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periphrastic Future</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13 (65%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the SP and PF are the same texts. This may suggest that the individual author teams decided early on that they would each formally present all three variants of futurity in their texts. In addition, all ten intermediate-level textbooks include a formal section on the MF. Therefore, when looking only at the ten intermediate Spanish textbooks in this study, the MF is formally presented more than three times as often as the SP and the PF. When the introductory and the intermediate textbooks are grouped together, 95% of the texts formally present the MF while 65% of them include formal presentations of the SP as well as the PF. Consequently, from a formal treatment perspective, it is clear that the MF continues to be the variant of futurity most often presented to learners, followed by the SP and the PF, respectively.

In addition to calculating the number of sections devoted to each of the three variants in the 20 Spanish FL textbooks examined, we also determined the number of exercises presented to learners for each futurity variant. Table 5 indicates the total number of exercises for each of the variants presented to learners in the 20 textbooks (see Appendices B and C for a chapter-by-chapter breakdown of the activities). When looking at the introductory texts, one can see that students are presented with 47 exercises to practice the MF, followed by 30 dedicated to the PF, and 20 to practice the SP. Therefore, in terms of grammatical exercises devoted to practicing the three variants, learners are given many more opportunities to practice the MF when compared to the PF and the SP. The trend continues in the intermediate texts. However, the difference is even more marked since 54 exercises dedicated to the MF were found, whereas no exercises were dedicated to the PF or the SP. When considering the 20 introductory- and intermediate-level texts together, 67% of the exercises dedicated to the expression of futurity involved the MF, 20% of all exercises were devoted to the PF, and 13% focused on the SP. Another interesting finding reported in Tables 4 and 5 relates to the formal presentation of the SP and PF. Specifically, three intermediate-level texts formally present both of these variants of futurity without providing learners with exercises to practice them. In response to the first research question, it is clear by this measurement that the MF continues to be emphasized over the PF and the SP. Our findings reflect that what Van Naerssen reported decades ago (1983, 1995) still

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant of the Future</th>
<th>Introductory Texts</th>
<th>Intermediate Texts</th>
<th>TOTAL exercises dedicated to the future (n = 151)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morphological Future</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>101 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Present to express Future</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periphrastic Future</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30 (20%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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largely constitutes the reality of how Spanish FL textbooks represent the expression of the future.

In the remainder of this section, we address our second research question: *How accurately does the formal presentation of the variants of the expression of futurity in contemporary Spanish FL textbooks reflect native speaker usage?*

As we determined how accurately the presentation of the variants of the future reflects native-speaker usage, we compared actual average usage to textbook presentation. While native speaker usage of the MF only reaches 11%, this variant is presented in 95% of the textbooks analyzed receiving 67% of all exercises to practice the future. The SP garners 18% of speaker usage as a marker of futurity but is presented in 65% of textbooks and receives only 13% of all exercises. The PF, despite being overwhelmingly preferred throughout the Spanish-speaking world and having 71% of usage across the board, is presented in 65% of books but given only 20% of all exercises dedicated to the expression of futurity. Thus, the answer to our second research question is that the formal textbook presentation of the variants of futurity is still far from reflecting native speaker usage.

