

CAFÉ PARA TODOS: A CRITICAL NARRATIVE OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION
POLICY AND PRACTICE IN MONOLINGUAL SPAIN

By

Grant Alexander Skoglund

A Thesis Presented to

The Faculty of Humboldt State University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Applied Anthropology

Committee Membership

Dr. Mary Scoggin, Committee Chair

Rebecca Robertson, Committee Member

Dr. Llyn Smith, Committee Member

Rebecca Robertson, Program Graduate Coordinator

December 2018

ABSTRACT

CAFÉ PARA TODOS: A CRITICAL NARRATIVE OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION POLICY AND PRACTICE IN MONOLINGUAL SPAIN

Grant Skoglund

This research presents an ethnographic account of English bilingual programs in public Spanish high schools, exploring not only how such programs currently function in the eyes of stakeholders, but also the significance of bilingualism in the context of an English Imperative perspective. This perspective, shown to be widely adopted by research participants, sees English as a practical necessity in contemporary Spanish society for future success in a globalized world. The objective of this research is to situate bilingual policy and programming within a larger socio-economic and political context and elucidate the attitudes and opinions of key policy actors – students and teachers – as constructive in the meaning of bilingual education and the taking up of English. Methods include participant observation, conducted through the researcher's concurrent role within bilingual high schools as an English language assistant, as well as teacher interviews and student focus groups. Qualitative data was analyzed using thematic coding, revealing key themes pertaining to the functioning of bilingualism and issues faced therein, and the terms with which participants interpret and understand the importance of English acquisition. Bilingual policy in Spain is ultimately shown to serve in response to, and in the cultivation of, English Imperative views. Finally,

recommendations are made for further aligning policy and program design with the experiences and perspectives of stakeholders and their understandings of what it means to take up English.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	ix
INTRODUCTION	1
Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)	9
Research Questions	11
Rationale	11
BACKGROUND RESEARCH	14
Literature Review.....	14
Global English and language ideology	14
Beyond Europe – English in education globally.....	17
Europe and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL).....	21
Research from Spain	24
METHODS	32
Field Sites.....	33

Participants.....	34
Teachers	34
Students	37
Participant Recruitment	38
Teacher recruitment	39
Student recruitment.....	40
Interviews.....	42
Focus Groups	44
Participant Observation.....	46
Analysis.....	48
Transcription	49
Thematic content analysis.....	50
FINDINGS	53
Teacher Views and Responses.....	54
On becoming a bilingual teacher – <i>Las Oposiciones y el bilingüismo</i>	55
Program functioning	60
Training opportunities and communication.....	61
Elective to Obligatory	69
Student Views and Responses	72

English-for-work	74
<i>Nivel medio, nivel básico</i>	75
English-for-mobility	81
Combining the two: mobility-for-work	83
DISCUSSION	88
Bilingual Education as “Good” Policy	88
Bilingualism in the context of hegemony	94
Recommendations	96
Limitations to Research	100
Directions for Future Research	101
REFERENCES	103
APPENDICES	109

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Thematic codes used in analysis.....	51
---	----

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Map of Spain	4
------------------------------	---

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: Informed consent form.....	109
Appendix B: Recruitment letter to bilingual centers	112
Appendix C: Recruitment letter to bilingual coordinators.....	113
Appendix D: Parental consent form.....	114
Appendix E: Minor assent form.....	117
Appendix F: Spanish language certificate	120
Appendix G: Interview schedule	121
Appendix H: Focus group schedules	122
Appendix I: Interview transcript excerpt	124
Appendix J: Focus group transcript excerpt	126

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this research is to explore the views, perceptions, attitudes and opinions of the principal stakeholders and apparent beneficiaries of English bilingual education in monolingual Spain – teachers and students – to further understand public bilingualism in terms of policy, program design and implementation. This ethnographic study takes an inductive approach to shed light on the significance of bilingual secondary education through a sociocultural rather than pedagogical lens. Its aim is to explain not only how bilingualism currently functions in Spain, but also how it is contextualized within a wider social, economic and political environment which has seen increasing demand for English acquisition. Such demand is evidenced not only through the continuous expansion of bilingual programs throughout the country over the last decade, but also through greater numbers of private English academies, high enrollments in English classes administered through public language schools and common usage of English words and phrases in commercial contexts as well as in conversational vernacular, all marking an increased prevalence of English in contemporary Spanish society (Luján-García, 2012).

The above factors, not least significantly public bilingual programs themselves, relate to the cultivation of what is referred to in this research as an English Imperative view. This view toward the taking up of English is characterized by an unshaken belief in the indispensable utility of the language, positioning it as a necessary resource for economic success and future prosperity. In short, the English Imperative dictates that

English is an absolute necessity and a basic requisite in facilitating mobility and employability in a globalized world.

Taking just one example from above to contextualize the socioeconomic ambit in which the English Imperative view takes shape, private language academies – largely specializing in English teaching and credentialing – have become a formidable industry in Spain. In the region of Andalusia alone (see below), private English academies have an estimated annual revenue of 500 million euros (J.L.P., 2018; Muñoz Bolanos, 2014). As evidence of the industry's expansion, companies incorporated under the *Asociación de Centros de Enseñanza de Idiomas de Andalucía* (ACEIA) have grown from 59 to 94 between 2014 and 2018, now representing 150 teaching centers which annually serve over 150,000 students, up from a reported 50,000 students in 2014 (Muñoz Bolaños, 2014; Muñoz Bolaños, 2018). Significantly, those institutionally registered centers account for only 60% of the regions total industry, the remaining 40% comprised of what have been characterized as intrusive pseudo-academies offering low-cost and supposedly lower-quality options for people looking to more affordably acquire English competencies and certifications (J.L.P., 2018).

It should be taken as no small coincidence that this period of industry growth corresponds to the aftermath of the 2008 global economic crisis and the ensuing years of economic detriment to which Spain, more so than most of its European counterparts, has been subject. While the average unemployment rate of the European Union peaked at 10.9% in 2013, for example, that of Spain reached a staggering 26.1% the same year

(Eurostat, 2018a). The private English industry itself has recognized this correlation between economic hardship and increased demand for its services; in a 2014 press release calling for tighter regulation of non-registered language schools, ACEIA also warned against the danger of private academies becoming “*una burbuja lingüística*” (a linguistic bubble) and principally serving as a refuge for those most affected by the economic crisis (Muñoz Bolaños, 2014). While this correlation serves to contextualize growing English demand with respect to private industry teaching, the research here posits that public bilingual education also plays a significant role – at once both responsive and contributory – in relation to English Imperative views, and one which is more embedded in Spanish institutions and bureaucracy, if not culture and economic life.

Focus given in this research to bilingual instructors and high school students enrolled in officially-designated bilingual centers is meant to lend protagonism to those voices of relevant policy actors often left out of decision-making processes, but who are nonetheless most affected by, and implicated in, policy and program implementations. The relevance of this research is supported by the apparentness of bilingualism and English teaching having taken center stage over recent years in Spanish educational initiatives with immense political and popular support.

Ethnographic data in the form of interviews, focus groups and participant observation was collected in two monolingual regions of Spain – Andalusia and Extremadura. These regions constitute two of the 17 Autonomous Communities that have comprised Spain’s political and public planning structure since the country’s

democratic transition of the late 1970s and early 1980s, following the end of a decades-long dictatorship in 1975. Each of these Communities has its own regional government responsible for managing certain public institutions, including education. The region of Andalusia is the southernmost and most highly populated of all 17 Autonomous Communities in Spain (See Figure 1). Extremadura, a largely rural and considerably less populated region, lies to the northwest of Andalusia and along the Portugal border.



Figure 1: Map of Spain (Junta de Andalucía, 2009).

In addition to both being monolingual regions (different, for example, from Catalonia, which has two official languages – Catalán and Spanish), Andalusia and Extremadura share other commonalities. Historically, neither of the two regions have had significant industrial development, both economies having been largely based in agriculture and livestock farming. For this reason, they have also historically been

among the poorest regions of Spain, in stark contrast to northern and more industrial areas such as the Basque Country and Catalonia, which today see higher wages and costs of living. One crucial difference between Andalusia and Extremadura, however – and one which invariably relates to heightened pushes for public bilingualism and demand for English learning – is tourism. In Andalusia, the tourism industry has grown to a formidable size, dating back to the large-scale development of the famous *Costa de Sol* in the 1960s. Indeed, it is now among the principal economic sectors of the region, generating over 20 billion euros in annual revenue and accounting for over 380,000 jobs (Consejería de Turismo y Deporte, 2018a, 2018b).

Since their founding as politically-demarcated Autonomous Communities in the early 1980s, the regional governments, or *Juntas*, of both Andalusia and Extremadura have been largely led by Spain's socialist party *Partido Socialista Obrero Español* (PSOE). While widely regarded today as left-centrist and rather reactionary, PSOE and its socialist-leaning policies largely characterize the political identity of Andalusia especially (where the party's regional governance has been uninterrupted since the early 1980s), and not least with regards to education; the *Junta* prides itself, for example, on providing free textbooks to all students, as well as on current inclusionary educational policies which fall under the broad and categorical heading *Atención a la Diversidad* (Attention to Diversity).

To this point, another important distinction can be made of Andalusia. Not only does the region have the most expansive network of bilingual schools in Spain, but

bilingualism has also become obligatory for all students in attendance at designated bilingual centers. This distinguishing feature of Andalusia's bilingual programs is meant to keep with the socialist narrative of the government's educational policies and to pacify any public apprehensions over possible elitism or academic segregation within public schools. As discussed in the findings of this research, however, the functioning of bilingualism in the region may take program growth and expansion – and the subsequent optics of increased equality and access to English learning, and thus globalization – as a higher concern than that of actually delivering quality programs with adequate teacher resources, evaluation measures for monitoring and ensuring student linguistic competencies, and effective communication amongst policy actors at all levels, for the sake of more informed and interactional project development.

It is to the above-mentioned obligatoriness of bilingualism which the primary title of this paper refers: “*café para todos*” (coffee for all) is a versatile expression which can be used to describe a situational yielding of equity to a broader and more far-reaching effort toward equality – or, in this case, equal access to a valued educational resource. Here, it is the idea that all students get coffee, despite perhaps wanting tea or juice, or even having an intolerance for caffeine: it may not be what everybody wants or needs, but at least everyone is getting the same. Following the metaphor, coffee is bilingual instruction, and there are no other beverage options on the school's menu. As it stands, the logic of *café para todos* is precisely what positions bilingualism to be considered “good policy,” acting as an ostensible provision of a social and educational resource in

response to a widespread public demand, the success of which is measured in terms of its reach. Importantly, this success can be acclaimed despite the fact that program outcomes may not necessarily translate to students' own understanding of what it means to take up English and the instruments by which its benefits are practically realized.

Bilingual education in Andalusia began in 2005 with the *Plan de Fomento de Plurilingüismo* (Plan to Promote Plurilingualism), a wide-reaching and ambitious set of initiatives designed to promote and foment the acquisition of foreign languages among public school students, especially English (Lorenzo, 2010). The framework for the Plan, as with other regional bilingual programs, was drawn from the language policies and goals of the European Commission (EC) with the shared aim of creating a plurilingual citizenry made more competitive in a global market economy via varied linguistic competencies (Ruiz de Zarobe & Lasagabaster, 2010). Other objectives of EC language policy include promoting ideas of multiculturalism and respect for diversity, as well as facilitating intracontinental communication and mobility through the use of a single, international language (Commission of the European Communities [EC], 2005). Recommendations by the EC for national language policy plans hence prescribe a “2+1” model whereby students in member countries learn two foreign languages – one of which is of an international status – in addition to their native tongue (Tender & Vihalemm, 2009).

In conjunction with the European policy objectives mentioned above, it is likely that Spain's decision to implement wide-ranging and large-scale educational language

reform was not a politically-benign undertaking. Prior to the Plan to Promote Plurilingualism, Spain had received a considerably low ranking amongst European nations in the area of foreign language acquisition and competency, as determined by the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) (Lorenzo, 2010). The country's poor results were seen as not only reflecting language abilities specifically but were interpreted also as a threat to the educational system as a whole, presenting a potential impediment to the growth and progress of public schooling and national development (Lorenzo, 2010). Thus, substantial language policy reform in Spain has had practical, political and ideological implications in its aims of increasing linguistic competence, augmenting the nation's status among its European counterparts, creating a new multicultural national character and improving the educational system at large (Lorenzo, 2010).

Bilingual schools in Spain have come to be, not through the founding of new educational institutes, but rather through the continuous conversion of already-existing schools to officially-designated bilingual centers. Under Andalusia's Plan to Promote Plurilingualism, the number of schools imparting bilingual education grew from an initial 139 to 518 between the years 2005 and 2008 (Salaberri Romero, 2010). It is important to note that of those 518 programs, 457 were English-specific, pointing to the discursive ambiguity of "plurilingualism," as well as those implicit emphases on multiculturalism which might suggest, as a matter of policy discourse, that the acquisition of *any* foreign language would suffice (Salaberri Romero, 2010). Indeed, English has become a

homogenizing component of bilingualism in Andalusia, evident through the further growth of bilingual centers from 2010 to 2016, a period which saw the incorporation of 318 additional bilingual schools of which only 12 were *not* English-specific (Consejería de Educación, 2016). Worth mentioning is the fact that these figures contradict statements made in a 2005 European Commission policy report on language education (EC, 2005), which acknowledged a strong tendency “for foreign language learning to mean simply learning English” and reminded readers that “the Commission has already pointed out that English is not enough” (EC, 2005, p. 4). The report even went as far as to warn against such favoritism toward English, suggesting “unforeseen consequences for the vitality of [national or regional] languages” (EC, 2005, p. 4). Seeking to understand this apparent contradiction and the resultant English “boom” in Spanish public education, both in reason and consequence, is thus among the principal motivations behind the research presented here.

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)

The preferred and most widely used model for bilingual instruction across Spain is known as Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) (Ruiz de Zarobe & Lasagabaster, 2010). The CLIL model for second language (L2) instruction involves the teaching of content areas such as history, mathematics and biology in both the target L2 and the students’ native language. Thus, in addition to the L2 as a subject itself, students are exposed to further language instruction in classes that are conventionally taught solely in the mother tongue. For instance, students receive not only English classes proper, but

partial English instruction in other core content subjects including, but not limited to, history, geography, chemistry, biology and physical education. In short, CLIL is seen as a kind of two-for-one, whereby linguistic knowledge acquired in L2 classes is supplemented and reinforced by partial L2 content instruction in other core subject areas while still imparting core subject content.

