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## ABSTRACT

This study considers the role of Spanish as a global language by examining its use in London, a global, multilingual and superdiverse city, where Spanish has no official status. I consider how pluricentric norms, panhispanism, and the emerging *Nueva Política Lingüística Panhispánica* (NPLP) find expression. In particular, I ask how regional and national varieties of Spanish are perceived by L1 and L2 learners and how these attitudes construct local language ideologies held by different actors.

I profile two institutions where language ideologies and linguistic practice can be examined. These are (1) an international Spanish-English bilingual school run as part of Spain’s diplomatic mission, and (2) a language school backed by the Spanish government. I argue that the NPLP is not just about the traditional “pillars” of Spanish language standardization (dictionaries, grammar, and orthography) but must also be negotiated through localized language policies outside of the “official” Spanish-speaking world.

## RESUMEN

Este articulo trata del papel del español como lengua global y examina su uso en Londres, una ciudad global, multilingüe y superdiversa, donde el español no tiene ningún estatus oficial. Considero cómo las normas pluricéntricas, el panhispanismo y la emergente *Nueva Política Lingüística Panhispánica* (NPLP) se expresan. En particular, se investiga cómo se perciben las variedades regionales y nacionales del español entre los aprendices de L1 y L2 y cómo estas actitudes construyen ideologías lingüísticas locales sostenidas por diferentes actores.

Me fijo en dos instituciones donde se puede examinar las ideologías y la práctica lingüísticas. Estos son (1) un colegio internacional bilingüe español-inglés dirigido como parte de la misión diplomática de España y (2) un centro de idiomas fundado por el gobierno español. Sostengo que la NPLP no se trata solo de los “pilares” tradicionales de la estandarización de la lengua española (diccionarios, gramática y ortografía), sino que también debe negociarse a través de políticas lingüísticas localizadas fuera del mundo hispanohablante “oficial”.
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# 1. Introduction

This study aims to situate Spanish as a global language by examining its use in London, home to an estimated 170,000 Spanish speakers from across the Hispanic world, where despite its presence and influence, the language does not have any official status. In this article, I consider how concepts and debates surrounding pluricentric language standards, panhispanism, and the emerging panhispanic language policy in particular, find expression in this context. The article studies what the impact of the continuing growth and importance of Spanish is, not just among those in London who count Spanish as their mother tongue, but also those learning it as a second or foreign language. In particular, it considers how different varieties of Spanish are perceived, and how attitudes towards these contribute to the emergence of local and global language ideologies held by different actors in the language learning process.

Building on my research that focuses on Spanish in London’s linguistic landscape (Paffey 2020), this article presents two case studies of institutions in London where the interplay between language ideologies and linguistic practices is salient. These case studies examine policies regarding, and attitudes towards, distinct varieties of Spanish used in (1) an international Spanish-English bilingual school run as part of Spain’s diplomatic mission, where Spanish is the medium of teaching, and (2) a language school which is part of a worldwide network backed by the Spanish government. The data in this article consists of transcribed focus group interviews with students in both institutions[[1]](#footnote-1).

I argue that the Spanish Language Academy’s *Nueva Política Lingüística Panhispánica* (Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española 2004) does not only uphold and expand on the traditional “pillars” of Spanish language standardization (dictionaries, grammar, and orthography) but equally can be negotiated through localized language policies outside of the “official” Spanish-speaking world. I also ask whether localized language practices are leading to the development of a “London Spanish” variety.

Spanish speakers and learners in a globalized and diverse city such as London manage and value their linguistic resources according to the perceived contribution that these make to the individuals’ linguistic repertoires. In this article, I examine how such perceptions of values related to Spanish are linked to the current visibility of the Spanish language (among many others) in multilingual London.

# 2. Contextual and analytical framework

## 2.1. Superdiversity and multilingualism in London

While migration is a global phenomenon, over half the world’s population now lives in urban areas. Consequently, migration flows tend to radiate towards cities where employment, accommodation, social support services and networks are more readily available. Many defining features of cities, such as the connections and contrasts between people, the activities and rhythms of urban life, and the geographical and socio-political ordering of neighbourhoods, are reflected in Timms’ description of the city as a “mosaic of social worlds” (Timms 1971, 1). The intensity of contact and difference, as well as the transnationality of lives and migration trajectories gives rise to a complex plurality of cultural and linguistic practices, social relationships, economic activity and political views. The term “superdiversity” goes some way to describing such contemporary forms of movement and migration (Vertovec 2007). Within sociolinguistics, writers such as Blommaert (2010, 2012, 2013, 2015), Rampton (2015), and Creese and Blackledge (2010), have argued that an understanding of superdiversity can reveal how the scale of current migratory, cultural and transnational practices has an impact on language use in “densely multilingual environments” (Blommaert 2013, 1). Of course the term has been critiqued, namely for failing to acknowledge the historical developments of diversity and multilingualism, and over-privileging urban linguistic settings (see May 2014, Ndhlovu 2016, Flores & Lewis 2016). Nevertheless, the notion of superdiversity is helpful in that it focuses on the complexity and fluidity of migration patterns and the identities and practices associated with migration across the globe including in urban contexts. One of the impacts of the increasing number of different countries of origin of migrants over the last century or so, and the subsequent complexity of the networks to which they relate, is that:

New, smaller, less organised, legally differentiated and non-citizen immigrant groups have hardly gained attention or a place on the public agenda. Yet it is the growth of exactly these sorts of groups that has in recent years radically transformed the social landscape in Britain. (Vertovec 2007, 1027-8)

Greater London’s population now totals more than 8 million people (GLA 2014), with one in three Londoners born outside the UK (ONS 2015). Its superdiversity is reflected in the complex network of social connections between people from different countries of origin with different transnational practices, religions, migration channels all of which affect their access to employment, the consequential effect of migrant human capital and multilingualism. This complexity is reflected in the fact that 233 languages are spoken in London’s schools (Mehmedbegović et al. 2015) and is one of the factors which has led Vertovec to write that “London is the predominant locus of immigration and it is where super-diversity is at its most marked” (2007, 1042).