4. Discussion

The current status of the Spanish expression of futurity discussed earlier reflects the preferential native speaker use of the PF. As the expression of futurity has evolved, the PF has claimed the dominant role in this linguistic variable and has largely replaced the morphological form. This phenomenon, which stems from the tendency of future paradigms to be recast periodically from modal VPs, is discussed by Fleischman (2009 [1982], 31), Bybee et al. (1991, 1994), and Dahl (1985, 2000), among others. In a larger context, the current distribution of futurity variants appears to result from a process known as cyclicity, which affects verbal morphology and triggers a number of internal morphosyntactic adjustments. As a consequence of cyclicity, and on its way to becoming the Spanish default expression of futurity, the PF has acquired new semantic functions formerly inherent to the MF. Concurrently, as has been attested crosslinguistically (Bybee and Pagliuca 1987; Ultan 1978) in the case of the Spanish subjunctive, the MF has survived by acquiring new semantic domains. That is, while gradually ceasing to function as a futurity marker, the MF has expanded semantically and now is used to express doubt, indeterminacy, conjecture, probability (Gutiérrez 1995; Sedano 1994; Silva-Corvalán 1994) and polite commands (Kany 1969; Niño-Murcia 1992). As part of the process of cyclicity, phenomena such as grammaticalization have prompted the PF to become the unmarked expression of futurity in Spanish, leaving the MF and SP as the marked future forms.
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The results of this study show that the aforementioned linguistic developments pertaining to the Spanish expression of futurity are not accurately reflected in the majority of contemporary Spanish FL textbooks, despite more than two decades of teaching with communicative approaches. The clear tendency to continue to favor the MF as the primary way to express futurity in the Spanish FL textbooks analyzed here is a lingering misrepresentation of the sociolinguistic reality of native speaker discourse including its inherent variation. A plausible reason for the disparity between NS usage and textbook treatment of the expression of futurity may lie in the persistent presentation of the MF as the Spanish future in grammar books with the Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española (RAE 1999) and the Nueva gramática de la lengua española (RAE 2009–2010) being prime representatives of this practice. Consequently, textbooks continue to emphasize the development of grammatical competence at the expense of, the arguably more important, sociolinguistic and strategic competence (cf. Geeslin 2011, 315; Lee and VanPatten 2003).

Understanding why each of the author teams of the various textbooks analyzed in this study — especially those who authored the intermediate-level texts — chose to emphasize (or not) specific variants of futurity remains outside the scope of this study. However, a possible explanation regarding why the MF is presented more often in the intermediate-level texts could relate to the fact that the MF is morphologically and, perhaps, more cognitively challenging for students to control when compared to the SP or the PF. As a result, textbook authors might possibly assume that given the morphological complexity of the MF, it simply needs more attention as students continue their progression through more advanced levels of language learning. Additionally, another explanation could point to the way market forces in the publishing world tend to dictate how authors determine and sequence content in their textbooks (Dorwick and Glass 2003, 593). However, more work is needed in this area to fully understand how authors and publishers determine the type and amount of content that is included (or not) in FL textbooks.

Meanwhile, we would argue that many college-level learners of Spanish in the United States who rely primarily on a Spanish FL textbook for their learning, as well as those who cannot participate in study abroad programs, continue to be presented with a skewed view of how native speakers of Spanish typically express futurity. To this effect, some researchers are beginning to look at the effects of this specific misrepresentation on students' interlanguage development. Gudmestad and Geeslin (2013) show that (a) the use of the MF among students of Spanish as a foreign language unnaturally increases as a result of their learning to use this paradigm in class; and (b) NNS usage of the PF, even at the advanced level, remains consistently below that of NSs. Given that language learners need to incorporate
target language sociolinguistic variation into their linguistic repertoire as they develop effective communication strategies (Geeslin 2011, 314), we strongly recommend that FL textbook and materials developers strengthen the lines of communication with variationist sociolinguists.

One of the main implications of this study involves how FL materials are created. Specifically, we would argue that FL textbook authors should consider the target language sociolinguistic and pragmatic norms to inform the content presented to learners. Doing so would, in turn, facilitate the development of learners' sociolinguistic and pragmatic competence. In the case of expressing futurity in Spanish, all three variants (i.e., SP, ME, and PF) should be presented to learners. However, at the very least, equal treatment should be given to all three at both the introductory and intermediate levels of instruction. Additionally, it would be beneficial to include in the textbooks information about the preference of native speakers to use the PF over the MF and the SP so that learners are aware of which variant is most commonly used in NS discourse. The majority of textbooks analyzed in our study did not offer this additional information to learners. Teachers informed by this study would make adjustments as they present the expression of futurity to their students by explaining how NSs and they personally express the future by modeling their own way of doing so.