Some authors have argued that the CLIL model carries neither a concrete working definition nor clear pedagogical or methodological approaches, instead seeing it as a varied series of localized interpretations and implementations (Bruton, 2013; Hüttner & Smit, 2013). While some programs and instructors, for instance, may rely more on written didactic materials and exercises, others may favor oral activities to encourage language learning through content instruction. This apparent ambiguity of CLIL as a codified approach to language teaching may be interpreted as a positive characteristic, seen as allowing for flexibility and adaptability to any given classroom setting; or, this ambiguity may be interpreted as a shortcoming for its lack of tested and explicitly-prescribed best practices (Bruton, 2013; Hüttner & Smit, 2013). At any rate, and in the case of Spain, the incorporation of English into content learning is thought to be an additive component to education which increases students' exposure to the language and gives further opportunity to practice and develop skills in reading, writing and speaking distinctly apart from their mandatory English language classes.

Research Questions

In accordance with the inductive ethnographic approach taken in this investigation, research questions are largely of an exploratory nature. These questions are meant to provoke an elucidation of the views of research participants toward bilingual education, aiming to reflect program functioning as well as the situatedness of bilingualism within participants' lives and, more broadly, Spanish society:

1. What is the state of public bilingual education and its functioning?
2. As measured against policy objectives, what can be said of implicit motives behind bilingual policy?
3. How is the significance and efficacy of bilingual programs understood and interpreted by student and teacher stakeholders?
4. How do these stakeholders view the relation between bilingual education and the role of English in contemporary Spanish society?
5. Assuming that English is deemed as having value and importance, how do stakeholders come to adhere to such views? How do they "know" that English is necessary?

Rationale

The rationale for choosing this research topic is to better understand bilingual education as a complex educational initiative, both in policy and in practice, which forms and informs heightened demands for English acquisition across Spain. Over the past

decade, the politically and socially-significant phenomenon of English CLIL in public institutes has grown substantially across the country and currently shows no signs of slowing. In constructing a larger ethnographic narrative of bilingual education through the views and experiences of student and teacher stakeholders, it is believed possible to gain greater insight into the multilevel interactions and interpretations comprising what appears to be a policy powerhouse.

The initial motivation behind this project was drawn from my own personal relationship with bilingual education in Spain. For the past four years, I have been contracted by the Spanish Ministry of Education as an *auxiliar de conversación de inglés*, or an English language assistant, working alongside instructors to impart bilingual classes in public high schools in both Extremadura and Andalusia. To date, I continue to live and work in Andalusia in this capacity, and it is from this first-hand experience that the research questions of this study have emerged.

Upon arrival in a rural Andalusian village in the fall of 2014, I had carried with me notions of hegemonic imposition regarding the global dissemination of English, notions which were to be unfounded in the articulated attitudes of students and teachers, as well as among members of the larger village community. Rather, it seemed there was a genuine interest in learning English and sincere motivations for acquiring the language, albeit for a variety of personal or professional reasons. This impression inspired a more sober consideration of bilingual policies and programs from different viewpoints which ultimately determined bilingualism in Spain to be a topic worthy of more formal

anthropological inquiry. Thus, my direct involvement and immediate experience in the field allowed for a broader, more holistic and more informed deliberation which led to the research and findings presented in this report.

BACKGROUND RESEARCH

Literature Review

In reviewing the academic literature on the subject of bilingualism and bilingual education, it is clear that it is a burgeoning topic in the fields of both education studies and applied linguistics, with articles concerning a range of issues including cognitive learning skills, language acquisition methods and bilingual program outcomes commonly appearing in the academic literature. Similarly, the geographic range of research encompasses the entire globe, the English language having become a core curricular subject in numerous countries everywhere from South America to East Asia (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007; Park, 2009; Porto, 2014; Tsuchiya & Pérez Murillo, 2015). For the purposes of this research review, then, it is only appropriate to also look beyond Europe and Spain with the intention of placing English teaching and learning in a globalized context to demonstrate its far reach, as well as the processes by which it has come to play a dominant role in education around the world.

Global English and language ideology

The notion of an international language is nothing new, but the role of English in contemporary global society is something unique and unprecedented (Dewey, 2007). Its position on the world stage has gone beyond that of a more conventional role as a foreign language to something far larger and more ubiquitous, a phenomenon fueled by processes of globalization as well as advancements in technology (Luján-García, 2012). Many

writers on the subject of bilingual English education and the global diffusion of English have engaged in debate over the hegemonic properties of international English acquisition, situating it within an increasingly commodified global economy whereby even language becomes a commodity, if not an outright component of imperialistic processes (Dewey, 2007; Heller, 2010; Phillipson, 2001; Phillipson, 2008; Porto, 2014; Relaño Pastor, 2014).

Among the staunchest of critics, Robert Phillipson (2001; 2008) posits that English is inextricably linked to processes of globalization and is institutionally codified in global capitalism via international bodies such as the World Trade Organization and the United Nations (Phillipson, 2001). The author argues that the diffusion and dominance of English has undeniably homogenizing effects insofar as it is used to facilitate the unification of markets in furthering the global economy and the tenets of late capitalism (Phillipson, 2001). Such critique calls for more critical analysis of global English and claims which posit it as *the* language of the world, while ignoring other geographically and demographically dominant languages, as well as English variants (Phillipson, 2001). Even the term *lingua franca* itself, benignly intended to convey the widespread communicative use of the language, is held in contention as downplaying or neutralizing the purposes that global English may serve, effectively obscuring the economic, cultural and military power that the United States has over the world, as well as ties to elitism in more local contexts (Phillipson, 2008).

Arguing against these critical views of Western and American imposition of a cultural homogeneity, Dewey (2007) proposes that a transformationalist perspective acknowledging the complexities of globalization is far more appropriate for understanding it in a linguistic context. While immense diffusion of American cultural products and the English language is undeniable, it is also worth considering the pluralistic uses of the language; the global spread of English is equally tied to its diversification (Dewey, 2007).

Acknowledging this debate in the context of English education, and in considering the role of obligatory English in public schools as an arm of neo-colonialism, Porto (2014) ultimately argues against critical narratives such as those posited by Phillipson in her study of English in Argentine schools. Rather than seeing a homogenizing and cultural imperialist effect, she views English as having an additive quality to Argentine education, noting that the language serves certain functions in local society (Porto, 2014). While the impetus for compulsory English classes may be *rooted* in neo-colonialism and a global language hierarchy, the author takes a utilitarian stance in stating that English does provide direct economic benefits to Argentinians. Importantly, critiques of English education as cultural colonialism are ostensibly invalidated for Porto for what she sees as their failure to take into consideration the positions, views and experiences of actual individual learners (Porto, 2014).

What is clear from both sides of this debate is that, be it benign or maleficent, English certainly plays a major role on the international stage for reasons relating to

processes of globalization. Thus, in addressing educational policies promoting the teaching and learning of English, it is important to engage with a working theoretical perspective regarding language ideology in the context of globalization and modern capitalism. Heller (2010) speaks to such language ideology in discussing the commodification of language, wherein it becomes seen as a tool or process by which social order and social meanings are produced. Situated within the context of late capitalism, language thus plays an increasingly significant role in facilitating the global exchange of goods (Heller, 2010). Language becomes important for managing the flow of resources, mediating services and, especially in the case of English, adding symbolic value (Heller, 2010). Such commodification has even given rise to language *as* labor, whether in the form of a particular skill set or as work itself (Urciuoli & LaDousa, 2013).

Beyond Europe – English in education globally

The global spread of English and its growing importance in realms of international communications and commerce has been accompanied by increased educational initiatives in numerous countries and world regions intended to promote the learning of English as a means of integrating citizens and economy into the global market. Drawing from literature on the subject of global English education policies and campaigns, commonly-referenced regions beyond the scope of Europe include Latin America and Asia.

Argentina, for example, where English carries considerable prestige for its speakers, has seen compulsory English classes as a part of educational policy since the

1990s, a reform attributed to the position of English as a *lingua franca*, or an internationally and universally utilized language (Porto, 2014). In the past decade, Mexico, along with other Latin American countries, has expanded English education in public primary schools with the aim of starting English education at a younger age and increasing hours of exposure by adding class hours to standardized curricula (Sayer, 2018). According to qualitative interviews conducted with parents of students in Mexico, popular support for such English education initiatives is garnered through the widely-held belief of increased economic and social opportunities afforded speakers of English (Sayer, 2018). In educational research documenting the design of a pedagogical approach to English-Spanish bilingual teaching in Colombia, Ordóñez (2011) describes what she calls “education for bilingualism,” a curricular model drawing from constructivist learning principles and which serves as an alternative to more conventional and long-standing bilingual methods found across the country.

Looking to Asia, English in public schooling appears to be no less common, though policy objectives are often more explicit in stating economic growth and global integration as pointed aims of English education (Park, 2009; Rubdy, 2001; Tsuchiya & Pérez Murillo, 2015). In Singapore, for instance, studies have been conducted on the effects of, and responses to, a controversial national campaign titled the Speak Good English Movement (SGEM) (Farrell & Kun, 2008; Rose & Galloway, 2017; Rubdy, 2001). Beginning in the early 2000s, SGEM is a government-sponsored initiative intended to encourage citizens away from the use of a Singapore-English dialect, known

as Singlish, in favor of using standard English as a means of linguistically unifying the country (Farrell & Kun, 2008; Rose & Galloway, 2017). The impetus for this drive toward using standard English over the local variant is largely economic, the government believing the former to be more favorable to growing business enterprise and promoting economic growth (Rubdy, 2001). This national policy has naturally impacted language teaching in public schools, though there has been debate as to the legitimacy of Singlish as a marker of local identity and the imposition of a language ideology inherent to the SGEM (Farrell & Kun, 2008; Rose & Galloway, 2017).

The Malaysian education system introduced science and math instruction in English in 2003 under a sweeping national language policy intended to produce scientifically and technologically proficient students who are also fluent in English, capable of contributing to an English-competent workforce which would aid in economic development (Tan & Saw Lan, 2011). Results from a mixed methods study on the implementation of said policy, centered on the role of math and science instructors, found that a lack of standardized methods has caused differential success among students, as well as significant outcome disparities between urban and non-urban settings stemming from a failure to consider different social contexts in which learning takes place (Tan & Saw Lan, 2011).

Recent years have also seen significant changes in the educational language policies of Japan, favoring an increase in English instruction with expanded teaching in both primary and secondary schools (Tsuchiya & Pérez Murillo; 2015). These revisions

in bilingual education, again, are intended to cultivate English communication skills to meet the demands of Japan's increasingly globalized economy, a point especially evident in the promotion of English-specific CLIL methodology in Japanese universities (Tsuchiya & Pérez Murillo, 2015).

A particularly interesting example from Asia, and one which exemplifies a veritable English "boom," is the case of South Korea. Authors Shim and Park (2008) describe the phenomenon of what they refer to as "English fever," a policy-driven trend in the country toward English proficiency by way of public education. This ideology has its historical roots in the US-led transitional government of the 1950s which effectively demonstrated the link between English language abilities and upward mobility in post-war society (Shim & Park, 2008). In more recent decades, the authors point to a more concerted and explicitly-stated government aim to create an English-proficient citizenry capable of competing in a globalized economy and thrusting South Korea onto the international stage as an economic hub in the region (Shim & Park, 2008). Their analysis takes a more critical approach to understanding English learning in the country, arguing that the "fever" is essentially a social construction whereby English hegemony and the language's relation to power structures is reproduced at local levels (Shim & Park, 2008). Evidence of the prestige attached to English is demonstrated through enormous amounts of money spent annually on extracurricular learning for children, while attempts at democratizing access to the language have included English television broadcasting and the building of mock "English villages" (Park, 2009).

Europe and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)

Differing from other countries which have promoted English principally as a means toward economic viability of citizens in a global market, English education in European nations has been pushed largely under the guise of multicultural integration among European Union (EU) member states (Lorenzo & Moore, 2009; Tsuchiya & Pérez Murillo, 2015). Language policies of the EU, taking into account the globalization of Europe and transmigrations across the continent, are meant to normalize linguistic diversity and promote mobility of European citizens within the region while also providing consequential benefits in terms of augmented economic opportunities (Busch, 2011). Within Europe, language policy and English-teaching campaigns have been centered on a particular methodological model known as Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) (Tedick & Cammarata, 2012).

This favored model for language learning in Europe involves the teaching of a foreign language (FL) through core subjects such as history, math and physical sciences. In other words, core classes are taught both in the native tongue of students and a target FL, in most cases English (Bonnet & Dalton-Puffer, 2013). Cited as “one of the trendiest terms in European educational scenarios” (Arribas, 2016, p. 270), CLIL is actually a new term for an old idea. As noted by Mehisto, Marsh, and Frigols-Martín, the innovation of the approach can be attributed to its integration of national and vernacular languages into curricula, in contrast to, for example, the classicism of Latin-based university instruction centuries ago (as cited in Arribas, 2016, p. 270). Proponents argue that CLIL offers a

kind of two-for-one, with students learning critical and mandatory subject matter while supplementing and reinforcing their foreign language classes, though some critics are more skeptical as to its effectiveness for FL development (Bonnet & Dalton-Puffer, 2016; Bruton, 2013). Further research has suggested that CLIL does not follow any specific pedagogical nor methodological uniformity, but rather is constituted by a conglomerate of localized negotiations and realizations of language policy across Europe (Arribas, 2016; Hüttner & Smit, 2013; Lorenzo et al., 2011). This lack of formulaic structure, some argue, is a major benefit of CLIL in affording the approach flexibility and diversity in practice (Hüttner & Smit, 2013). At any rate, consensus among scholars holds CLIL as the hallmark of recent European language education policy. English-dominant, nationally-sponsored language education programs following a CLIL approach have been cited in countries across Europe, including France, Hungary, Germany, Norway, Sweden, Italy, Bulgaria and Spain, though each may differ to some extent with regards to curricula design, resource availability and allocation, the elective or compulsory nature of bilingual programs, and program quality and outcomes (Arribas, 2016; Brüning & Purrmann, 2014; Cinganotto, 2016). In Bulgaria, for example, there are neither standardized criteria for bilingual teaching nor a clear set of agreed-upon policy goals for public bilingual education, suggesting that despite EU policy influence, program quality across Europe can fluctuate (Brüning & Purrmann, 2014).

In Italy, CLIL and English bilingual education, made mandatory in many high schools throughout the country, constitute cornerstones of educational reform in recent

years, CLIL being seen as having the potential to augment student motivations toward FL learning and to advance and modernize the educational system as a whole (Cinganotto, 2016). Falling in step with wider EU language policies promoting these measures, Italy's Good School Reform program pushes CLIL and (English) language competency as top goals, a "good school" being that which produces linguistically competent students (Cinganotto, 2016).