Spanish is the eighth most spoken language in London, and its estimated 190,000 speakers come from both a longstanding population that originates from Spain as well as a Latin American and Spanish-speaking Caribbean population (e.g. Cuba, Dominican Republic) that has multiplied since the 1970s. While Spanish-speakers may not necessarily be as historically predominant or “visible” as other population groups (e.g. Indian, African, or Caribbean migrants from English-speaking contexts such as Jamaica) their impact on London’s social—and particularly linguistic—landscape is evident as a result of their linguistic interconnectedness. Aspects of the economic, social, and migratory realities of these populations have been explored by Pes (1993), Block (2008) and McIlwaine et al. (2010), with Márquez Reiter/Martín Rojo (2015) shifting attention to the sociolinguistics of Spanish in London. Aside from the linguistic landscape, their impact is seen in commercial, cultural and educational sites where Spanish is used. As Blommaert observes:

The locus where such landscapes are being documented is usually the late-modern, globalised city: a densely multilingual environment in which publicly visible written language documents the presence of a wide variety of (linguistically identifiable) groups of people. (Blommaert 2013, 1)

By “documenting” the presence of Spanish language varieties, we discover how concentrated or widespread particular language varieties are in London, the extent to which Spanish is used alongside English, and how diverse language practices drive, and are driven by, participants’ language ideologies. Not only is the linguistic landscape “the most visible marker of the linguistic vitality of the various ethnolinguistic groups living within a particular administrative or territorial enclave” (Landry and Bourhis 1997, 34), but also language has a “privileged position…as a tool for detecting features of superdiversity” (Blommaert 2013, 6).

Evidence of language practices in public spaces and of the underlying attitudes to such practices will offer insights into the transnational lifestyles of minority ethnic/linguistic communities such as Spanish-speakers, because social and linguistic features are, according to the definition offered by Gumperz and Hymes (1972), “dialectic, i.e.. co-constructive and, hence, dynamic” (Blommaert 2013, 7). In other words, the visual environment demonstrates which economic, cultural and linguistic practices exist and are visible in urban spaces (i.e. shopping, schooling, advertising of services, social clubs, solidarity associations), and how these practices are enacted in local sites which in turn create transterritorial connections between superdiverse global cities. Observing language practices also sheds light on how Spanish speakers place value on their language varieties. Language is a vehicle through which speakers negotiate their place within superdiverse cities, and—more demonstrably—the micro-level localities; yet its use can also be exclusionary when speakers use a variant not recognized as being the hegemonically-accepted dominant variety. An understanding of language ideologies is crucial when seeking to speakers’ perceptions of the languages they use, and the practices they adopt (or reject) in their diverse settings.

## 2.2. Language ideologies and cultural capital in teaching contexts

Woolard, a key theorist in the field of language ideology, writes that languages are “[r]epresentations, whether explicit or implicit, that construe the intersection of language and human beings in a social world” (1998, 3). These language ideologies form the conceptual “bridge” connecting the microculture of a language - how it is perceived, formed and used within L1 and L2 speakers’ discursive practices - with its macroculture *-* the broader social structures in the community where that language is found, particularly in multilingual language contact environments (Kroskrity 2000) such as London. Language ideologies also help us understand the value attached to what Bourdieu (1991) calls *cultural capital* that is, that is to say the linguistic skills they possess or which they acquire so as to be able to communicate with people in their immediate environment, or even to leverage opportunities in an idealised environment they plan to access in the future. In light of this, the present study seeks to establish how Spanish speakers perceive those intersections between their language use, their cultural capital, and their identity as learners, heritage speakers, and/or migrants.

The value of languages—and the resulting linguistic and social capital of speakers—fluctuates depending on the context in which it is “deployed’, therefore influencing the individual’s beliefs and psychological responses to language variation (Leeman 2012), as well as the subsequent linguistic choices migrants make in their everyday negotiations. This value also impacts upon the agency that speakers exercise when deploying their individual linguistic repertoires within the linguistic “market” of the city. In a diverse, globalised and multilingual city like London, certain perceptions of language value are likely to affect, and be affected by, the current visibility of the Spanish language. That visibility has increased over recent decades as the number of Spanish-speaking migrants has grown, and the language has become even more present in London. In most settings around (and travelling to) the research sites for this study, Spanish could be overheard being used by passers-by, people working remotely in cafés, and staff in the service and retail industries. Spanish is, to a certain extent, present all around, and by recognising the language ideologies at play in the contexts under consideration in this research it is possible to examine how that linguistic and cultural capital affects the attitudes and practices of both L1 and L2 speakers of Spanish.

Widespread, ideologically-driven attitudes towards the value of particular language varieties emerge in any given space, especially in superdiverse spaces and specifically within language education spaces in particular, where “multiple currents and constellations of ideology” exist (Train 2007, 211). As Train goes on to comment,

a critical awareness of the intersection of ideology, language, and education offers an avenue for recognising, confronting and questioning the ideologized realities of teaching and learning. (Train 2007, 211)

There is, then, an opportunity here to explore the ideologies which are expressed not only in an educational context but also, in line with Woolard’s claim that language ideologies are never just about language (1998), to consider the “important institutions in the life of language and its speakers which take a view on the value of language both to those individuals and to the community of language users” (Marimón Llorca 2015, 114). This article will also consider how these collective imaginaries of the Spanish language are rooted in the wider sociopolitical institutions and their associated policies such as the *Nueva Política Lingüística Panhispánica*.

## 2.3. Panhispanism and the Nueva Política Lingüística Panhispánica (NPLP)

The philosophy of *panhispanism* is nothing new, but constitutes a postcolonial approach to earlier Hispanism, that is, the pre-eminence of Spain’s cultural identity across all countries where Spanish is spoken (Andión Herrero et al. 2017, del Valle & Gabriel-Stheeman 2002, Moraña 2005, Moreno Fernández 2006; Villa & del Valle 2014). However, its conception in the mid-20th century when the *Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española* (ASALE) was founded, panhispanism has become an effective and significant framework to promote Spanish around the world and solidify its position as a key stakeholder in the global linguistic market.

This renewed panhispanic vision of language is driven by Spain’s *Real Academia Española* and ASALE who together are promoting a new image of apparent consensus among the Academies, fully collaborating in the production of dictionaries, grammars and other publications, and advancing their motto of “unity in diversity”. However, the reality is that the policies and associated activities outlined in the *Nueva Política Lingüística Panhispánica* (NPLP) are led by Madrid, where ASALE has its headquarters in the RAE. The Director of the RAE also automatically holds the position of President of ASALE. Publicly, the discourse of the NPLP espouses what Villa and del Valle call “moderate prescriptivism” (2014, 574), involving an acceptance of the pluricentric nature of Spanish norms, a commitment to produce every standardizing text as a collective effort approved by all national Academies, and a view that the Academies’ pronouncements are merely a response to popular demand by an anonymous public. In a speech launching one of the first publications of the NPLP era, the *Diccionario Panhispánico de Dudas* (DPD), the then-Director of the RAE stated:

Es nuestra obligación. Lo único que hemos hecho es estar atentos a lo que oímos en la calle, hacerlo nuestro y devolvérselo a los hablantes en forma de norma. La gente nos ha dado la tela y nosotros hemos confeccionado un traje. (El País 10 November 2005)

Underlying this metaphor of the linguistic tailor is the Academy’s belief that it takes the raw material of the Spanish language wherever it is spoken and produces a norm which is perceived as being of greater value than just “the word on the street’. This ideology of standardisation suggests that beliefs about language are not about language alone, and that in spite of its appeal to an anonymous public as the source of normativity (Gal & Woolard 2001), it is the wider socio-political context of “the street” which is the target of verbal hygiene (Cameron 2012).