5. Conclusion

Our inclusion of intermediate-level textbooks represents a step beyond van Naerssen's research on the presentation of the expression of futurity in Spanish L2 textbooks. However, our focus on what was presented in the FL textbooks was motivated by a desire to retain the spirit of van Naerssen's (1983, 1995) previous work. One of the goals of our paper is to strengthen ties between sociolinguistic and SLA research so that both of these areas continue to inform each other. This study has attempted to do so with an aim to improve learners' acquisition of Spanish. While this research has shed some light on the disconnection between sociolinguistic realities and the information presented in Spanish FL textbooks, much more empirical work is obviously needed. We would like to renew van Naerssen's call for research on other constructions in Spanish as well as in other languages intended to "provide useful insights and further support for textbook writers and contribute to theoretical concerns in language acquisition and to the search for universal tendencies in linguistics" (van Naerssen 1995, 467).

The application of research on sociolinguistic variation to FL textbook development is important in the preparation of language learners, and the implications of this study are both obvious and practical. We open the door to further research
intended to explore a series of issues beyond the scope of this paper. Subsequent work might examine Spanish FL textbooks not analyzed here and also include advanced-level texts. Research seeking to provide an even more complete picture of how the three variants of futurity are represented could extend to other materials, such as the exercises included on the accompanying websites for many FL textbooks. Thus, as far as the expression of futurity is concerned, our results validate the argument advanced by several scholars (cf. Bragger and Rice 2000; Dorwick and Glass 2003; Gutiérrez and Fairclough 2006) that FL materials often fail to reflect the linguistic reality of native speaker target language usage. Further areas to be investigated are representations of other grammatical aspects of Spanish in FL textbooks when compared to native speaker discourse. Similarly, other research avenues include comparative analyses of textbooks used to teach such languages as Arabic, Chinese, French, German, and Portuguese with the native speaker norms of those languages. Regardless the focus, sociolinguists and SLA researchers can (and should) be powerful allies to improve FL teaching and learning. This paper has contributed to that endeavor.

Finally, it is worth noting that this paper has several limitations. First, only 20 textbooks were analyzed. If more introductory- and intermediate-level Spanish language textbooks were included in the study, our results would present a more complete picture about how futurity is represented in a wider array of texts. Secondly, interviewing authors/author teams of some of the texts analyzed in this study would have provided a fuller understanding as to why certain variants of futurity were included or left out of specific textbooks. Future research in this area might include authors' perspectives on how they go about deciding which linguistic paradigms to include, leave out, or de-emphasize in their texts.

Notes

1. We are very grateful for the valuable comments provided to us by Margaret van Naerse, Hugh Buckingham, Kim Potowski, and two anonymous reviewers. We are fully responsible for all remaining infelicities.
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Appendix A.

Introductory-level texts analyzed (i.e., texts typically used in first- and/or second-semester, college-level Spanish courses)
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Intermediate-level texts analyzed (i.e., texts typically used in third- and/or fourth-semester, college-level Spanish courses)


Appendix B.

Number of practices/activities/tasks that include usage (i.e., recognition or production) of specific expressions of futurity found in each chapter of the ten introductory-level Spanish textbooks.

Note: The symbol ‘—’ indicates that the book does not have that chapter.

SP = Simple present (to express future) – PF = Periphrastic future – MF = Morphological future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¡Claro que sí!</td>
<td>SP1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PF6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicho y hecho</td>
<td>SP1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PF2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¡Dímelo tú!</td>
<td>SP3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PF1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dos mundos</td>
<td>SP2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PF2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploraciones</td>
<td>SP2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PF3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizzas</td>
<td>SP3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PF5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puentes</td>
<td>SP3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PF1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PF2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puntos de</td>
<td>SP1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partida</td>
<td>PF3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vistas</td>
<td>SP2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PF3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¡Vívelo!</td>
<td>SP2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PF2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix C.

Number of practices/activities/tasks that include usage (i.e., recognition or production) of specific expressions of futurity found in each chapter of the ten intermediate-level Spanish textbooks.

Note: The symbol '-' indicates that the book does not have that chapter.

SP = Simple present (to express future) – PF = Periphrastic future – MF = Morphological future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textbook</th>
<th>Practices/Activities/Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atando cabos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conexiones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De paseo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espacios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identidades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Más allá de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>las palabras</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mundo 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumbos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sueña</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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