The case of Germany presents a similar scenario through the country's heavy promotion and continuous expansion of English FL teaching and English content instruction over the past two decades, CLIL having become the centerpiece of primary and secondary educational policies since 2013 (Brüning & Purrmann, 2014; Lanvers, 2018). In a critical discourse analysis study of German print media texts on this phenomenon of "Englishization" in German education, Lanvers (2018) found that there are competing and conflicting stakeholder views toward the massive favoritism given English, both as an FL and a medium of instruction, across all levels of the public educational system. While the national policy stance is to promote linguistic pluralism in education, thus clearly drawing influence from European directives, critics see such calls for linguistic diversity as constituted by the clear partiality given to English (Lanvers, 2018). Textual analyses of media stories on the controversy surrounding Englishization revealed conflicts between stakeholder perspectives, these conflicts corresponding to social debates as to the protection of German as an historic and academic language versus

the pragmatism aligned with English acquisition as necessary for both individual and country in the face of globalization (Lanvers, 2018).

Research from Spain

Bilingual education and CLIL program implementation in Spain have been considered a significant success by European policy onlookers, largely due to the substantial growth the field has seen throughout the country (Brüning & Purrmann, 2014). For the past two decades, Spain has institutionally supported English acquisition through compulsory English classes in public schools, having begun through a 1996 collaboration with the British Council and most recently in adhering to language policy ideas and goals set by the European Commission in 2005 (Guillamón-Suesta & Renau, 2015; Lorenzo et al., 2010). As indicated by the language policies of Spain, like those of the EU, English teaching and CLIL are seen as promoting cultural and linguistic diversity, encouraging and enabling greater mobility of citizens and increasing their competitiveness in the global economy (Tedick & Cammarata, 2012; Tsuchiya & Pérez Murillo, 2015).

Literature concerning bilingual education and CLIL in Spain has encompassed a range of topics including differences in implementation among the country's various Autonomous Communities, comparisons of performance between CLIL and non-CLIL students, teacher training, methodological strategies and best practices, among others (Bruton, 2011a; Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010; Lorenzo & Moore, 2009). What follows is a review of those studies deemed most relevant to the research presented in this report.

Gerena and Ramírez-Verdugo (2014), in a study investigating the views of students and teachers toward bilingual education, have pointed to overwhelmingly positive outlooks of both stakeholder groups toward CLIL in Madrid, each citing the importance of English for future competitiveness and increased professional opportunity. In their Fulbright-funded qualitative investigation centered in the Madrid region, the researchers utilized interview, survey and observational data in examining the attitudes of teachers, language assistants and students in public bilingual centers, finding that the positive views of program participants closely reflected and reinforced stated governmental language policy aims by invoking the utility and international status of English in global society (Gerena & Ramírez-Verdugo, 2014). Further attention in the study was also given to pedagogical methods and their effectiveness, though to the exclusion of a critical analysis of ideological implications inherent to bilingual policies in the Madrid region and beyond.

In a similar, yet more critical, case study focused on a single high school in Madrid located in a working-class neighborhood, Relaño Pastor (2015) focuses on teacher-student interactions to show that English is given linguistic priority in the center. The author states that the idea of bilingualism, understood to be strictly English-Spanish, actually serves to mask and undermine an already-existing multilingual and multicultural character of the school, owed to the high percentage of immigrant students (Relaño Pastor, 2015). According to the author, English instruction billed as bilingualism effectively establishes a language hierarchy within the school, adopting and reinforcing

an underlying ideology which relates English competencies to a certain elitism tied to future economic opportunity (Relaño Pastor, 2015). At the same time, this hierarchical positioning of English over other languages present in the school can be seen as contradictory to the purported tenets of linguistic diversity and pluralism found in European policy discourse. That is, the notion of true (and in the case of the above study, already existent) multiculturalism is confounded with a selectively narrow construction of what cultural and linguistic diversity means in an educational context. Such diversity becomes something that is *provided* or implanted via bilingual English classes, demonstrating the extent to which the language policy in question is couched in global relations and favors an internationally-dominant language.

Yet another study concerning CLIL in Spain which goes beyond strictly pedagogically-centered inquiry, yet maintains focus on learning outcomes, is that conducted by Alejo and Piquer-Píriz (2016) on rural vs. urban settings and the influence of the social environment on bilingual programs. The authors set their focus on external factors influencing bilingual education, principally from the perspective of student learning. Set in the western region of Extremadura, the study compares program implementations and results of an urban city-based school with those of an institute located in a small rural town, this rural-urban point of comparison arguably serving as a proxy for the socioeconomic status of students (Alejo & Piquer-Píriz, 2016). While urban students were found to receive more language input via extracurricular private instruction, attributable to greater economic advantage, the amount of in-school input was

exactly the same (Alejo & Piquer-Píriz, 2016; Bruton, 2011b). In their conclusion, the authors posit that family background, rather than a simple rural/urban divide, is more significant regarding differences in student performance; the socioeconomic index and educational history of families, however, can be correlated to rural vs. urban living, the former corresponding to typically lower incomes and levels of education (Alejo & Piquer-Píriz, 2016). This is a substantive work in Spanish CLIL research in that it effectively addresses the clear lack of investigative reports concerning external factors as related to bilingual education in the country.

Turning to research centered on the region of Andalusia, doctoral thesis work done through the University of Seville has investigated the segment of public bilingual programs which employs foreign native-speakers of English to serve as language assistants in public bilingual centers (Sánchez Torres, 2014). The objectives of this study were to examine the functions carried out by *auxiliares* (language assistants), the extent to which their obligations are met with respect to program and policy mandates, the interactions between *auxiliares* and bilingual instructors, and the perceptions of these actors regarding program success (Sánchez Torres, 2014). Through a longitudinal qualitative study involving in-depth interviews with *auxiliares*, instructors, program coordinators and school directors from 15 bilingual centers in the province of Seville, the author draws conclusions as to the functioning of language assistants in schools and the implications of this for bilingual programs in general (Sánchez Torres, 2014). It is concluded that not all functions are met in compliance with program rules, regulations

and objectives, often attributable to the fact that these are not clearly explained to *auxiliares*. Perceptions of program success, then, largely depend upon issues of communication and coordination, professional development and time (Sánchez Torres, 2014). The study suggests that insufficient hours are allotted for planning with *auxiliares* and inadequate training is offered those language assistants who have less teaching experience and may be unsure as to their specific role, all of this resulting in differing views in terms of program success and participant satisfactions (Sánchez Torres, 2014). Similar issues regarding communication and coordination are expressed by subjects in the research presented here, though extended further to communicative deficiencies across all levels of bilingual policy. Finally, this program component of contracting native-speaker *auxiliares* is a clear demonstration of the very language-abled geographic and economic mobility professed in bilingual language policies, with foreign individuals being employed solely for the fact that they speak English and come from a native-speaking country (Heller, 2010; Urciuoli & LaDousa, 2013).

Other research on Andalusia's *Plan de Fomento del Plurilingüismo* has been similarly bent towards an evaluative look at program implementations and outcomes, though more concerned with student competencies. In an evaluation project conducted some five years after the *Plan* was put into place, researchers Lorenzo, Casal and Moore (2010) offer an analytical review of the regional program by looking primarily at competency development of students, curricular organization, classroom discourse and the satisfaction of teacher participants. Findings suggest that CLIL does have positive

effects on student learning and that instructors see it as having benefits in terms of interdepartmental cohesion and cooperation. In general, though, and in situating Andalusian CLIL within European policy discourse, the authors find that the model lacks a larger conceptual foundation, pointing out that much research is concerned only with quantitative language competency results as opposed to qualitative analyses of the inner workings of program development and implementation (Lorenzo et al., 2010).

The tone and focal points of the aforementioned research reflect the major methodological, pedagogical and learning outcome concerns found in most writings on CLIL and bilingual education in Spain. In an anthological work of essays on CLIL in Spanish education, for example, common inquiries are based on questions of teacher training methods, classroom methodologies and differences found between monolingual Communities and those regions of Spain which have a second official language, such as Catalán, Gallego or Euskera. (Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010). This edited volume by Lasagabaster and Ruiz de Zarobe (2010) highlights early implementation efforts of CLIL-driven bilingualism in various Autonomous Communities, as well as teacher training programs initially offered to bilingual instructors to help ensure success from the onset of program implementation throughout the country. The two featured essays which focus on Andalusia, for instance, characteristically present (a) an overview of CLIL in the region, and (b) an overview of teacher training initiatives corresponding with early implementation strategies (Lorenzo, 2010; Salaberri Ramiro, 2010). In the latter of these two, the author mainly outlines the structures that were put in place to

foment teacher development and training from 2005-2008, though it is noted that the majority of data was taken from yearly dossiers published by the Regional Education Department which present quantitative figures on teacher training centers and participant trainees (Salaberri Ramiro, 2010). Furthermore, in comparison with the current state of bilingualism in Andalusia, such training measures appear to have been front-loaded in the region's bilingual trajectory.

The goal in describing such reports is to illustrate existent gaps in the literature concerning bilingualism in Spain, gaps which this project addresses in its departure from pedagogically and methodologically-centered inquiry in favor of more sociocultural and sociopolitical approaches. An example of parallel research looking beyond the scholastic realm and situating bilingual education within a wider social context is that of Luján-García (2012). In a study of the impacts of English on Spanish daily life, the author points to a multitude of ambits in which English has come to influence Spanish society, such as in television and other mainstream media, communicative discourse involving increasing usage of anglicisms, and commercialized public demonstrations of English in local shop signs. Not of least importance is the educational system itself, the author citing not only the increasing presence of English from the earliest stages of public teaching, but also the high demand of English courses in public Official Language Schools (Luján-García, 2012). The research presented here sets to further fill such gaps in the existent literature, taking an ethnographic approach to understand the larger

implications of bilingual education in Spain through the perspectives and lived experiences of student and teacher stakeholders.

METHODS

This research project followed a qualitative and inductive approach. To this end, research questions were largely exploratory in nature, and methods were chosen which would give insight into the perspectives, opinions, experiences and attitudes of research participants. The two main qualitative methods employed in data collection were semi-structured interviews and focus groups. As an ethnography, this study also draws on participant observation in the form of years-long immersion in public bilingual teaching as an English language assistant.

Research participants were those individuals identified as most directly involved in bilingual education, specifically at the level of program implementation – students enrolled in bilingual content classes and bilingual content instructors. Also included is a select number of current and former bilingual program coordinators. Each of these participants constitute principal policy actors of publicly-sponsored secondary education bilingual programs and, as such, their views are believed to be instrumental in understanding bilingualism in Spain (Llinares & Dafouz, 2010). The ethnographic nature of this study follows a theoretical position that the *meaning* of bilingual education is in large part constructed by what it means to and for those represented by participants in this research, and not constituted simply by that which is put forth in policy and program designs.

Field Sites

Field sites included in this thesis research are comprised of public high schools located in the Autonomous Communities of Andalusia and Extremadura which have been designated as official *centros bilingües* (bilingual centers). What this designation means is that, following the CLIL model, core content classes such as math and history are taught in both Spanish and the target second language (L2) of English. All teacher data collection was done in the region of Andalusia, while student data was gathered at two public bilingual high schools in Extremadura.

A total of six high schools were visited across three different provinces in Andalusia; Seville, Malaga and Granada. This dispersion of field sites was largely consequential, the selection of sites having been determined by access to willing participants and professional contacts in those areas. This geographic range is believed to buttresses the reliability of data collected and the generalizability of results. The six field sites in Andalusia represent two neighborhoods in an urban city environment (Seville), a rural inland community (Granada), and a southern coastal suburb (Malaga).

As stated above, each high school has been designated a bilingual center, with bilingual content instruction available for all students who enroll. It is worth noting, however, that the roll-out process of converting to a bilingual school is a gradual one, happening over the course of four years. These transitional years correspond to the mandatory four years of secondary education in Spain: 1°ESO, 2°ESO, 3°ESO and 4°ESO

(*Educación Secundaria Obligatoria*). Over four years, each incoming group of 1°ESO is inducted into the bilingual program and continues a bilingual trajectory, resulting in a fully operational bilingual center once the first inductees reach 4°ESO. As a minimum, each of these six field sites which correspond to teacher data collection was in its second year of transition, if not already a fully-functioning bilingual center with all students enrolled in bilingual content instruction. Finally, the two public bilingual high schools in Extremadura visited for student data collection both pertain to the same semi-urban municipality.

Participants

Data was collected from a total of 44 research participants, comprised of 13 teachers and 31 students. Of the 13 teachers, 10 were bilingual content instructors and three were English instructors who also currently or previously served as bilingual program coordinators in their respective institutes. Among the 31 student participants, 10 were from 3°ESO (ages 14-15), 15 from 4°ESO (ages 15-16) and the remaining six from a vocational program focused on administrative and secretarial work (ages 18-30).

Teachers

Teachers were solicited for their role as principal stakeholders in public bilingual education and for their fundamental charge of implementing bilingual policy at the local level. Their views are instrumental in understanding how policy functions in localized

contexts, as well as how policy mandates are communicated, and ultimately interpreted, from the regional government down to single bilingual centers and individual instructors.

Of the 13 teacher participants, ten are bilingual content instructors who follow the institutionally-prescribed CLIL educational model in imparting their regular core content subjects. With respect to participants, those subjects include history (six teachers), math (two teachers) biology (one teacher) and technology (one teacher). The experience of instructors ranged from anywhere between six months and eight years. Instructor participants with most experience were thus able to speak to policy changes witnessed since their initial foray into bilingual instruction. On the other hand, while one year or less of bilingual teaching experience may seem limited in such a way as to disallow for reliability and generalizability of data results, the perspectives of those participants newly inducted into bilingual teaching are believed valuable for their timeliness of experience. That is, with regards to introduction, orientation and professional formation pertaining to bilingual policy and teaching, participants with least experience were most able to speak to the contemporaneity of the field.

The remaining three teacher participants are English instructors who currently serve, or who have served in the past, as bilingual program coordinators for their respective schools. Program coordinators are always English instructors and are charged with organizing and facilitating the center's implementation of bilingual programs. Regular tasks associated with the position include the creation of class schedules, organization of interdisciplinary bilingual events, dissemination to instructors of any

relevant and available information pertaining to the bilingual program and its mandates, and the intake and oversight of native-speaker language assistants (*auxiliares de conversación*), a post which I have personally held for four years in four different high schools. In essence, the coordinator is the captain of the bilingual team, as well as the effective intermediary between the *Junta* and bilingual instructors. Bilingual program coordinators were solicited primarily for these roles and for their close interaction with, and understanding of, policy mandates regarding the implementation of bilingual instruction. Further, program coordinators involved in this research project each had at least four years of experience in the position, allowing for reflective insight as to the changes undergone by bilingual education policy in recent years.

For the purposes of this report, the words “teacher” and “instructor” may be used generally to refer to both bilingual content instructors and program coordinators (coordinators are, first and foremost, English teachers). The term “coordinator” will then be used when referring to an individual who has expressed views particular to that role, and in their capacity of the position of bilingual program coordinator.