The contemporary geopolitical context is important in understanding how and why the NPLP has developed. The rise of global English and the perceived threat of its cultural and commercial dominance means the Academies, the Instituto Cervantes, and other multinational corporate partners who provide support for the NPLP legitimise and naturalise a particular vision for Spanish and its role in the world. That vision is:

panhispánica, unida en su diversidad, global y capaz, por tanto, de ser generadora de prestigio y riqueza en el mercado mundial….una política lingüística bien planificada cuyo objetivo, como propuso Ángel López (Rosario, 2004), es derribar la tercera frontera del español, que es simbólica, de naturaleza ideológica y que consiste en ser el complemento simbólico e idiomático de la cultura global dominante, el inglés. (Marimón Llorca 2015, 114)

Fundamentally then, the language ideology of panhispanism centres on the belief that in the face of other powerful global languages and cultural identities, as well as the pluricentricity and considerable linguistic variety of Spanish across *la hispanofonía* (del Valle 2006), Spanish remains (and *should* remain) a unified language. This is not just on the basis of observed linguistic uniformity between its varieties in many areas of language structure (a uniformity which is partially observable, partially discursively constructed), but largely on the basis of non-linguistic factors such as cultural unity, “shared” history of colonialism, and the strategic geopolitical importance of the “imagined community” (Anderson 2001) of 500 million Spanish-speakers around the world.

In the context of language learning, the NPLP finds expression in part through the Instituto Cervantes, another Spanish state institution established to pursue “the promotion and teaching of the Spanish language and…the spread of Spanish and Hispano-American culture” (Instituto Cervantes 2007). It follows that another site in which the ideological-linguistic imagination (Marimón Llorca 2015) of this panhispanic linguistic norm is constructed and divulged can be found in language teaching contexts where Spanish is not an official language but where the language is taught as a first, second, and/or foreign language, such as in London. Indeed, as one Director has written, “El Instituto Cervantes debe ser un muestrario de lo mejor de la lengua y la cultura del mundo hispánico, con toda su variedad, con toda su riqueza, con toda su pluralidad y, también, con toda su homogeneidad” (Moreno Fernández 2003, 45). The Instituto Cervantes plays a crucial role in the development of panhispanism from a cultural, linguistic, and diplomatic perspective.

Wherever a language is taught through the formal education system, whether in compulsory or non-compulsory settings, in contexts where the language has official status or no status at all, delivery of the curriculum consists of a packaged version of the language which has been subject to a process (arguably an ideological process) of selection, standardization and commodification. The result is perceived as a commodity, skill, and product, such as a “Beginner”, “Intermediate” or “Advanced” level of Spanish, to which a student can purchase access and receive tuition as well as then acquiring the subsequent certification which confirms that product is now owned by the consumer. This can then transfer what Bourdieu (1991) referred to as “symbolic power” from the provider of the language tuition to the consumer, and in doing so, confirms the role of teaching in ideological flows:

Definitely, teaching can be interpreted as a system from which a symbolic power is exercised on the part of those who organise and direct it, which it is evident in all the components and phases of the teaching-learning process: the teachers, the programs, the assessment and consequently, certificates. In this way, teaching is an instrument of symbolic power, with an undeniable ideological base, as some of its instruments are considered to be fundamentals: the norms, rules, exams, grades, and certificates. (Moreno Fernández 2017, 15)

This neoliberal framing of the product and consumer has driven the growth of language teaching industries for a number of languages around the world, including both English and Spanish (Block et al. 2012, Flubacher & Del Percio 2017, Gray et al. 2018). Evidently, selections are made not only by the provider but also by the learners too, who select where they will learn the language and what the rationale is for that choice. In many cases, as attested by the data for this research, learners reflect the idea of an idealised norm of Spanish and will access that through whichever provider they believe can deliver this prestigious commodity. However, as Train writes:

The authoritative unitary state of the Spanish language (e.g., *el castellano, el español, el buen español*) implies the construction and imposition of an idealised native speaker norm (e.g., the *buen uso* or proper usage) as the normative center of discourse practices (Bartsch, 1987), with the assumed internalisation or nativization by speakers of a range of ideologies, behaviours, and affective stances attached to this norm. (Train 2007, 214)

Consequently, this naturalised, “common-sense” rationale of wanting to speak a unified, desirable variety of Spanish means that learners’ decisions reproduce the construction of such an idealised native speaker. In so doing, learners unconsciously align themselves with the “best” speakers or “proper” varieties, but as Train observes above, such a position is more ideological than it is intuitive.

# 3. Spanish in London’s classrooms

## 3.1. Research sites and methodology

In order to understand the practical application of theories pertaining to language ideology in the context of Spanish language learning in London, this study uses a mixed methodology drawn from the field of linguistic ethnography. In order to understand the latent language ideologies in the discourses of individuals, classrooms, schools and to some extent wider society, the fieldwork consists of participant observations and engagement with the learning communities in two London establishments: the Instituto Español Vicente Cañada Blanch and the Instituto Cervantes. While they differ in terms of the learners they house, the two institutions are of interest to this study because of the role that the learning environment plays in socialising learners into particular ways of thinking about language, whether explicitly or implicitly. Addressing language ideologies among Spanish heritage language (SHL) speakers in the USA, Leeman notes that:

Because school is a key site where young people are socialized into hegemonic value systems, research on pedagogical policies, practices, and materials can shed light on how language ideologies are reproduced in SHL instruction. In particular, research on language ideologies in SHL can reveal and problematize implicit assumptions regarding the goals of language instruction, the value of Spanish, the kinds of people who speak Spanish, the relationship of Spanish to “authentic” Latino identity, and which kind of Spanish is “best”, among other issues. (Leeman 2012, 44)

The Cañada Blanch is an independent school in West London sponsored by the Spanish government as part of its diplomatic mission to the UK. It currently educates around 500 pupils aged between 5-19, the majority of whom have at least one Spanish language parent or whom are from non-Spanish language families with an interest in their children receiving Spain’s compulsory school curriculum in a bilingual Spanish-English setting. Participating students include those who were UK-born to Spanish parents (who constitute the majority)[[2]](#footnote-2), UK-born to non-Spanish parents, and born in Spain to British or Spanish parents. As such, most of the student population is already bilingual with varying degrees of competence when they come to the school, depending on whether they have grown up in Spain, the UK, or elsewhere. The languages of students in classes that I observed (in addition to Spanish and English) included Catalan, Basque, Galician, Danish, Portuguese, Italian, and Serbian.