Finally, instructor participants were largely chosen via convenience sample, a method of subject selection which relies primarily on availability. For seven teacher subjects, this was done utilizing pre-established contacts within the Andalusian public teaching community made by way of my years-long position as a native language assistant in public bilingual centers. The remaining six were chosen by convenience

sample based on their geographic locations and the ease and frequency of travel permitted to conduct interviews with them.

While the utilization of convenience sampling may raise questions as to the representativeness of selected teacher subjects, it is important to note the nature of public teaching work in Spain. At the outset of their careers, and for up to a period of years, public teachers serve as substitutes working for durations of anywhere from two days to a full scholastic year. Even once one's job is secured and stable, a fixed *geographic* placement may remain uncertain for years to come. These *interinos*, as many research participants here are, are then likely to be granted a position for a full academic course, but without the guarantee of staying at the same institute beyond that course. Therefore, those more experienced participants in research had worked in up to four bilingual institutes across Andalusia at the time of being interviewed. A more detailed account of participant recruitment is described further below.

Students

The principal motive for including students as research subjects is to gauge their opinions and attitudes toward bilingual and obligatory English learning, their views as to the role of English in Spanish society as well as their own individual lives, and the relationship between the two. Of the 31 student research subjects, ten were from 3°ESO, 15 from 4°ESO and six from a public vocational program offered through a secondary education center and focused on administrative and secretarial work. Those 25 students in their third and fourth years of high school had been enrolled in bilingual programs since the

beginning of their secondary education careers. Students from 3°ESO and 4°ESO were chosen for having completed two or three years of enrollment in a public bilingual program at the time of participation, respectively. This experience, it is believed, is significant in capturing informed perspectives on bilingual education from a student point of view.

With respect to vocational program student participants, it should be stated that their program was not specifically bilingual. English was, however, a mandatory component to their curriculum, taught through course materials adapted to the focus of the program – the administrative work sector. Thus, these participants were solicited for their positions as students more immediately preparing to enter the work force, and for the fact of English playing a significant role in their educational and professional formation. In this sense, these participants are meant to serve as a representation of Spanish youth in general, apart from adolescent students whose professional careers may be chronologically further away. Although not in a bilingual program at the time of participation, two of the six students had attended bilingual high schools prior to their vocational enrollment.

Participant Recruitment

Research subjects were selected via convenience sampling. With each participant, proper ethical guidelines were followed in line with stipulations made by the Humboldt State University Institutional Review Board: informed consent forms were

obtained from each research subject, as well as parental consent forms for those participants under the age of 18.

Teacher recruitment

Seven of the 13 teacher participants were contacted with the help of personal and professional contacts within public bilingual high schools. Each of these seven subjects were contacted in-person, during school hours, with the help of professional acquaintances within their respective centers. At first meeting, this project was explained verbally, and an informed consent form was presented which further explained the research, its proposed purpose, and the proposed methodologies in which willing subjects would participate (Appendix A). Interview dates and times were then coordinated with interested parties.

The remaining six teacher participants were recruited also via convenience sampling, though without the help of a third-party contact. First, bilingual centers in the city of Seville and its outlying villages were chosen as recruitment points for ease of travel, allowing for more frequent visits and subsequent accommodation to the schedules of potential research subjects. Initial contact emails were sent to the general administrative addresses of 20 bilingual centers in Seville province requesting contact information for the bilingual program coordinators of those centers (Appendix B). Only one response was received, notifying that the message had been forwarded. Through further internet research and phone calls, contact information for program coordinators of eight of the 20 schools was uncovered. Those individuals were then contacted directly

via email with a brief introduction to the research project (Appendix C), as well as an attachment of the informed consent form with a more detailed description. Again, the response rate was far less than desirable, with only one coordinator responding to state that no members of their bilingual team wished to participate.

It was then decided that in-person recruitment would likely yield more positive results. Through a series of phone calls to administrative offices, certain windows were identified in which coordinators from two schools would be available to meet during school hours. After identifying other nearby centers which could be easily reached and thereby enhance efficiency of travel, the first recruitment trip to Seville took place in February 2018. In a single day, success was had in speaking with coordinators and instructors of three bilingual centers; at first meeting, the project was explained verbally to potential participants, who then expressed their willingness to participate in interviews or not. Contact information was exchanged with potential participants to coordinate schedules and set interview dates via email. These impromptu in-person visits thus proved significantly more successful in participant recruitment than did electronic mails or phone calls. Furthermore, my concurrent status as a native language assistant helped in gaining access to field sites and served positively in participant recruitment, as much with teachers as with student subjects.

Student recruitment

Student research subjects were recruited via convenience sample with the help of professional contacts in the public education system of Extremadura. All student subjects

who participated in this research lived and studied in the region of Extremadura at the time of participation. With the help of a fellow language assistant working at one prospective field site, a meeting was scheduled with the bilingual coordinator of that site to explain the scope and purpose of the project. After a receptive response, introductory meetings were held with two separate groups of students which would comprise two student focus groups used in data collection. A verbal explanation of the project was given students, as well as the opportunity to ask any questions regarding the investigation. Other questions as to my role as an American language assistant were also encouraged to help establish a social rapport with the would-be student subjects. During these introductory meetings, interested students were given a parental consent form to take home and have signed by their legal guardian(s) (Appendix D). These forms were then collected at a later date for which the focus groups were set. The days of the focus groups, and upon collection of parental consent forms, students were presented with a minor assent form to give their expressed informed consent to participate in research (Appendix E). At all encounters, students were explicitly told that participation could be withdrawn at any time, and that taking part in research would have no bearing on their academic standing. Prior to engaging with students, additional approval was sought from the director of the school. Though not an officially required component to the consent process, this was believed to be an appropriate and respectful step of social propriety. Permission to interact with students was granted by the director.

Accounting for the recruitment of vocational program students, these participants were enrolled at the bilingual center where I was contracted during the 2017-2018 academic year. After speaking with the director of the center, permission was granted to engage with vocational students during school hours for investigative purposes. During a daily class break, students were approached directly in their regular classroom to give a brief explanation of the project, what it entailed and what their participation would mean. Prior to beginning the focus groups session, these participants, all adults, were presented with an informed consent form.

Interviews

Of the 13 qualitative, semi-structured and informal instructor interviews, nine were held one-on-one with the participants, while two interviews were conducted with two participants each. One of those double interviews was planned as such, while the other involved a program coordinator joining impromptu an interview-in-progress. Thus, a total of 11 interview sessions were conducted with 13 teacher participants. Nine of the 11 interview sessions were held at the participants' respective schools during school hours. Most often these were conducted in a vacant room in the school building, while one occurred in the school cafeteria and another in the teachers' lounge. Two other sessions occurred in the participants' private offices. The remaining two interview sessions took place, at the participants' request, off school grounds at a public café.

All interviews were audio-recorded using a handheld digital recording device, following the written and verbally expressed consent of the participant. In addition to the written informed consent form which explained the interview process, extra measure was taken to verbally explain the project and interviewing and recording at the time of the interview. Audio files were recorded in an mp3 format which allowed for easy transfer to a personal laptop for the purposes of transcription, at which point audio files were erased.

In referring to Mann's (2011) critical analysis of the qualitative interview process, and considering the bilingual abilities of instructor participants, the choice of language in which the interview was to be held was left to the participants. Mann argues that interviews are best seen as interactional, localized performances whereby the interviewer and the interviewee both play a role in its construction (Mann, 2011). By nature of their positions, all teacher participants held at least a B2 title in English, coincidentally the same level which I hold in Spanish (Appendix F). In either case, whether an interview was held in English or in Spanish, one of its co-constructors would inevitably be speaking in their non-native language. Thus, the choice was given to participants as to which language they felt most comfortable and confident expressing themselves in. Ultimately, three participants requested that interviews be conducted in English (one of whom was a native English-speaker of Irish origin). The remaining ten participants requested that interviews be conducted in Spanish.

Each interview session lasted between 30 minutes and one hour. Consistent interview questions were drawn from a prepared schedule (Appendix G), while other

non-scheduled questions were posed in response to participant statements and in following with the semi-structured format. After exhausting all scheduled interview questions, each participant was asked if there were any other thoughts or opinions that they wished to express regarding the topics of conversation that had been covered.

Focus Groups

The purpose of utilizing a focus group format was to create a more comfortable and natural setting than that of one-on-one interviews, allowing for students to interact and discuss topics amongst themselves. The unit of study, then, is the group of students as representative of a larger student body, rather than the individual opinions of single persons (Smithson, 2000).

One focus group held with students in their third year of high school (3^oESO) consisted of ten students. Another held with students from their fourth year of high school (4^oESO) was comprised of 15 students, and the final focus group session was held with six vocational program students studying to enter the administrative labor sector.

Those two focus groups held with minors in high school were accompanied by one of the students' regular teachers, in accordance with the administrative policies of the school that no students be left unaccompanied by an official instructor. In further accordance with this stipulation, measure was taken so that students who wished not to participate could enter another class of their peers. This step was seen as tantamount to an ethical requirement insofar as that isolation of any student resulting from the decision

not to participate could be inferred as a negative consequence or repercussion enacted against that student. As students in vocational training were all over the age of 18, they were free to leave if they wished not to participate, and there was no requirement to have an additional teacher present during the time of the focus group.

As with interviews, focus groups all lasted between 30 minutes and one hour. Each session was recorded using a handheld digital recording device. Audio files were recorded in mp3 format for ease of transfer and subsequent transcription on a personal, password-protected laptop. For reasons explained above, all student focus group participants were given the collective choice to conduct the session in the language of their choosing, English or Spanish. All students in all groups unanimously chose to speak in Spanish.

Focus groups followed an informal and semi-structured format, drawing from prepared schedules of questions while also allowing for more improvised questioning to act in conversation with students and their responses (Appendix H). Every focus group session was held on school grounds and during school hours. In the case of high school students, this occurred in their regular classroom during English period. With vocational students, the focus group session was held in a vacant classroom during a free period in the students' schedule. At the end of each focus group session, students were asked if there were any further thoughts or opinions that they wished to share regarding the topics of conversation. Finally, students were made aware that, while their confidentiality was secure as far as research and reporting were concerned, respect for confidentiality and the

views of others was equally important but less guaranteed in light of the group setting.

This was asked to be kept in mind when speaking before the group.

Participant Observation

Though the findings of this research do not explicitly cite data related to participant observation, this hallmark method of ethnographic study does constitute the foundation and contextual backdrop to all other data collected. For the past four years, I have been immersed in public bilingual education in Spain through my continuing capacity as an *auxiliar de conversación de inglés*, witnessing first-hand the challenges and theatrics involved in policy and program implementations. Since 2014, I have been contracted by the Spanish Education Ministry to work alongside bilingual content instructors in public *centros bilingües*, my principal role being to help students and teachers alike with verbal communication in English.

The thought behind contracting native English speakers is that, despite the grammatical competencies of Spanish bilingual instructors, there is no substitute for a native accent and native pronunciation. Such is the tone of the yearly orientation meetings, organized by provincial Education Departments, which all language assistants are obliged to attend. In these orientations, I have been assured as to the indispensability of my nativeness and the promise that I hold as a linguistic resource for Spanish learners of English. Indeed, my presence as a language assistant has invariably been presented as a significant privilege for students, teachers often citing the fact that it is something they

did not have in their own education. In this way, the presence itself of *auxiliares* seems to mark for teachers and administrators the advancement of bilingual education in Spain, certainly trumping assistants' actual job performance or any pedagogical skills they may impart. To illustrate, in each of my four years in this position, the only evaluation I have received has come early on in the school year, serving strictly as a bureaucratic step for applying for renewal of my contract for the following year. Significantly, such renewal does not necessitate a continued stay at the same center; most often, language assistants are required to move from one school to another, the implication being that, despite the possibility of good working relationships with teachers and students, any *auxiliar* will do. In a similar vein, the past two years have seen increasing numbers of *auxiliares* split their time between two schools; each school, then, may have fewer hours of access to a native accent, but each technically *does* have access.

My position as an *auxiliar* has given me unique insight not only into the workings of bilingual programs, but also the extent to which students, teachers and community members alike adopt attitudes toward English acquisition informed by an English Imperative perspective. For example, my post has involved interacting with teachers not only in their role as educators, but also as parents. Without fail, I and other language assistants are approached in our first days of work by colleagues soliciting our services as private English tutors for their children or children of friends or family. The haste with which these solicitations come reflects the high demand for English teachers, especially ones coming from English-speaking countries, producing a sense of being a “new native

on the scene” whose schedule will presumably be quickly filled with private tutoring classes.

In this way, my official post as a language assistant in public bilingual schools has been amplified to the broader category of *language worker* in Spain, privileged to have the opportunity of multiple sources of income at a time of considerably high unemployment in the country. This opportunity comes not as a result of any professional training in English teaching, but simply for being from a place where English is the most widely spoken language. Remarkably, responses to my position have never provoked feelings of being seen as an intruder. On the contrary, my reception in schools and communities as a language worker has produced the sensation of being a welcomed and highly desired asset – or at least a high-value status symbol – which the country and its students are seen as desperately needing. Participant observation in this project, then, is characterized by the countless conversations, meetings, tutoring requests and class lessons that I have engaged in with teachers, students, friends, parents and community members over the last four years, all having informed the motivation, rationale and investigative approach for this research.

Analysis

Analysis of qualitative interview and focus group data occurred as an ongoing and iterative process involving two principal steps: transcribing and coding. Each transcription of interview and focus group audio files was followed by the analytical

method known as thematic content analysis. This inductive approach involved a gradual process of increasingly refined coding for categories and themes gathered from data with the intent of representing the views, perspectives and lived experiences of research subjects (Rivas, 2012). In going through this refinement process, a zig-zag approach was employed, meaning data was continually analyzed as it was gathered, each stage of analysis informing the subsequent stage of data collection in an ongoing and overlapping manner (Rivas, 2012).

Transcription

Upon completion of interviews and focus groups sessions, audio files were transcribed using Microsoft Word. Using Windows Media Player, transcription of mp3 audio files was done manually through continuous and repeated listening, playback and typing of dialogue into a Word document, using a separate document for each single interview or focus group recording. Transcription software was not used.

Recordings in which participants chose to speak Spanish were transcribed in Spanish, with translations of transcript excerpts being utilized only for the purpose of presenting data and findings in this final report. Leaving transcripts in the original language also facilitated the use of *in-vivo* coding, a method whereby data codes are given in correspondence with the actual language used by research participants as a means of avoiding any possible misinterpretations resulting from early analysis and interpretation (Rivas, 2012).