The second case study is the Instituto Cervantes, Spain’s official language and cultural institution with more than 70 such branches around the world. Its mission is “to promote Spanish language teaching throughout the world as well as Spain's co-official languages, in addition to fostering knowledge of the cultures of Spanish-speaking countries” (Instituto Cervantes, 2018). Learners based here at their Central London office (located in the heart of City of London, the city’s business and legal district) are adults interested in improving their language skills for a variety of personal and professional reasons.

In both institutional research sites, classroom observations and focus group interviews were carried out. This method of gathering data was selected as a way of exploring the “shared knowledge, lay theories and ideologies that underpin explanations of social phenomena” (Cogo 2012, 238). A further benefit of focus groups as opposed to individual questionnaires or direct interviews is that there is an element of “co-construction” whereby the participants discursively construct and potentially perform the expression of their views and evaluations, both in response to initial questions but also in response to the contributions of other participants.

The focus group discussions are carried out with students following the structured lesson they have just taken part in. The subjects and levels studied in these lessons depend on the access provided by the institution to the researcher, so in the IECB school, the lessons ranged from Spanish language and linguistics, through Geography and Economics to class-based Physical Education. At the Instituto Cervantes, a variety of Intermediate and Advanced stage Spanish language lessons were observed, and the students in these then took part in the focus groups. The same lessons were also audio-recorded and visually observed, and field notes were taken throughout the lesson in order to capture aspects such as the number of students, gender distribution, classroom layout, content and language of any notices and publicity on the walls and noticeboards, how the lesson was organised, how teacher-student interactions were structured, and whether the teacher corrected students’ use of language according to a particular norm. Additionally, to gather further data from key policy makers such as class teachers and directors of study, semi-structured interviews were designed for this study to gather data from the Principals/Directors of each institution (see Appendix 2). The focus of these interviews included discussions relating to the policy-making processes relevant to their work, the strategic goals of language study, the pedagogical practices of their respective organisations, and the institutional interaction with broader policies such as Spanish educational and diplomatic policies. Their awareness of the NPLP and its perceived impact upon the practices in that place were also explored in these interviews.

At Cañada Blanch these focus group interviews were spread across three different year groups in the secondary section of the school, so as to capture a variety of ages, language competencies and reasons for studying at the school. Figure 1 shows the age, gender, and origin of the student participants.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Ages | M | F | UK-born | Spain-born | Other-born[[3]](#footnote-3) |
| 1º Bachillerato (A) | 17-18 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| 1º Bachillerato (B) | 17-18 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 1 |
| 4º ESO (A) | 15-16 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 4º ESO (B) | 15-16 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 2º ESO | 13-14 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Total |  | 8 | 18 | 8 | 17 | 1 |

Fig 1. Student focus groups at the Instituto Español Vicente Cañada Blanch

A total of six lessons were observed across the different year groups covering Spanish language, Geography, PE theory, and Economics. Most lessons were delivered in Spanish because the students follow a compulsory curriculum that prepares students for exams and qualifications from Spain’s education system. In the case of Geography, this is delivered in English as a matter of school policy, as are English-language classes. Small focus groups lasting between 45 and 100 minutes each were carried out involving a total of 26 students, and the guiding questions can be seen in Appendix 1. The discussions followed the line of questioning outlined in the appendix, though with certain groups such as the first of two Bachillerato groups, they had just finished a class on Spanish linguistics, so I was able to make reference to a number of concepts they had covered in the class and which were relevant to my research, such as standardisation and linguistic varieties. This was coincidental rather than planned, and in most cases the focus groups followed classes which did not provide any relevant context to the discussion of students’ language practices.

At the Instituto Cervantes, focus group interviews were carried out with two Intermediate and two Advanced level groups. A total of four lessons were observed across these levels, including a mixture of morning, afternoon, and evening classes to capture the demographics of different groups, For example, retirees studying Spanish for travel are more likely to attend during the day whereas working-age students will often attend evening sessions after work. Small focus groups lasting from 30 to 60 minutes each were carried out involving a total of 13 students, as shown in figure 2.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | M | F | UK-born | Other-born |
| Intermediate (A) | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 |
| Intermediate (B) | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Advanced (A) | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Advanced (B) | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
|  | 6 | 7 | 9 | 4 |

Fig 2. Student focus groups at the Instituto Cervantes.

Following my transcription of the recorded data and fieldwork notes, the data was collated as text using qualitative data analysis software (NVivo) to enable coding of recurrent themes arising *a priori* from the theoretical framework and research questions, as well as *in vivo* from the data itself through key terms employed by participants or emerging conceptual patterns. Data analysis itself involved a thematic content analysis of the interviews, field notes, curricular guides and policy documents. These data were examined for evidence of how speakers of Spanish - whatever their level of proficiency - discursively think about and evaluate their own use of the language, the ways that other speakers use the language, and the broader value of the language and its many varieties. This analysis reveals something of the complex ways speakers index certain language attitudes, evaluations, and ideologies (whether explicit or implicit) with regards to the varieties of Spanish they use and those with which they come into contact.

## 3.2. Perceptions and value of Spanish language varieties

Content analysis of the data reveals a number of recurring themes which emerge from discourses of students of Spanish both as a first (L1) language users and second (L2) language users.

### 3.2.1 Adolescent L1 and L2 learners: the Instituto Español Cañada Blanch

One very common perception among students is that linguistic varieties relate hierarchically to a fixed, overall Spanish language, and that any variety is a dialect which is subordinate to “la regla general” of the standard form.

This is exemplified by this statement from a 1º Bachillerato (age 16-17) student at the Instituto Español Cañada Blanch (IECB):

Student: Sería (sic) como **dialectos** porque en España tienes **un español que entiende todo el mundo** y luego **cada uno tiene sus singularidades** siempre y cuando no se han ...they don't overpower they don't overcome la regla general

(IECB\_069/1ºBach)

For the most part, students at IECB frame their discussion of language variety in neutral or positive terms. Students debate which are thought to be the most prevalent Spanish varieties heard around the school (some say Galician, others say Andalusian) and how exposure to different Spanish varieties among students provokes feelings of amusement and mutual joking:

when I came and there were like ten people from Andalucía speaking in an Andalusian accent it was very funny

(IECB\_069/1ºBach)

And also it's kind of nice that we have a variety because we also kind of like make fun of each other’s dialects so like the people from southern Spain like to say ajo a lot so ajo is kind of like cebolla, what is the word, onion, they like to say ajo to a friend of ours. So we like to make fun of that but then I'm from Madrid, when I say Madrid I don't say the “d” at the end so they also make fun of that, so we make fun of each other's accent. And Alejandro who's from the Canary Islands, they say the bus instead of el autobus they call it la guagua, so we make fun of that.

(IECB\_079/2ºESO)

A common dichotomy presents itself in the data is that between varieties which provoke a sense of sounding more or less interesting:

El acento venezolano y cubano me ... de la Republica Dominicana me encanta me encanta me encanta I feel like it's more exciting, more musical kind of, they say things with passion whereas with Spanish - maybe because I've heard it so much here on a daily basis - I just find it ... dull.

(IECB\_069/1ºBach)

When they all speak I say that Spanish accent is the dullest most boring accent ever. Yeah it's the most boring but it's the one we tend to find the most smart.

(IECB\_069/1ºBach)

There are also discourses reflecting a lesser value placed on certain varieties for various reasons. One student reflects negatively on the likelihood of her own variety of Spanish changing due to her future return to Spain:

Me da miedo el año que viene a mi porque yo vuelvo a España not by choice but because my mum's going back and I'm forced to come back with my parents y me da miedo el año que viene acabar con un acento murciano porque en la zona de Alicante es un acento murciano que es horible y me da mucha rabia y no quiero.

(IECB\_069/1ºBach)

There is also evidence that different varieties of Spanish are hierarchized in the school as a result of their geographical provenance and, therefore, linguistic structure. Furthermore, there is a hierarchy of value by which regional varieties - and in some cases other national varieties of the Spanish-speaking world - are judged in relation to the standard language variety of Spain. This also relies on a discourse of authority which argues that the origins of Spanish should continue to determine the prevalent norms of the language:

Student 1: The well the Colombian accent or South American accent, I don't like it because it's kind of incorrect because **it's the language that Spain kind of created** so it's kind of like changing it so

Student 2: So basically like a **cheap imitation.**

(IECB\_079/2ºESO)

Spanish from beyond Spain is not only seen as an imitation of “the original” but also a “cheap” one. Various perceptions indicate what del Valle identifies as “ideologies of pluricentricity and standardization” (del Valle 2014, 364). That is, there are varieties which are identifiable and recognised as having an indexical role as pluricentric norms in their “home” locations, but the norms of standardization and particularly the elevation of the central Castilian variety mean that even in a transnational, global city context such as London, assumptions of validity and prestige are replicated.

### 3.2.2 Adult L2 learners: The Instituto Cervantes

Perceptions of different varieties of Spanish among adult learners of Spanish at the Instituto Cervantes (IC), indicate that learners dichotomise two basic varieties, “Spanish Spanish” and “Latin American Spanish”.

*P:* There are a few people in the class who have **good accents** and other people who have **less good accents**. It is something you can hear when people speak **whether they sound like a Spanish person** or they sound like an English person trying to speak Spanish

*Interviewer*: Can you give me any examples of the give-aways of a good accent or a less good accents?

*P:* People say “TH” /𝝷/ instead of “S” and things like that or ON instead of EN or they confuse it with Italian

(IC\_067/Intermediate)

Learner P equates a “good accent” with sounding like a Spaniard, and when asked what “good” sounds like, Learner P describes a unique feature of standard Castilian Spanish (distinction between pronunciation of graphemes **c** and **z** as /𝝷/, and s as /**s**/) and contrasts it with the marked phonetic variation of Spanish varieties from southern Spain and the Americas (seseo, or lack of distinction between **c**, **z**, and **s** which are all pronounced as /**s**/) which they deem to be characteristic of “less good accents”. This ideology of authenticity determines that success as a learner means sounding accurate and authentic like native speakers that use a prestigious variety, the so-called “good accent”. Such an ideology holds for not just fellow learners but the teachers who model the standard variety, too. Asked if they were aware of any official IC policy on standard language, responses were interesting:

F: They employ Spanish Castilian speaking teachers. Is that right? Other organisations employ more Latin American teachers of Spanish my understanding is that **here you get more Spanish-Spanish** yeah?

L: But there’s a lot of

F: I have to come clean at this point **it’s one of the reasons I came here** because that’s what I learned originally I suppose

Interviewer: Is that true of the others? That you chose the Cervantes because of the Spanish that you expected to learn?

C: No

L: Well **it’s official Spanis**h

P: It’s **the official institution**

(IC\_067/Intermediate)

Here, learner discourse indicates that Spanish-Spanish is considered to be prestigious and that a high value is placed on the variety that teachers use. Some learners indicate their desire to replicate this variety through their learning, and Learner F justified why they choose to learn Spanish there (“I have to come clean at this point”) on the basis of the IC’s perceived employment policy (employing Spanish Castilian teachers) which, if true, favours particular linguistic norms. Learner F also reinforced the linguistic normativity to which they were exposed during their previous learning experience (“what I originally learned”) and summarised the value of both the language and teaching institution with the positive term “official”. Another L2 learner in an Intermediate group at the IC agrees with this sentiment, saying:

M: **I would actively stay away from a place that had South American teachers** because it confuses me as they do things differently and their accent is different.

ME: The accents, I really disagree. I like the variety. I like that the pronunciation is different. It’s good. Is it the Paraguayans that claim to speak the perfect Spanish? I love all the quirks and the differences. It’s one of the appeals for me in Spanish.

M: I’ve seen some places offering teaching in South American Spanish and then Spain Spanish. Different classes.

(IC\_0084/Intermediate)

By virtue of being “different” as well as the personal rationale of finding difference confusing, learner M claims they would choose a place of learning based on the variety of Spanish taught. This ideology is contested by learner ME on the basis of the “quirks and differences” that are valued positively and appeal to them.

Additionally, learners’ views and expectations reveal who models the desirable variety of Spanish to imitate:

ME: I find it interesting the idea that there are levels of value though, like is this person speaking good Spanish. You might be able to be understood or understand both of them but do you have a view about **one being better than the other**?