Though audio files were transcribed virtually in their entirety, transcribing was a somewhat selective process; moments when interview or focus group sessions deviated off-topic or veered into more causal or personal conversation were left out. Such decisions to emit portions of audio were determined by a judgement of their relevance to the research topic. In moments of doubt as to a word or phrase used by a given participant, the help of a third-party native Spanish speaker was enlisted for checking and clarification to ensure the accuracy of interview and focus group transcripts. Such instances involved care not to reveal any more audio than was necessary for clarification, safeguarding the identity of research participants and the full contents of their responses.

At the time of transcription, all personal information was removed from interview and focus group transcripts, participants having been assigned abbreviated codes in place of their names. Similarly, all other potentially identifying information was removed, such as the names of specific schools where the participant was working or had worked, as well the names of villages where the participant was working or had worked (See Appendices I & J for transcript samples). Following transcription, audio files were erased in accordance with procedural steps to ensuring confidentiality as stated in the informed consent documents presented to subjects prior to participation. Transcripts were saved on a personal, password-protected laptop.

Thematic content analysis

Qualitative data was analyzed using thematic content analysis. Through this approach, each transcript was read through while assigning codes and themes to significant words,

statements and passages contained within each data set. This was done until a point of saturation was reached wherein no new codes or themes appeared in interview or focus group transcripts. Once saturation was reached and no new themes occurred, existing codes and themes were then grouped together to create operational categories in relation to participants' opinions, views, attitudes and experiences (Table 1). When appropriate, *in vivo* coding was utilized in the naming of codes and themes.

Table 1: Thematic codes used in analysis

Category	Codes/themes comprising category
Program Functioning	Resources/training, communication, evaluation, obligatory vs. elective, policy changes
English Imperative	English-for-work, English-for-mobility, mobility-for-work, <i>nivel, a la hora de..., para tener trabajo</i>

The category of Program Functioning is operationally defined as pertaining to those views expressed which relate to participant experiences in the functioning of bilingual programs, and ties largely to the relationship between the policy and the practice of bilingual education. As such, themes of resources and training offered instructors, systems of evaluation, the obligatory nature of bilingualism in Andalusia and changes in policy mandates over time are included in the category of Program Functioning.

“English Imperative” is the analytical category which encompasses participants' views toward English in Spanish society, the nature of its uptake, motives for learning the

language and the role it is seen as playing in their current and projected future lives. This categorical title reflects the unanimity of participant attitudes as to the undeniable importance of English in contemporary Spain and beyond.

FINDINGS

Findings from this research reveal certain consistencies in participant views toward both the idea and the practical implementation of bilingual education policy and programming. In general, all participants in research can be said to be in favor of bilingual education, or at least in favor of the *idea* of bilingualism. Teachers, though seeing distinct problems and challenges in implementation, all had positive attitudes – albeit varying in degrees of positivity, and ultimately rooted in a utilitarian perspective invoking the global importance of English – toward the underlying motivation behind this sweeping educational initiative. As succinctly put by one teacher, “*La idea es buena, pero cómo se está haciendo, no.*” (“It’s a good idea, but how it’s being done, no.”). Likewise, students involved in bilingualism recognized challenges to content learning provoked by English instruction of core content but spoke favorably about CLIL bilingual classes and obligatory English learning. Noteworthy, however, is the distinctly pragmatic stance taken by most bilingual students, positioning English as a necessity in today’s world, and thus viewing bilingual classes as a valued instrument in achieving that necessity. This view is reflected in teachers’ own personal choices to enter the field of bilingual teaching specifically, each citing the professional advantages afforded them by having a requisite English competency certification as a principal motivation for soliciting a bilingual position – a motivation which seemingly far outweighs any ideological belief in the acquisition of English or even a personal attraction toward the English language and its use as a medium of instruction. The complex subtleties of

participant views are not few and situating them within the greater social milieu of Spain renders them no less complex. Findings from this research can be grouped into two main analytical categories – 1) Program Functionality, which includes views and experiences regarding implementational practices and bilingual policy mandates, and 2) the idea of an English Imperative, involving participant motivations for supporting bilingualism, ideas as to the social and economic role of English in Spain and beyond, and future projections regarding employment and individual mobility.

Teacher Views and Responses

In general, bilingual instructors and program coordinators interviewed for this research were in favor of the *idea* represented by bilingual educational policy and its practice via CLIL bilingual content classes. That is, they believed stimulating and fomenting English language acquisition in new ways to be a good thing for addressing what is seen as an obvious deficit in the country, invariably positioning English as a much-needed linguistic resource. By contrast, however, differing or even critical opinions and reflections were offered with regards to *how* bilingual education is being done, illustrating concrete critiques as to implementational practices and policy design. As shown through interview data, however, such critiques were often ultimately linked to the education system as a whole and were not necessarily unique to bilingual policy. In understanding instructor attitudes toward bilingual policy and programming, it is first important to grasp their motivations for soliciting these specialized educator positions in the first place.

On becoming a bilingual teacher – *Las Oposiciones y el bilingüismo*

Las Oposiciones refers to the official state-administered exams which teachers and all other public servants must pass in order to secure fixed and stable employment from the regional government, each exam being particular to the field in which the candidate wishes to enter. These exams are a hugely significant part of a highly bureaucratic system through which teachers, bilingual or not, receive position placements, petition transfers and accumulate points over the course of their career which count toward their professional standing and job security in the field of public education. The job market for public teaching is extremely and notoriously competitive in Spain, and the road to receiving a geographically-fixed, permanent and stable teaching position is a long, arduous and bureaucratically-enlaced path. One participant explained this formal examination as follows:

Aquí en España hay una cosa que se llama Sistema Oposiciones. Es como un macro-examen dónde tú te examinas de muchos temas, muchas materias. Tienes que hacer aprobar ese examen [y] luego pasar a otro examen donde te evalúan un tribunal de cinco personas, etc., etc. Y al final te ponen una nota. Son pruebas donde se puede presentar todo el mundo que tiene licenciatura. Es muy complicado sacarte la plaza.

Here in Spain there's something called *Sistema Oposiciones*. It's like a macro-exam where you are tested on many topics, many subjects. You have to pass that exam [and] then take another exam where a tribunal of five people evaluate you, etc., etc. And at the end they give you a grade. They're tests that anybody with a degree can take. It's very complicated to get a position.

The difficulty cited by the participant is evidenced by figures from the most recent 2016 and 2018 *oposiciones* exams in Andalusia. In 2016, a total of 22,293 individuals competed for 1,674 *plazas* in secondary education – a ratio of 13 candidates for every one

available position (Central Sindical Independiente y de Funcionarios [CSIF], 2016a, 2016b). With a surprisingly more favorable ratio of 6:1, 2018 saw 26,093 candidates compete for 4,229 secondary education positions (CSIF, 2018).

Upon entry to the public teaching system, all instructors begin by serving as substitutes throughout their respective regions; different from the United States, substitute teaching does not represent a separate job category. These temporary positions may last from days to weeks to a full academic year, and the substitute phase of one's career may last for up to a period of years. Prior to or during this time, instructors and instructors-to-be may spend up to two years studying and preparing for *las oposiciones*, which currently come up biennially and are taken by candidates according to their respective subjects. In other words, one year may see *oposiciones* for prospective history teachers, but a biology instructor may have to wait until the following year. Upon passing the official exam for entry into public teaching, the candidate is also awarded points which correspond to their professional profile. Points are awarded for passing the exam, for any additional certifications or professional training courses, and for accumulated experience in the field.

In short, *las oposiciones* represent a defining moment in the career and professional advancement of any public servant, most certainly including teachers. This explanation of the state-exam process and its significance is meant to contextualize entry into public teaching and illustrate the complexity it may entail. Further adding to this complexity, the way in which bilingualism plays into the accumulation of points and

serves as a facilitator of entry into the teaching field is clear from interview data. As one participant explained of his own entry into teaching mathematics:

JL: Pero, no había personas [que aprobaran las oposiciones] que tuvieran el título correspondiente en inglés para impartir [bilingüismo]...Entonces abren una convocatoria pública para que todo el mundo que tenga ese título y que pueda dar clases de matemáticas...Yo no me había presentado [a la oposición] nunca. Se te pide que tienes ciertos títulos – matemático, ingeniero o arquitecto. Si tienes cualquier de esos títulos puedes dar clases de matemáticas. Y bueno, el sistema de la oposición se valora tu examen y se valora tu experiencia.

Q: Entonces, si entiendo, ¿hoy en día un profesor nuevo que tenga un título de inglés ya no hace falta aprobar las oposiciones necesariamente para sacar una plaza...?

JL: Para empezar a trabajar. Para empezar. Pero ten en cuenta que empezar a trabajar implica que llegues antes a ser profesor. Porque estás cogiendo experiencia y el sistema valora la experiencia mucho...si quieres dedicarte a la docencia, al día de hoy es mucho más fácil empezar a ser profesor con bilingüismo que si lo intentas sin el bilingüismo.

There weren't people [who passed the exam] who had the corresponding English title to teach [bilingual classes]...Then a public call goes out so that anyone who has that title and can teach math...I had never taken [the official exam]. You need certain certifications – mathematician, engineer, or architect. And well, the system values your exam and it values your [teaching] experience.

Q: So, if I understand, today a new teacher with an English title doesn't necessarily need to pass the official exams to get a placement...?

JL: To start working. To start. But keep in mind that starting to work implies you become a teacher sooner. Because you're accumulating experience and the system values experience a lot...if you want to teach, nowadays it's much easier to get started with bilingualism than if you try without it.

This excerpt shows how bilingual teaching can serve as a competitive, if not decisive, edge within the bureaucratic system of examination and professional valuation through which instructors establish and further their careers. Having

previously worked as an engineer, the participant was able to capitalize on his holding an English title and receive a teaching position imparting high school math classes, despite not having passed *la oposición* at that time. In his case, this ticket to entry served him well, given that work for engineers had sharply declined following the 2008 economic crisis. Another participant who did, in fact, take and pass the official examination for becoming a history teacher explains his induction into the field as being equally facilitated by bilingualism:

Q: ¿Cómo te has encontrado en una plaza bilingüe? ¿Cómo has empezado con el bilingüismo?

JA: Pues, sencillo. Cuando hice las oposiciones, aprobé pero sin plaza. Y estaba en la bolsa de trabajo. Por las titulaciones académicas de idiomas, estaba en tres bolsas – castellano, inglés y francés. Este año la implantación de inglés ha aumentado muchísimo, y me llamaron el día 14 de septiembre para empezar el día 15. Así.

Q: How have you found yourself in a bilingual position? How'd you start with bilingualism?

JA: Well, simple. When I took the official exam, I passed but without a placement. And I was on the employment list. For my academic language titles, I was on three lists – Spanish, English and French. This year the implementation of English has increased very much, and they called me on the 14th of September to start on the 15th. Like that.

While bilingual instruction and capitalizing on the possession of English titles served the above participants as the principal means of entering public teaching, the specialized role of bilingual instructor played to the benefit of, and was utilized by, other instructors who had already been working within the system. In such cases, bilingualism has allowed previously monolingual content instructors enhanced mobility and preferential placement within Andalusia by

virtue of the points associated with second language abilities and corresponding titles:

Q: En principio, ¿cuál era tu motivo personalmente para sacar un B2 de inglés?

LA: Que me daba más puntos para las oposiciones, la verdad. No era ningún otro motivo. El tener ese título me daba más puntos para las oposiciones.

Q: At first, what was your personal motivation for getting a B2 in English?

LA: The truth is, it gave me more points for the official exams. There wasn't any other motive. Having that title gave me more points for the official exam.

Despite her candidness, the scenario of this participant is anything but unique; most participants have stated a similar thought-process and justification for choosing to acquire certification of English competency and enter bilingual teaching. She goes on to discuss the question of placement location as further explanation for her going into bilingualism:

Pues si te digo la verdad, es por una cuestión completamente práctica personal de sé que hay menos personas con la acreditación para bilingüe. Por lo cual me iba a poder acercar más a [esta ciudad] que es dónde vivo yo, aquí...Es simplemente por eso, la verdad.

Well to tell you the truth, it's a completely practical matter, because I know there are less people with the credentials for bilingual [teaching]. So I would be able to be closer to [this city] which is where I live, here...It's simply for that, honestly.

The participant affirms that she solely chose bilingual education for the fact that it increased the likelihood of being placed in her destination of choice, in this case a highly-solicited capital city. Most teacher participants have similarly cited their decision to undertake a career in bilingual teaching as driven by the

fact that they could more quickly and assuredly secure a job position in or near their destination of choice – often, a capital city where the participant either lives or is from. It is extremely common, even predictable, that once an educator begins their career, thus starts an often years-long journey to hopefully getting placed where one calls home. Considering the competitive nature of public teaching, bilingualism can undercut significantly the time it takes to gather sufficient points and experience to be granted a position in one’s preferred locale. In the words of yet another participant, “It was a vocational question, really. It was out of necessity. The only way to be in a school close to [here] was bilingual teaching.” In total, seven of the ten bilingual instructor participants asked about their motive for taking this job path attributed the decision to either fast-tracking their entry into public teaching or fast-tracking their placement in a geographic destination of choice.

Program functioning

Despite a broad support for the idea of widespread obligatory bilingual education (*‘el bilingüismo es una buena idea’*), teachers expressed critical views on some of the details as to how this policy is implemented. Questions asked of teachers aimed at elucidating these points of contention largely pertained to resource allocation to bilingual education in the form of teacher training and support. Further, teachers were asked about communication between education officials, schools and themselves to understand how

bilingual policy and programs function, and how policy is transmitted to its on-the-ground practitioners.

Training opportunities and communication. In positioning teacher training as a key implementational tool and component to program functioning, instructor participants were asked to describe their initial induction into bilingual education as a specialized form of instruction, as well as ongoing training opportunities offered them in their capacity as public bilingual educators. While many participants cited the existence of optional training courses offered bilingual teachers to further their linguistic capacities and familiarity with CLIL methodology, it was consistently noted that there does not exist any formal orientation or introduction to the job and its specific and specialized demands. One participant, in her first year of bilingual instruction, but who had previously worked as a monolingual history teacher, described her transition to bilingualism as follow:

Yo lo que veo es que...la transición que he tenido de un puesto no bilingüe a un puesto bilingüe es ninguna. Es decir, el único requisito es tener un B2 en inglés. Pero no hay ningún requisito de una formación en metodología bilingüe, por ejemplo. Que no es lo mismo dar una clase en un idioma que darla en dos...No sé, algún curso relacionado con eso yo creo que sería conveniente antes de hacer un puesto bilingüe, y eso no existe. No hay una formación obligatoria sobre eso. Y yo, la verdad que creo que sería algo bastante bueno. Vamos, que no hay aquí y no hay en ningún centro. No es una cosa de este centro. Es que eso no existe.