M: When I listen to politicians or the king of Spain, I don’t know how well they’re actually speaking. It’s like footballers, when it’s footballers the flow of the conversation is quite good but whether they’re speaking complete rubbish, my Spanish isn’t good enough to work out. **You expect politicians to speak a very high level of good Spanish and then expect footballers to speak not so good a level but I’m not good enough to tell.**

ME: My neighbour in Spain with whom I frequently chat via WhatsApp has just terrible written Spanish. She comes from a village and probably left school when she was 13, she never learned any grammar, her spelling is dire. So, probably that’s not very good Spanish, written Spanish, but her spoken Spanish is perfect, as far as I can tell.

(IC\_084/Intermediate)

L2 learners also reflect on the varieties that they are studying, and unlike some of their colleagues, do not always link that to a specific geography or prestigious identity, speaking instead of a more functional “textbook Spanish”:

I think the Spanish that I speak is quite bland, it’s probably a bit dull, because you don’t have those good colloquial phrases that probably make the conversation more lively, so it’s all about making yourself understood rather than expressing tone, more factual, more workmanlike.

Interviewer: If you had to describe the variety using whichever terms you would use how would you describe it?

ME: Really interesting question. I would say textbook Spanish

J: Yes I was going to say it’s been mediated through textbooks

(IC\_084/Intermediate)

Yet the same person reflects later on what variety it is not, and reveals some of their own attitudes towards these contrasting varieties:

Learner ME: I spend all my time in Spain in Andalucía and this is definitely not Andalusian Spanish we’re learning here. Probably just as well, cos the only people to understand Andalusian seem to me to be other Andalusians! (All laugh) I can never understand a word they say. Whereas if I’m in Madrid, it’s rare that that would happen to me. It’s certainly not Andalusian that we’re learning here.

(IC\_084/Intermediate)

As well as contrasting supposedly high-level and low-level social actors, learners appeal to the authenticity of a high register “norma culta” spoken by politicians, monarchs and academics who happen to be the public face of the NPLP. In this sense, whether the detail of the content of the NPLP is understood or not by speakers around the world, the NPLP relies on ideologies of prestige that promote valued figureheads of that language. Other social actors (e.g. footballers, regional identities such as Andalusians) model a variety which is differently authentic and indexed to a lack of educational achievement.

In terms of their own educational progress, perceptions of the value of Spanish (regardless of variety) affect both L1 and L2 speakers. For L1 speakers at IECB, Spanish as a commodity with certification of proficiency either through the GCSE or DELE is valuable for their future plans. Some 4º ESO students (aged 15-16) are planning to leave IECB to enter the English sixth-form system to pursue A-level qualifications[[4]](#footnote-4), but recognise the advantage they have had from speaking not only one but two global languages and will often study Spanish as an A-level to “keep it going”. Achieving particular benchmark qualifications underpins the perceived instrumentality of Spanish and is seen as guaranteeing a future “capital” benefit. The increasing visibility of Spanish in London (Paffey 2020) linked with its growing global population influences how much value the language carries, and also opens up other streams of social/emotional capital (partnerships, marriage, personal identity, etc). This is equally true of L2 learners who choose to take up Spanish language classes. They too report the opportunities created by learning and using it, whether social (friendships both in UK and Spain, learning partner’s language/culture), commercial (business, career advancement) or personal (Spanish citizenship application, impending Brexit).

## 3.3. Language ideologies, policies and practices

In both institutions, key teaching staff are employed directly by the Spanish authorities. In the case of IECB, teachers are civil servants of the Spanish state who receive their training and initial professional experience in Spain, apply for a teaching place in London and, if successful, are appointed for a 6-year period, after which they must return to work in Spain for a number of years before they are permitted to re-apply for a longer posting in London. The Instituto Cervantes also has core staff in the London centre who are employed via Madrid under Spanish contracts, with just a few ancillary staff employed locally using UK employment and conditions. As the IC is part of Spain’s cultural diplomacy strategy (Lamo de Espinosa & Badillo Matos 2016), teaching staff in London are, in effect, cultural diplomats representing the “soft-power” interests of the Spanish state overseas. This would imply that the expectation is that language ideologies identifiable within the Spanish state would inform the work of individual teachers and the collective efforts of the Instituto Cervantes.

At the IECB, the curriculum and teaching policies must adhere to Spain’s Ley Orgánica de Educación and cannot be amended locally. Also, in matters of language, the curriculum is mostly delivered in Spanish with a few subjects (English, Maths, Geography) delivered in English, particularly for those who intend to take GCSE exams aged 15-16 instead of progressing to the Spanish *Bachillerato[[5]](#footnote-5)*. While there is no localised policy on curriculum or language, it is still possible to conceive of local language *ideologies* in terms of what underpins institutional and individual attitudes towards standards, pluricentric norms, and other varieties.

## 3.4. “London Spanish?” Linguistic convergence or Spanglish codeswitching?

Students’ reflections of their own language practices revealed an awareness that the maintenance of distinctive characteristics from their multiple linguistic backgrounds and repertoires gives way to a convergence towards what they saw as standard Spanish.

S1: That's why when you're here because you're surrounded by so many different accents it just turns into one standard accent.

S2: Sí yo creo que todos hemos perdido un poco el acento o sea desde principio del curso hasta ahora hemos llegado a un español mas estándar

S3: Es como que te quieres adaptar. Tienes muchas variedades y luego en medio hay algo y todos queremos seguir a este medio...

(IECB\_069/1ºBach)

Students did not regret this shift towards a collective standardised variety, evaluating it as a better position to be in, as this would eradicate “wrong” aspects of their individual speech varieties. Such convergence and emerging commonality could indicate what one of the IC adult learners called “textbook” Spanish. Rather than being identified with central-northern Spain, this convergent variety would index the specific educational context—a multilingual school community situated in a global city—and therefore index the opportunities and “capital” that arise from such an education.

In addition to this convergence, students at the IECB point towards Spanglish as one of the linguistic practices that mark the particularities of being Spanish speakers in London, arguing that it is often vital for successful communication in a multilingual context:

C: I think it's amazing. When I'm speaking Spanish and I don't know what the word is, I just add it in English.

D: Well I can use Spanglish with my friends so if I’m speaking in English and I don't know something I just say it in Spanish and I know they are going to understand.

(IECB\_075/2ºESO)

However, the ideology of standardisation and linguistic purism mean that Spanglish was not deemed acceptable by all students, and furthermore is not considered as being acceptable in wider society, leading some to reflect negatively about it:

I feel like using English and Spanish is just an easier way for us to communicate. But we know for sure that if we go outside of school like with certain English persons that don't know any Spanish like you wouldn't really like if I went to Sainsbury's or something I wouldn't really say "where are the manzanas?" Cos they don't know.

(IECB\_075/4ºESO)

I try to avoid speaking Spanenglish (sic) so sometimes when I'm stuck on a word I might ask "oh what is this word" in Spanish or in English sometimes, but if I'm speaking in English and I can't really get the word then I'll ask in Spanish […] I just feel like I shouldn't really use Spanenglish (sic).

(IECB\_079/2ºESO)

For both L1 and L2 learners, the predominance of the prestigious standard form, and the standardising tools of dictionaries and grammar guides are difficult to resist. The Instituto Cervantes bases its worldwide curriculum across all 70+ centres on the *Plan Curricular* (Instituto Cervantes 2006), setting out the content and goals of its teaching and mapped against the Common European Framework of Reference. Highlighted within its introductory pages is a statement which emphasises the institutional centrality of one specific variety:

Los Niveles de referencia para el español no son, tampoco, un instrumento de descripción normativa del español. Para desarrollar las especificaciones de los inventarios se parte **del español peninsular central-septentrional** y se incluyen especificaciones sobre otras variedades del español. Tanto las especificaciones como los ejemplos que se dan en los distintos inventarios responden en general a **la norma culta**, si bien se incluyen también aspectos relacionados con el uso coloquial —especialmente en los niveles más altos—, cuyo dominio denota un mayor grado de profundidad en el conocimiento y uso de la lengua por parte del alumno. (Author’s emphasis) (Instituto Cervantes 2006)

While this clearly sets out a preference for its global teaching framework, discourse among IC students and teaching staff on a local level appeared to reflect a greater acceptance and value of a multiplicity of varieties, or at least limited explicit focus on the north-central peninsular Spanish variety. The pluricentrism of the NPLP sits somewhat at odds with the specific naming of this one variety, though it is of course understandable that an organisation established by the Spanish government would underpin its cultural diplomacy efforts with a Spain-centric ideology of linguistic authority. Furthermore the IC’s role as partner in the NPLP means it supports the dissemination of standardising publications such as the *Gramática Panhispánica* (RAE-ASALE 2009), *Diccionario Panhispánico de Dudas* (RAE-ASALE 2005), as well as its own publications, *Las 500 dudas más frecuentes del español* (Instituto Cervantes 2013), and *El libro del español correcto* (Instituto Cervantes 2012) among others.

These publications promoting standard language usage may still shape many of the attitudes and related language ideological debates (Blommaert 1999) about Spanish, but the perception of the institutions behind them, particularly the Real Academia Española (RAE), is less robust. A common view among students was that the RAE is that it is necessary but outdated:

R: A ver yo creo que la RAE está bien pero me parece anticuada [...] yo creo que la RAE se queda atrás como que intenta demasiado retener lo que ya está que está bien porque hay que tener unas normas y todo pero si empieza a [...] a mucha gente cada vez más tiene que avanzar y creo que la RAE avanza muy poco.

(IECB\_069/1ºBach)

The NPLP has provided a platform for the RAE to continue its work of modernisation, to provide more rapid responses to language change, and to collate the efforts of the “sister academies” of ASALE in this panhispanic project. I would argue that while seeking to counter attitudes such as the one expressed by the IECB student above, the RAE uses its key position in the NPLP to focus on sustaining Madrid’s leading role in the ASALE as *primus inter pares*, maintaining the benefits of profit and prestige for Spain that come from the global expansion of Spanish as a first, second and foreign language, including in superdiverse sites such as London.

# 4. Perceptions, ideologies, and practices: some conclusions

The Spanish language is increasingly visible and audible in London, due to growing numbers of both L1 speakers and L2 learners of this global language. This growth is taking place at a time when the coordination of language standardization and promotion is taking place against the backdrop of the *Nueva Política Lingüística Panhispánica (NPLP)*, bringing together the Real Academia Española, the Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española, the Instituto Cervantes, and other partner organisations to drive forward:

una determinada visión de la lengua española: panhispánica, unida en su diversidad, global y capaz, por tanto, de ser generadora de prestigio y riqueza en el mercado mundial….una política lingüística bien planificada cuyo objetivo, como propuso Ángel López (Rosario, 2004), es derribar la tercera frontera del español, que es simbólica, de naturaleza ideológica y que consiste en ser el complemento simbólico e idiomático de la cultura global dominante, el inglés. (Marimón Llorca 2015, 114)

There is tension between the stated declarations of the NPLP regarding the pluricentric norms that govern Spanish development in its global expansion, and yet the place of Spain’s language authorities within this policy initiative, and the prevalence of European Spanish norms. This debate concerning language ideology and the value of a given standard variety takes place not only where the language is “native” but also in contexts such as the Instituto Español Cañada Blanch, an independent all-through school, and the Instituto Cervantes, Spain’s official language and culture teaching agency, both of which have sites in London. It is in sites such as these where discourses concerning ideologies of Spanish are propagated and where the effects of the NPLP on these discourses are easily identifiable.

By analysing the discourse of learners in each organisation, language ideologies about discrete languages (Spanish, English, Catalan) and varieties (Andalusian, Valencian, Mexican, Colombian) are embedded in learners’ beliefs. These relate to, and are driven by, not just the traditional “pillars” of Spanish language (dictionaries, grammar guides) that have hitherto been the major preoccupation of language policy makers. Now, the NPLP impacts on contexts outside of the “official” Spanish-speaking world, and it is of interest to note how language ideologies emerge locally and thus reflect or differ from national or global language ideologies. In numerous focus groups carried out with learners, patterns emerged which demonstrate the “persuasiveness of the ubiquitous standard language ideology” (2007: 89), yet which are also highly nuanced and, in some cases, apparently self-contradictory concerning the value of non-standard varieties of Spanish. In the data, some students revealed the value that they hold for the prestigious standard variety while at the same time criticizing language academies and other organisations which promote the very ideologies with which they initially agree.

At the interface between the teaching of this panhispanic language and the learners themselves, there is little or no consciousness of these overarching market forces or symbolic battles for dominance on the global linguistic stage. Nevertheless, what does emerge is a *de facto* co-officiality between English and Spanish in hyperlocal areas such as within the school and its community, where alternative local language ideologies contest the national dominance of “English only”, reflecting that symbolic contestation of the predominance of English. Simultaneously, the ideology that puts language at the centre of identity leads to the negotiation of students’ Spanishness and Englishness through hybrid linguistic practices, such as codeswitching, translanguaging, varietal convergence and complex multilingualism.