What I see is...the transition I had from a non-bilingual position to a bilingual position was none. That's to say, the only requisite is a B2 in English. But there is no training requisite in bilingual methodology, for example. It's not the same to give a class in one language as it is to give a class in two...I don't know, I think some course related to that would be good before taking a bilingual position, and that doesn't exist. There's no

mandatory training about that. And truthfully, I think it would be something quite good. I mean, it doesn't happen here or in any other center. It's not only this school. It just doesn't exist.

Another participant, also in her first year of bilingual content instruction at the time of interviewing, related a similar experience in describing her introduction to bilingualism.

When asked what kind of information or training she had received upon entering bilingual teaching, she simply stated, "*Ninguna. Nada...Eso es lo que tú has estudiado – en la academia de inglés que yo me estudié, y ya está.*" ("None. Nothing. It's what you have studied – in the English academy where I studied, and that's it."). Again, the implication here is that the only requisite for her entry to bilingualism was her existent and credentialed knowledge of English, with no additional training needed as to the policy mandates or instructional methodology to which she was now ostensibly held to.

When asked about this issue of training specific to bilingual instruction and CLIL methodology, another participant with more years of experience in the field echoed the above quotes, citing the lack of obligatory methodological training, but also mentioning optional courses periodically offered teachers:

No existe formación obligatoria...acredita que tienes un título de que se entiende que tú conoces la [asignatura] y el otro que se entiende que tú tienes conocimiento de un idioma extranjero. Ya está. Si tú no quieres volver a formarte nunca más en ninguna de esas dos cosas, no tienes un porqué hacerlo. Existe alguna formación optativa, pero a distancia...y además muy incoherente. Yo hice un curso eso y no me sirvió para nada.

Obligatory training doesn't exist...they confirm that you have a title by which it's understood that you know [the subject] and another by which it's understood that you're knowledgeable in a foreign language. That's it. If you never want to go back to get training in either of those two things, there's no reason to do so. There's optional training, but online...and very incoherent. I did one of those courses and it didn't help me at all.

The participant here explains what he sees as inadequacies in terms of teacher training and illustrates his introduction to bilingual teaching as a matter of simply confirming the minimum requirements as stipulated by policy mandates with no further preparation nor explanation of his duties specifically as a bilingual instructor of a core curricular subject. Returning to this issue later in the same interview, he offered insight as to a greater and perhaps more tacit policy aim of bilingual education, stating that, “*si ponemos más trabas el sistema no crece.*” (“if we put more obstacles, the system doesn’t grow.”) His point, drawing from his years of experience in bilingualism, is that more components to mandatory teacher training would impede the growth of bilingual programs in the region by creating obstacles to filling a growing demand for teachers. In other words, and in his opinion, if the *Junta* were to require additional certifications of bilingual instructors, there may thus happen a shortage of teachers and the system would, in turn, be unable to grow.

This lack of formalized introduction into the practice of bilingual teaching runs parallel to what appears to be a lack of open communication between the various levels of policy actors. That is, according to participant interview responses, the channels by which policy is communicated to its teacher practitioners run top-down and ultimately leave much for want. In reflecting on his five years of experience as a bilingual program coordinator, one interviewee described the enactment of policy as each actor “putting the load on the shoulders of the person that’s below them.” He elaborated:

So, the [directors], they say, “Okay. It’s your job,” to the coordinator. They tell the coordinators, “You guys have to do it.” Then I tell the bilingual teachers, “You guys have to make all these kids bilingual.” So,

it ends up being on the shoulders of teachers. And I'm not giving them anything, no more skills or anything to work with.

In this chain-of-command-style diffusion of bilingual policy, according to the coordinator, the responsibility to execute and implement policy and achieve program goals of “mak[ing] all these kids bilingual” is ultimately placed on the teachers themselves. This, in combination with the fact that teachers are responsible for their own professional formation in seeking bilingual positions and thus fulfilling a necessary demand for educators qualified to teach in two languages, effectively renders teachers the principal instrument of realizing bilingual education programs and putting policies into practice.

The responses of instructors largely support the above reflection of the program coordinator regarding channels of communication and the transmission of policy rules. They equally reflect, however, the apparent limitations of this mode of diffusion. In many instances, teachers cited their respective program coordinators as the mediator between them and the regional government, charged with informing them as to their duties and the rules to be followed; admittedly, though, instructors actually knew very little about these. When asked about his introductory experience and the demands placed upon bilingual instructors, for example, one participant stated, “*Lo que recibí fue con la coordinadora del bilingüe. Algunas nociones de...tanto por ciento de la hora que vamos a dar [en inglés], y puntos en común de todos los profesores bilingües. Nada más.*” (“What I received was through the bilingual coordinator. Some notions of...so much percent of the hour that we give [in English], and other things in common with all the

bilingual teachers. Nothing else.”) These common points refer to practical questions of instruction, such as how much time instructors are to teach in English and questions of evaluation – namely that students are to be awarded for correct usage of the language, but not to be penalized for incorrect usage. In a similar explanation of how they understand and come to know of bilingual policy, two participants who were interviewed together confirmed:

ME: La coordinadora. Es la encargada.

MA: Coordinadora del bilingüe. Ella nos va informando de los cambios, de la legislación, y si salen cursos para profesores bilingües...Ella es la que nos conecta con todo.

ME: The coordinator. She's in charge.

MA: The bilingual coordinator. She goes on informing us of changes, of the legislation, and if any courses come up for bilingual teachers...She's the one who connects us with everything.

Shortly thereafter in the interview, however, limitations to their understanding of policy directives were acknowledged in stating:

ME: Nosotros no conocemos bien las normativas. Nosotros conocemos un poco la parte de la normativa que nos afecta – las horas que tenemos que dar, las lecciones en el cincuenta por ciento de la clase, cómo evaluar la competencia lingüística que, por cierto, es uno de los puntos flacos y no se sabe.

MA: Esto no se sabe.

ME: Pero realmente la ley está allí. Te la dan y tú la miras. Simplemente eso.

ME: We don't know the regulations well. We know a little about the part that affects us – the hours that we have to give [classes], lectures [in English] in fifty percent of the class, how to evaluate linguistic competency, which, by the way, is one of the weak points and nobody knows.

MA: It's unknown.

ME: But really, the law is there. They give it to you and you read it. Simply that.

It is expressed, then, that these teachers have a general knowledge of those policy directives which most affect their day-to-day work, particularly the stipulated hours of instruction that is to be in English. Also expressed is the knowledge that there is, in fact, a structure for evaluating student linguistic competency, though this is stated as being unknown. That is, there is awareness that certain evaluation measures exist, but it is not understood what they are, how they function, nor how this applies to their jobs as content instructors. "*No se sabe*" (It's unknown). The notion that "the law is there, and you look at it," then, proves to be an inefficient model for providing clear understanding of bilingual policy directives.

In pointing to such deficiencies in communication and troubles with program implementation generally, a unanimous complaint of teacher participants has been the elimination of a previously-existent, arranged time in workday schedules for meeting with their respective bilingual team members and preparing bilingual class materials. Until the 2016-2017 school year, all bilingual content instructors in Andalusia had a reduction in class hours which allowed for a weekly coordinated meeting with fellow instructors and the elaboration of teaching resources. It was understood that the benefit of this reduction was to provide time for bilingual instructors within a school to coordinate interdisciplinary activities, develop coinciding class materials and learn of news regarding policy changes or other bureaucratic notifications pertaining to their jobs

via the program coordinator. Indeed, as affects the day-to-day work of bilingual instructors, the elimination of this meeting time has marked the most significant shift in the directed implementation of bilingual programs and is unanimously seen as having a negative impact on program quality and the ability of teachers to effectively carry out their duties.

Creo que necesitamos una hora o dos de reducción horaria para poder dedicarnos a [el bilingüismo]. Hoy por hoy no tengo una hora de reunión con la gente que lleva el tema de bilingüe. No me puedo reunir con ellos – todo tiene que ser por email, todo tiene que ser por WhatsApp, y eso repercute en mi trabajo. Es decir, si yo no me puedo coordinar con mis compañeros, al final el trabajo es más descoordinado. Esto es muy contraproducente. Y lo digo porque anteriormente sí que existía la reducción horaria por estos temas y hoy por hoy no la tenemos.

I think we need a one- or two-hour reduction in our schedules to focus [on bilingualism]. At present I don't have an hour to meet with the people involved with the bilingual program. I can't meet with them – everything has to be by e-mail or WhatsApp, and that has repercussions on my work. I mean, if I can't coordinate with my coworkers, in the end the work is less coordinated. This is very counterproductive. I say this because there used to be a reduction in schedules for these things, and now we don't have it.

Even teachers who have not experienced this built-in meeting time for the purpose of program coordination were aware of its prior existence and considered it something which would be very useful to them now:

MA: El problema es que no tenemos una hora para reunirnos. Tenemos un grupo de WhatsApp. El año pasado fue el primer año que se quitó.

ME: Nosotras no hemos vivido esa hora de reunión. Porque como empezamos el año pasado, y ya la quitaron. Y a mí me hubiera venido muy bien, el año pasado y éste...fundamental.

MA: The problem is that we don't have an hour to meet. We have a WhatsApp group. Last year was the first year they cut it.

ME: We haven't had that hour for meeting. Because since we started last year, and they'd already cut it. And for me it would have been great, last year and this year...fundamental.

The elimination of a bureaucratically-sanctioned coordination meeting has been met with such fierce criticism because, according to participants, bilingual teaching already supposes added work for the instructor with no additional remuneration, monetary or otherwise. Without scheduled preparation time in their work week, then, this condition has been exacerbated. In other words, participants feel as though more work has been added to and already extra workload. As one instructor put it, *"Y claro, sin reducción ni nada, se hace más pesado y más intenso que si no tuviera bilingüe."* ("And obviously, without a reduction [in hours] or anything, it's more tiresome and more intense than if I didn't have bilingual [classes]."). Thus, class-hour reduction is seen as the one facilitating tool that was unique to bilingual programs, and its elimination has been strongly lamented by teacher participants for its hindrance to individual and group work duties seen as specific to bilingual content instruction.

Furthermore, in the face of an expanding bilingual system and obvious pushes for growth, it stands as a question of anachronistic perplexity to teachers as to why a tool which facilitates program functionality should be eliminated. From a policy perspective, this raises questions as to implicit goals of simply diffusing bilingual programs, regardless of quality or student learning outcomes, and regardless of input from the principal practitioners. As regards individual instructors, the cutting of the only obvious benefit of being a bilingual teacher effectively renders the position itself the only lasting advantage; that is, the perspective of bilingualism as a career fast-track may not

necessitate any further incentives for entering bilingual content instruction, even with the widely-held understanding that it is, in fact, more work for teachers.

Elective to Obligatory

Another significant change undergone by bilingual education policy in Andalusia has been the shift from elective to obligatory bilingualism in high schools designated as bilingual centers. The shift has occurred gradually over recent years, and current policy stipulates that all students in attendance at a bilingual center must mandatorily be enrolled in bilingual content classes. Previously, there existed bilingual tracks which students and parents could opt for. According to participants with substantial experience and who have worked in the age of elective bilingualism, students who chose this track were often of higher academic standing and seen as “up to the task” of dual-language content classes. For some, elective programs were thus seen as having an air of elitism about them, essentially filtering “good” students from “bad” and creating unequal access to English learning opportunities (Bruton, 2011b; Lorenzo et al., 2011).

Such debate as to the merits of elective bilingualism versus those of obligatory CLIL have played out not only among scholars, but among participants in this research as well. In accounting for the shift to obligatory bilingual classes, one instructor suggested that:

“[I]t’s a better option. Otherwise...consciously or not, centers tend to separate good students who are normally...there is a correspondence between your level of English and your academic level, right? So, there are two groups – “A” for the ones that have more level and “B” for the ones that have a lower level. And I think this is not the best way to

organize the thing. So, I believe that the only way to correctly and wisely implement bilingual programs is by making [them] obligatory.”

Contrary to this, another participant offered support for an elective system, stating simply that, “*Todos los niños no son iguales. Por tanto, no todos pueden estar en un grupo bilingüe.*” (“Not all kids are the same. Therefore, not all can be in a bilingual group.”).

Despite differing opinions as to which is best for teaching and learning English via content subjects, electively or mandatorily, participants all agreed that an obligatory model does present certain challenges in their day-to-day work. Variances in student linguistic competencies within a single classroom are seen as complicating instruction, as teachers must find a balance between English and Spanish instruction to ensure that *content* is being sufficiently and adequately learned. Again, this relates to pedagogical debates as to whether content instruction in a foreign language hinders or waters down the principal subject matter of core classes. In the words of one participant critical of obligatory bilingual classes, “*Si un alumno no se expresa bien en castellano – no tiene éxito en su propio idioma – me tiene que venir alguien a explicarme, ¿cómo se pretende que se desempeña bien en una lengua extranjera? Lo veo casi imposible.*” (“If a student doesn’t express himself well in Spanish – he isn’t successful in his own language – someone has to explain to me how you expect him to perform in a foreign language. I think it’s almost impossible.”)

Taking a less critical stance, but nonetheless being in favor of elective bilingualism, one program coordinator who experienced this shift in policy explained it as follows:

One of the main changes that we have suffered was the change from being an elective program to becoming an obligatory program. The thing is that our school was not in favor of making this type of teaching obligatory, because without the parent, families, students to be free to be able to choose...so, it was a question of freedom. Because in the opinion of certain groups, if it's elective it's elitist. But I don't think that's a reality...and I think one of the main problems that teachers are facing now [is] the lack of motivation to be in bilingual groups for those [students] who have been obligated to be there.

As a response to what she identifies as a dilemma of choice, this coordinator and administrators at her center invoked their roles as policy actors in devising a creative implementation strategy involving two bilingual tracks. One track “offer[ed] the students the possibility of four [bilingual] subjects,” while the other was “a reduced path with just two subjects.” This reduced track technically fulfills the minimum requirements as set by governmental policy mandates, with students receiving just enough hours of content instruction in English – and in less academically rigorous courses – to be considered enrolled in bilingualism. The second and more intensive track, then, is meant to offer other students, as a matter of choice, greater opportunity to develop their English competencies.

Regardless of belief as to the efficacy of either model, elective or obligatory, the shift to mandatory bilingual classes is largely understood to be motivated by what they see as the increasing importance of English in Spanish, and global, society. The perceived necessity of English – or an English Imperative perspective, as is referred to in this research – seems to explain for instructors and coordinators this major change in policy, even if they do not see it as the best mode for instruction and for securing optimal

learning outcomes. Indeed, acknowledgment and adherence to the belief of the necessity of English may be two different things, as expressed by one participant:

Cada vez la globalización va más...pues necesitamos saber inglés. Así lo entiendo y lo veo lógico. Pero no lo veo necesario que niños con 12 años tengan que saber inglés. A lo mejor necesitan una asignatura de educación emocional, de valores, de saber estar. ¿A qué estamos dando prioridad? A un idioma, ¿de verdad?