Under current prevailing ideologies, particularly given the current visibility of the Spanish language in multilingual London, the practice of city-specific variations of Spanish is likely to give rise to ideologies of purity (do not mix language varieties) and standardization (say X not Y). This may result in limited valorisation or even devalorisation in the same way that “Spanglish” is often seen (including in students’ discourse here) as something one does to fill an immediate communicative need but not something that should index a particular identity, such as a “London Spanish”. It has not been within the scope of this study to explore the nature of these practices (only students’ reflections on them) but this will be a crucial task for further scholarship to interrogate what form a London Spanish might take and how this mirrors the development of Spanish/Spanglish among US Latinos.

In all of the situations considered in this study, whether L1 heritage language learners in compulsory schooling or L2 adults learning Spanish for diverse purposes, choices are made which add to the linguistic, social, and cultural capital of speakers. As del Valle writes, “variation is inherent to all dimensions of language, and choices—at different levels of awareness—are constantly made.” (2014b, 358). Such choices are deeply rooted in speakers’ ideologies, attitudes, and perceptions of that variation and in both L1 and L2 language teaching contexts, students should receive a critical awareness of these otherwise latent or potentially invisible ideologies, precisely because this pedagogic dialogue can avoid what Train calls the “de-legitimizing discourses surrounding Spanish and Spanish speakers” that play a role in “activation and perpetuating prejudices and stereotypes” (Train 2007, 227). One of the key places to challenge de-legitimizing discourses is in the classroom, where teachers should:

conocer y explicar con claridad hasta qué punto llega la diversidad y la unidad de la lengua, así como qué significado social y lingüístico tienen sus nombres. El profesor de español como lengua segunda o extranjera debe tener una formación básica —y disponer de una información adecuada —sobre la realidad dialectal de la lengua que enseña. (Moreno Fernández 2003, 39)

Greater awareness among language learners of how linguistic diversity is constructed and perceived must be more widely implemented in educational contexts, and it is evident that this ideological awareness-raising will also depend on not only the curricular content of the language-learning classroom, but also the knowledge and willingness of language teachers to do so by adopting inclusive and appropriate pedagogies in this age of global Spanish.
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# Appendix 1

## Student Focus Group question guide

1. START: Which language would you like to use? No right/wrong answers, not a test—views, opinions, experiences
2. How many of you are from families where Spanish is the main home language? Are other languages used in your homes?
3. On a typical day, could you tell me which languages you would use, and when you would use them?
4. In particular, can you tell me about how you use the Spanish language in your life? (i.e. contexts, people, level of proficiency, formal/informal language education, personal/family/school/institutional/faith/social/sport settings; what influence do your language practices have on how you identify yourself? what motivates your language choice in specific contexts?)
5. Why are you at this school?
6. Do you hear different varieties of Spanish around the school? How do you know it’s different? Where do you hear these? What do you think of these? Are there any you like/dislike? What kinds of words would you use to describe these language varieties? Would others agree/disagree?
7. Is it important to speak in a particular way here?
8. Who do you think speaks “good” Spanish? People at school/on TV/ elsewhere? Do staff correct you? Give examples.
9. What will you do in the future? How do you plan to use your languages?
10. If you have doubts about the language, what do you do?
11. Do you hear different varieties of English around the school? Where? What do you think of these? What kinds of words would you use to describe these language varieties? Would others agree/disagree?
12. Do you understand the term “standard language’? What is it? Do you speak it? Do you know anyone who speaks it?

# Appendix 2

## Policy maker/Stakeholder interview questions

1. Can you tell me something about your role in the school? What influenced your decision to live in London? What influenced your decision to work at this institution? What influenced your decision to live in the specific area of London that you do? Do you identify yourself as a Londoner/British/mixed-nationality/Hispanic/Spanish-speaker/multilingual/other—please explain.)

2. How would you describe the variety of the Spanish language that is spoken in the classrooms? (standard/dialectal/national variety/ “Londonised Spanish” variety—how so?)

3. What are the specific policies that guide how language(s) are used in the school? What is the source of these? What is the nature of the specific localized implementation of these policies? What informs the schools implementation of external policies? What informs the school’s implementation of internal policies?

4. How are teaching staff trained in bilingualism/ intercultural education?

5. How does the process of designing and delivering language classes in this school work? What is the source of these curricular frameworks?

6. Beyond the school, what importance do you think Spanish has in London? (in the contexts you are linked to/in other contexts e.g. business, diplomacy, cultural life, education, retail, employment market, media, tourism?)

# Appendix 3

## NVivo coding categories (“Nodes”)

Nodes are the tools used to tag particular words or groups of words so that these can be treated as data subsets with a common node. For example, any reference in an interview, focus group or policy document to language as a unifying factor could be classified with the node “belonging” and/or “identity. The use of nodes produces a collection of references which can then be further interrogated for word frequency or correlation with other terms, and from which patterns can be subsequently identified.

* CONCEPT

o accept

o belonging

o identity

o moral

o power

o resist

o solidarity

* IDEOLOGY

o authenticity

o authority

o legitimacy

o standardization

* + INSTITUTION

o ASALE

o Cañada Blanch

o IC

o RAE

* + LANGUAGE

o change-adaptation

o competency

o evaluate-judge

o growth

o importance of lang

o importance of speaker

o London Spanish

o national variety

o Other languages

o regional variety

o role of lang

o sexism

* + LEARNER

o learners FL

o learners L1

o learners L2

* + POLICY

o NPLP

o policy GLOBAL

o policy LOCAL

o policy NATIONAL

o policy REGIONAL

* + PRACTICE

o agency - collective

o agency - individual

o codeswitching

o monolingualism

o multilingualism

1. While the broader data collection also included lesson observations and individual interviews with the directors of each institution as well as managers responsible for curriculum design and implementation, the constraints of this article require a focus on the student interactions as a source of language attitudes and ideologies. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Enrolment figures at the Instituto Cañada Blanch in 2018 cited 18 new entrants with Spanish nationality, of whom 15 were born in the UK. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Other-born refers to students who were born in countries where Spanish is not a national or official language, and who were therefore learning Spanish at IECB as a second or third language. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. A-levels are qualifications taken by students in England and Wales at the end of compulsory education (aged 18). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. *Bachillerato* is the post-compulsory phase of Spanish education (16-17 years old) leading towards the university entrance exam (PAU: Pruebas de Acceso a la Universidad). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)