Every day globalization goes further...well, we need to know English. That's how I understand it and it seems logical to me. But I don't think it's necessary for 12-year-olds to know English. Maybe they need a subject on emotional education, values, behavior. What are we prioritizing? A language, really?

While this reflects the personal opinion of the participant, statements attributing the rising importance of English to global processes and internationalization were common in all teacher participant responses. As such, obligatory bilingualism is understood as ostensibly meant to meet this demand in an inclusionary and open-access manner. The issue for participants seems not to be a question as to the importance of learning English in general or as a subject, but rather the incessant fervor with which English has gained such prominence in Spanish public education.

Student Views and Responses

Data gathered from focus groups with high school and vocational program students revealed predominantly positive and supportive views toward English learning, both as a singular subject and via the instruction of non-linguistic core subject areas in English. To be sure, difficulties and complications arising from bilingual content

instruction were expressed – namely that some subject matter can be more difficult to absorb in a foreign language:

A: Cuesta acostumbrarse.

B: Depende de las asignaturas que sean en inglés. Por ejemplo, en segundo teníamos en inglés ciencias naturales, y esa era muy difícil en inglés.

C: Sí, era difícil porque era mucho contenido nuevo y conceptos que no sabíamos todavía muy bien. Entonces nos costó más aprenderlos.

A: It's hard to get used to it.

B: It depends on the subjects that are in English. For example, in our second year [of high school] we had natural sciences in English, and that was really difficult in English.

C: Yeah, it was difficult because it was a lot of new content and concepts that we still didn't know very well. So, it was harder for us to learn them.

Another student, whose statement was affirmed by classmates, similarly criticized certain decisions as to implementation in her school:

A mí, algunas cosas me parecen muy estúpidas. Por ejemplo, poner en primero y cuarto matemáticas bilingües. Me parece muy estúpido. Porque las matemáticas es calcular cosas con fórmulas y ecuaciones principalmente. No hay apenas teorías, entonces no tiene sentido.

To me, some things seem really stupid. For example, to have bilingual math classes in [the] first and fourth [years]. It seems really stupid to me. Because math is mainly calculating things with formulas and equations. And there's hardly any theories, so it doesn't make any sense.

Nonetheless, and despite pointed and relatively minor critiques concerning certain subjects being taught bilingually, students generally and overwhelmingly adhere to the notion that bilingual classes are beneficial, if not crucial, to their educational formation. In student responses expressing these supportive and positive perspectives, three central and interrelated themes emerged which all fall under what is referred to here as an

English Imperative view. That is, students see English as an absolute necessity in contemporary society and as an indispensable resource for their futures; knowing English is, in a word, imperative. Central to the anthropological line of inquiry here, then, was aiming to understand how and why students have come to align themselves with this view.

English-for-work

To begin focus groups, students were asked to discuss their personal histories with learning English, virtually all stating in turn that they began studying the language in early childhood around three or four years of age. It is clear, then, that English has been a compulsory subject during the whole of their public educational careers, high school bilingual programs notwithstanding.

Central to student focus group responses was the belief that English, as a linguistic resource, carries great economic and social benefit for its foreign speakers. This is reflected not only in terms of possibility, or even probability, but rather in terms of an inevitable and practical necessity. That is, student views go beyond seeing English as augmenting and expanding opportunities later in life, framing it more as an essential component to their academic formation and future professional profiles in their projected search for work. Such views are frankly and succinctly summarized by statements such as:

A: A la hora de conseguir un trabajo, lo primero que te piden es saber inglés.

B: Pues yo creo que para el tema del trabajo es lo más importante.

A: When it comes time to find work, the first thing they ask you is to know English.

B: Well, I think [English] is the most important thing for finding work.

These affirmations citing work and job opportunities as prime motivators for learning English largely reflect the attitudes and opinions of students actively engaged in bilingual education. When asked how they see the relationship between English and employment, the frequent and unanimous sentiment was:

A: Que [el inglés] influye mucho. Si tienes un buen nivel de inglés, es más fácil que entres en un trabajo. Y tienes más puntos.

B: Ahora mismo en todos los trabajos te piden un nivel de inglés.

A: That [English] has a lot of influence. If you have a good level of English, it's easier to get work. And you have more points.

B: Right now, all jobs require you to have a level of English.

The above responses reflect the framework under which students understand the necessity of English in securing jobs in the future and contain the key word and metric by which the value of the language is understood and, most importantly, demonstrated: *nivel* (level).

Nivel medio, nivel básico. As relates to students' main preoccupation with the relationship between English and work, concern lies less in the acquisition of subjective linguistic and communicative competencies, and much more with acquiring a demonstrably certified level. Indeed, statements such as "*te piden un nivel medio de inglés para tener un trabajo,*" ("they ask that you have an intermediate level of English to get a job") reflect not only the extent to which students understand projected and future job requisites in terms of titled certification, but the very mechanism by which English

has become a commodified good in Spain. The significance of this concept of level and its decisive power regarding employment and employability is clearly demonstrated in the words of one student:

Ahora mismo la mayoría de los trabajos piden un nivel medio de inglés para aceptarte. Con turismo, la universidad... Bueno, también te pueden coger con un nivel bajo del inglés. Pero si tú, por ejemplo, llevas un nivel alto, tienes más probabilidad de entrar en el trabajo.

Right now, most jobs require an intermediate level of English [for you] to be accepted. With tourism, the university... Sure, they might also take you with a low level of English. But, for example, if you have a high level, you have better chances of getting the job.

These certification levels, the most infamous of which are B1 and B2, fall under the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). The CEFR is a framework designed and used for the supposedly objective measurement and designation of acquired foreign language competencies. This system is used across Europe and is the means by which English learners in Spain obtain proof of their learning via titled certification. As such, and while the term itself is inherently ambiguous, *nivel* is inextricably aligned with the commodification of English in Spanish society via what is commonly and popularly referred to as “*titulitis*” (“title-itis”), or the obsession with acquiring titles and certifications which ostensibly demonstrate, in an official capacity, one’s linguistic competencies. This very demonstrability of *nivel*, then, is what becomes most important in acquiring it. In other words, it is not entirely uncommon to hold a B2 title but not have an equivalent competency level or, conversely, to have an impressive English repertoire without holding an equivalent and officially-granted title.

As a point of contextualizing student responses supporting bilingualism and professing English as a necessity for work, it is clear that certification titles, taken as a concrete referent to the notion of *nivel* espoused by focus group participants, may take precedence over real and practically demonstrable communicative skills. This very sentiment is rather humorously highlighted in a satirical monologue by popular Spanish actor and comedian Luis Merlo, in which he wittily dissects the phenomenon of English *titulitis* by discussing the well-known discourse, shown to be common among students, of *inglés nivel medio* (intermediate level English) (TopTrendingVideo, 2014). Merlo describes *inglés nivel medio* as if it were an indigenous language of Spain, a dialect spoken and understood only by its native inhabitants:

Es un dialecto de uso interno, sólo para hablarlo entre nosotros. El inglés nivel medio es una de las grandes aportaciones que la cultura española ha hecho al mundo. (TopTrendingVideo, 2014)

It's a dialect used domestically, only for speaking amongst ourselves. *El inglés nivel medio* is one of the great contributions that Spanish culture has made to the world.

Intermediate *nivel* is further characterized by Merlo for its frequent appearance on CVs across Spain, but without any verifiable communicative abilities tied to it (TopTrendingVideo, 2014). Further, the popular platform from which the comedian offers his musings is perhaps proof in and of itself of just how much this key phrase is both recognized and recognizable in Spanish popular discourse, a point which certainly becomes apparent when looking at student focus group data.

The significance attached by students to English is not only limited to work specifically but goes further to include institutional access to professional resources

logically understood to enhance one's employability – namely, higher education. As one participant noted, “*Ahora, fundamentalmente en todas las carreras te piden un nivel básico de inglés*” (“Now, a basic level of English is a fundamental requirement for all university degrees”). There is truth to this statement; relatively new national educational legislation has made it a requirement to hold a B1 title for the full completion of any undergraduate study program. However, contrary to the above statement, this title can be in *any* foreign language, not just English. This point of misinformation is quite telling, at once asserting and reaffirming the prestigious position English has come to hold in Spanish education and Spanish society in general; the student is aware of the B1 degree requirement but goes further to assume that said title must be in English. Responses of other students revealed a more informed, yet consequentially similar, view:

Q: Entonces, ¿cuál sería la diferencia entre elegir estudiar inglés y elegir estudiar francés o italiano o...?

A: Hombre, mejor el inglés por el tema que ya hemos dicho. Te abra más puertas, más todo.

Q: So, what would be the difference between choosing English and choosing French, or Italian, or...?

A: Better English for the reasons we've already said. It opens more doors for you, more everything.

In this case of choice regarding foreign language learning, then, the above response falls directly in line with student views of English as a practical necessity. Thus, the institutional requirement of having a B1 in any foreign language apparently indirectly promotes the study of English. For reasons of lexical and grammatical similarity, it stands to reason that students would find greater ease in taking up French or Italian.

English, nonetheless, is opted for due to the belief that it will yield greater professional (economic) benefits. This choice of English, then, may not be so much a real choice, but rather a conditioned selection.

In considering the English Imperative view found in student focus group data, it is also worth noting contradictions that arose from experiences of vocational program students. This student group, ranging in age between 18 and 30 years old, is the only one in which participants had actual work experience – precisely, three participants. The descriptions of these three subjects’ direct personal experiences in the labor sector contrast with what they and their peers perceive as their collective future in the job market. That is, among those students who had actually worked, none needed to speak English or present an English certificate, neither to get the job nor to complete their duties on the job:

A: Qué pasa es que el trabajo que he hecho no necesitaba el inglés.

B: A mí nunca me han preguntado si sabía inglés.

C: [C]uando entré a trabajar [en un hotel] temporalmente unos meses, no me exigieron inglés. Yo entraba temporalmente, unos meses en verano, y no me exigieron.

A: For the work that I’ve done I didn’t need English.

B: Nobody’s ever asked me if I knew English.

C: [W]hen I went to work seasonally [at a hotel] for a few months, they didn’t require English. I entered seasonally, a few months in summer, and they didn’t require it.

In contrast to her statement above, however, Student B had stated earlier in the discussion:

B: Pero si tú trabajas en un sitio y tienes clientes que te vienen en inglés...sepas trabajar en un bar de playa, ahora mismo todos los ingleses y todos los americanos y de otros países hablan inglés. Todo el mundo habla inglés. Entonces, hasta para abrir una Coca Cola necesitas hablar inglés.

B: But if you work in a place and you have clients that come to you in English...you know that working in a bar at the beach, right now, all the English and all the Americans and people from other countries speak English. Everybody speaks English. So, even just to open a Coca Cola you need to speak English.

Not only does this excerpt reiterate the recurring theme of English-as-necessary-for-work, but also underscores the context in which many discussions of job possibilities amongst young people occur. Reflected are contemporary conceptions of work in Spain as largely centered on notions of globalization and, more pointedly, tourism. That is, there seems to be an assumption of going to work in ambits directly related to globalized relationships, transnational movements and a globalized economy wherein English as a *lingua franca* becomes instrumental. Its necessity is asserted, despite the case of a lived experience which may nullify that very assumption of its being necessary. The statement, “even just to open a Coca Cola, you need to speak English,” is a striking illustration of this. It speaks to the dire unemployment situation faced by young people entering the world of work – though down from previous years, the average youth unemployment rate for 2017 was 38.6 percent – and the extent to which English is believed to be a requisite even for what are seen as relatively menial labor tasks (Eurostat, 2018b; Zamora-Kapoor & Collier, 2014).

English-for-mobility

A secondary theme common to student views supporting bilingual programs and the perceived benefits of English acquisition came through responses appealing to the notion and prospect of individual mobility. Like those ideas of economic mobility espoused above, and similarly invoking the status of English as a *lingua franca*, students referred also to physical, geographic mobility across national borders:

A: Cuando viajas a otros países, si no te sabes ese idioma tienes que hablar en inglés, porque es el idioma más importante...es cómo te entienden.

A: When you travel to other countries, if you don't know that language you have to speak in English because it's the most important language...it's how they understand you.

B: Si quieres viajar también. Tienes que hablar inglés con otras personas, porque no siempre te sabes el idioma del país que vas.

B: If you want to travel as well. You have to speak in English with other people, because you don't always know the language of the country where you go.

C: Yo lo veo bien [el inglés obligatorio] porque ahora el idioma universal es el inglés. Y con eso te puedes comunicar con la mayoría de la gente cuando vas a un país extranjero, aunque no sepas el idioma de ese país.

C: I think [having to learn English] is good because now English is the universal language. And with that you can communicate with most people when you go to a foreign country, even though you don't know the language of that country.

These excerpts present the most fundamental assumption underlying the perceived benefits and importance of speaking English; "It's the most important language." Thus, insofar as students are preoccupied with the possibility and probability of travel later in life, English comes to represent a key to unlocking those possibilities and a tool for facilitating international mobility. It is clear that such mobility abroad is an

important issue for these students, who are aware of European education programs such as Erasmus which provide funding for the promotion of international study. Thus, while such travel may at this stage be somewhat idealized, there is no doubt as to its very real possibility, even probability, in their futures. As one student stated, *“Cuando era más pequeña, decía, ‘Cuando sea mayor yo voy a irme a estudiar fuera.’ Y puede ser que eso me influye en el estudio del inglés.”* (“When I was younger I said, ‘When I’m older I’m going to study abroad.’ And it could be that that influences me in studying English.”).

Themes of mobility and travel were also presented by students from the other side, considering English competency as important for receiving those who come to Spain, as well:

Un día vas por la calle, y preguntan en inglés y te queda como, “¿Qué?” A mí me pasó. Se paró un coche y preguntó por dónde estaba un hotel en inglés. Y yo...pff. Menos mal que mi amigo sí sabía. Para eso, simplemente para ayudar a alguien por la calle – normal que te pregunten en inglés.

One day you’re in the street, they ask you something in English and you’re like, “What?” That happened to me. A car stopped and asked where a hotel was in English. And me...pff. Good thing my friend knew. For that, simply to help someone in the street – it’s normal that they ask you in English.

This anecdote paints a typical picture of what students see as English in use for them domestically. Such a scenario of putting acquired skills into practice via short-term interactions with tourists is seen as a realistic, day-to-day use of English, and one which reinforces its utility. In the words of another participant, *“Por ejemplo, un fin de semana estaba en la calle y me encontré a un inglés que estaba perdido. Un turista.”* (“For

example, one weekend I was in the street and I ran into an English person who was lost. A tourist.”)

It is worth considering these recounted interactions and the significance attached to them in the context of international relations and movements of people, as well as broader European language policy. Just as students value the utility of English for visiting other countries, it is valued at home in situations of interacting with visiting tourists lacking in Spanish competencies. What is represented is a kind of reciprocal English learning-communicating amongst European citizens, the fulfillment and enactment of which amounts to becoming the “ideal” European in today’s global landscape. This ideal is, in fact, specifically outlined in European Commission (EC) language policy, the progenitor of bilingual policies across Spain. Among the prescriptions of EC policy is a “2+1” model of language acquisition whereby students learn two foreign languages, one of which is necessarily deemed as having universal status (i.e. English) (Tender & Vihalemm, 2009). Given this context, students quoted above reproduce narratives which directly support the rationale for stipulating that a language of universal status be integral to European education; the policy supports the perceptions of students, and their experiences in turn support and reinforce that policy.

Combining the two: mobility-for-work

These two central themes to student understandings and perceptions as to the importance and practical necessity of English are anything but mutually exclusive. Focus group participants frequently synthesized the two notions through hypothetical scenarios in

which the benefit of mobility and international communicative abilities translate into expanded and augmented work opportunities. The role of choice in such scenarios varied in student responses, with some participants framing their statements in terms of possibility (“can”), while others tended to frame the issue in terms of likelihood or even necessity (“might have to;” “have to”):

Por ejemplo, si no puedes encontrar trabajo aquí [en España], con el inglés puedes ir a cualquier otro país y encontrar trabajo allí. Y puedes comunicarte bien con esas personas, aunque...por ejemplo, en Alemania. Aunque no sepas hablar alemán, puedes hablar inglés, por lo que te puedes comunicar perfectamente.

For example, if you can’t find work here [in Spain], with English you can go to any other country and find work there. And you can communicate well with those people, even though...for example, in Germany. Although you may not know German, you can speak English and communicate perfectly.

As expressed by another student, more as a matter of possible necessity and in response to jobs insecurity in Spain:

Porque a lo mejor, más adelante, tú no tienes porqué encontrar un trabajo aquí en España. A lo mejor tienes que encontrarlo fuer, en Inglaterra o en Francia o en algún país de esos. Y allí ya te piden un nivel de inglés un poco más alto.

Because maybe later on, there’s no reason you’ll find work here in Spain. Maybe you have to find it abroad, in England or in France or in one of those countries. And there they expect you to have a level of English that’s a little higher.

These excerpts are representative of a common view in which moving abroad in search of work is a likely situation in which students may find themselves. To this end, English is reaffirmed as a necessary tool for confronting an uncertain and doubtful jobs economy in Spain.

In their totality, and to contextualize student data in a broader and more theoretical sense, these views of an English Imperative can be related to the “taking up” of linguistic repertoires to be used in particular situations – in this case foreseeably economic ones. This notion of taking up speech in the form of a situational and deliberately used repertoire can be linked to Robert Moore’s work on superdiversity (Moore, 2012). In a case study of indigenous language revitalization classes, Moore argues that the uptake of native language lends its new speakers, far from fluent, a certain and demonstrable cultural capital within the community through public displays of their native linguistic repertoire. Such knowledge may be exercised, for example, in public speeches and community events, garnering its speakers an augmented socio-cultural status (Moore, 2012). As shown from student data, English serves a similar purpose as a linguistic repertoire, though in a perversely globalized fashion which affords its speakers economic rather than cultural capital; English serves, from student perspectives, as an *economic* linguistic repertoire. As such, its uptake, even if far from amounting to fluency, can be employed in concrete situations where an individual may stand to make economic gain. From the data shown, such gain is believed to come principally in the form of future work and job opportunities.

The fact that said opportunities stand as future projections is another key distinction of students’ views toward bilingualism and the taking up of English. Commonly used phrases such as, “*a la hora de buscar un trabajo*,” (“When it comes time to find work”) do not necessarily correspond to participants’ immediate

socioeconomic situations, but rather appeal to a projected future in which English is foreseen as playing a decisive role in their economic and professional lives. Expressed notions of work opportunities and mobility as enhanced by certified English competencies constitute a social imaginary distinct from the social immediate of bilingual students, and English becomes a certain tool for navigating an uncertain future (Vigh, 2009).

Social navigation is characterized by the movement of social actors within a changing environment in which experiences are largely marked by an unpredictability resulting from the rapid political, social and economic change symptomatic of a globalized world, and this perspective lends greatly to contextualizing student preoccupations with work in the future and the associated promise that English is believed to hold (Vigh, 2009). In the case of Spain, such unpredictability can be related to social and economic conditions resulting from a global economic crisis which has had lasting effects on the Spanish economy and unemployment rates, particularly among younger generations (Zamora-Kapoor & Collier, 2014). Subsequently, English is positioned and taken up as a practical mechanism for navigating through unstable economic situations and an uncertain future.

To be sure, the social imaginary referred to here is not an invention of student participants, but rather a view built from their current social environment. When asked as to how they *know* that English provides definite leverage in economic advancement, some students cited second-hand experiences of older relatives who have been required to

hold an English title to get their current job, or who had been denied opportunities for lack of such certification.

More frequent, however, were statements appealing to the idea of an English Imperative as a simple point of fact or common knowledge, “*que todo el mundo te lo dice, porque es la verdad. Porque sí siempre te piden un nivel de inglés.*” (“that everyone tells you, because it’s true. Because, yes, they always require that you have a level of English.”) For that reason, “*se habla de que todo el mundo ahora mismo está buscando un nivel de inglés más o menos que sea básico.*” (“It’s talked about how everyone right now is trying to get a level of English that’s more or less basic.”). Further evidence is cited as television and other mass media, and even the education system itself: “[S]i el inglés no fuera importante, no lo pondrían en todos los colegios, en todos los institutos.” (“If English weren’t important, they wouldn’t put it in all elementary schools, in all high schools.”) Considering the ubiquity conveyed in such responses, perhaps the most telling and succinct rationale for explaining, understanding and adopting an English Imperative view was offered by one student, who simply said of the language, “It’s everywhere.”

DISCUSSION

Bilingual Education as “Good” Policy

In reviewing the findings of this research, and drawing from theories on the anthropology of development, it is asserted here that bilingual education in Spain represents “good” policy that “legitimizes and mobilizes political and practical support” (Mosse, 2004, p. 663), as evident not only from participant views illustrated and discussed above, but also from the continued expansion of bilingual programs across the country. The laudable success of these programs arguably pivots on the two key and interlocking factors of growth and access; growth of the system itself, which invariably and necessarily creates greater public access to what has been shown here to be a highly desired linguistic resource.

Bilingual policy and its associated projects clearly cultivate support among key stakeholders (teachers and students) for their appeal to the English Imperative view of English as an absolute necessity. This appeal speaks loudly to what appears to be a popular demand for English uptake in Spain, and equally serves as evidence and rationale *for* the necessity of taking it up. For, as quoted above, “If English wasn’t important, they wouldn’t put it in all the schools.” In other words, the prevalence of bilingual programs serves, among its functions, as further evidence of the need for English while at the same time providing public access to it. It becomes yet another example of the fact that “it’s everywhere,” simultaneously identifying and stimulating the preoccupying problem of

needing English for future success *and* providing (at least part of) the solution. In this way, bilingual projects undoubtedly align with the practical interests of students of acquiring and developing what they see as a necessary linguistic repertoire for later competing in a presumably precarious job market.

As for teachers, the similar yet more immediate practical interest of securing work in the field of public education is met; bilingualism serves, in the eyes of participants, as the principal, if not sole, reason for their having a job. Even those dissenting voices of teachers who recognize flaws in implementation and criticize certain aspects of bilingual programs have already admittedly benefitted from hiring structures inherent to educational policy by getting a job faster or having job stability by way of bilingual education projects. The mutual benefit to bilingual teachers and to the policy objective of growth can be said to represent a translation of policy goals into practical interests of these practitioners which, in turn, feed back into the aim of program expansion. That is, the clear advantage that an English title leverages in the public teaching field links the practical interests of teachers who want a job with the policy aim of increasing numbers of bilingual schools. Referring back to teacher qualifications and the minimum B2 requirement for bilingual instruction, “if they put more obstacles [for teachers to enter bilingualism], the system wouldn’t grow.” As more teachers recognize the competitive edge afforded them by bilingualism, the system is subsequently supplied with more practitioners, allowing more bilingual centers to be opened, thus leading to greater

numbers of bilingual students, or at least students who have greater and equal access to English learning; growth and access are achieved. In the words of one participant:

Una cosa es que tú llames centro bilingüe a un centro en el que un niño tiene cuatro profesores que tienen un título en inglés. Si a eso queremos llamar el bilingüismo, pues entonces podemos tener más bilingüe que ninguna zona del mundo. Si seguimos en esta línea...reducimos la hora de la coordinación – da igual si los profesores estén coordinados o que no estén. Eso es la idea, ¿no? Pero da igual, y el centro sí se sigue llamando bilingüe. Y si al día de mañana veamos que con cuatro asignaturas no podemos hacer más centros bilingües, da igual. Cuatro no. Tres. Y entonces habrá más centros bilingües. Pero bajo de mi punto de vista, está lejos de lo que significa la palabra "bilingüismo."

One thing is that you call a bilingual center a school where a kid has four teachers with English titles. If that's what we want to call bilingualism, then we can have more bilingual [education] than anywhere in the world. If we continue like this...reducing coordination hours – it doesn't matter if the teachers are coordinated or not. That's the idea, right? It doesn't matter, and the school is still called bilingual. And if tomorrow we see that with four [bilingual] subjects we can't open more bilingual centers, it doesn't matter. Four, no. Three. And then there'll be more bilingual centers. From my point of view, that's very far from the meaning of "bilingualism."

The participant here presents "bilingualism" as an educational and political branding of sorts, an institutional designation which ostensibly provides a much-needed and much-demanded educational and economic resource – English uptake. As stated above, this resource is clearly believed to hold immense value, as evident in student responses which see English, by and large, as imperative to future success. Understanding this perceived value of the English language and, by extension, English bilingual education, can help to situate the expansion of bilingual programs throughout the country – and the resulting increase in equal access by making it mandatory – as an objective of bilingual policy.

However, bilingual projects may not actually nor necessarily “turn policy into reality” (Mosse, 2004, p. 664), meaning that public high schools are not necessarily producing *bilingual* students. The goal has not so much to do with concern over how implementation occurs so that it may be most effective, nor with the actual outcomes regarding students’ English competency levels. What is most important, drawing from teacher data, is the continued expansion of bilingualism; that bilingual education emanate from greater numbers of schools, thus reaching greater numbers of students: “[V]an en pro de expandir del programa, pero no en pro de conseguir los objetivos del programa.” (“They are in favor of expanding the program, but not in favor in achieving the goals of the program.”)

This point of view is further supported by evidence from research findings which suggests a lack, if not complete absence, of measures for evaluating program and learning outcomes from bilingual projects. Of all teacher and coordinator participants interviewed for this research, not a single person had witnessed, nor heard of, any form of inspection or evaluation specific to bilingualism. To quote one program coordinator, “They have a bilingual inspector, who has never come. And I’ve never heard of them going anywhere.” According to another coordinator, in referring to program evaluation:

Es que yo hago la evaluación – del departamento, de los profesores o de nosotros mismos, que somos los profesores de inglés. Nosotros al final de curso siempre presentamos las memorias que dicen, ‘hemos hecho esto, esto y esto.’

I do the evaluation – of the department, the teachers, or us who are the English teachers. At the end of each school year we always submit a report that says, “We’ve done this, this and this.”

Here, the participant describes a departmental briefing presented to the regional government as the only kind of inspection or evaluation related to bilingualism. In speaking to such an evaluation model, however, one teacher noted:

Si la evaluación la realizamos nosotros mismos, ¿cómo va a ser nuestro trabajo? Seríamos muy tontos si pusiéramos "No, el programa bilingüe no funciona."

If we do the evaluation ourselves, how is our work going to look? We would be stupid if we put, "No, the bilingual program doesn't work."

In addition to what can be portrayed as inadequacies in program evaluation, so too are lacking measurements of real and verifiable student outcomes in terms of linguistic competency gained via bilingual content instruction. Rather, learning outcome goals are stated in terms of what level of English students *should* have:

[E]n las instrucciones, ahora se te dan qué nivel lingüístico deberían tener los alumnos...en el instituto es el B1 y B2. Se supone que esos son los niveles que deben de alcanzar los alumnos. Pero no existe ninguna evaluación de eso. No existe ningún sistema de que nosotros veamos si eso es verdad o mentira. Y encima, estaría falseado porque los alumnos que los consiguen esos niveles de certificación van a academias particulares y pagan.

In the instructions, now they say which linguistic level students should have...in high school it's a B1 and B2. It's thought that those are the levels that students must reach. But there doesn't exist any evaluation of that. There's no system for us to see if it's true or if it's a lie. What's more, it would be false because students who achieve those levels of certification go to private academies and pay.

This point is supported by yet another participant, a school administrator as well as bilingual instructor, in stating that while students receive a certificate of completion for bilingual high school, that certificate does not amount to any practical benefit for students: "[E]s un certificado oficial [que] viene de la Junta...pero no es un B1, no es un

B2, no es nada...no te ayuda para nada.” (“It’s an official certificate that comes from the *Junta*...but it’s not a B1, it’s not a B2, it isn’t anything...it doesn’t help you with anything.”)

By stipulating, then, that students are supposed to have a B1 level of English upon completion of high school, and a B2 upon completion of *bachillerato* (two years of university preparation, from 16 to 18 years old), it is simple enough to assert and assume, from a political standpoint, that all students who finish these stages of public bilingual education do, in fact, possess the corresponding levels of linguistic competency. Basing understandings of policy outcomes on “should” and “then-ought-to,” and in a social environment marked by English Imperative views, effectively eliminates the need for any large-scale and thorough evaluation of actual program and student learning results. For, as put by an experienced bilingual program coordinator:

[The government] can already say, ‘We’re teaching every Spanish kid to speak in English with a native speaker.’ They can already say that. Nobody’s going to look at the statistics at the end of the day of how many of them actually can speak English or not.

Taken all together, it is asserted here that bilingual education policy constitutes “good” policy insofar as it clearly speaks to the practical interests of both its practitioners and its supposed beneficiaries which, in turn, serve to facilitate the further growth and expansion of bilingual projects. Teacher support, despite critiques as to implementational practices, aligns with the pragmatic advantage of securing work; students are ostensibly provided with access to a valued and demanded resource; politicians and policy-makers benefit from the optics of bilingual projects (regionally, nationally, and even

internationally) by increasing and equalizing access through greater numbers of centers where bilingual content instruction is offered; and all of this without having to make greater investments in teacher training or program evaluations. From a policy perspective, bilingual education in Spain can be declared an overwhelming success.

Importantly, though, this success does not occur in isolation, but rather depends upon, and lends itself to, the greater social milieu in which English is held in such high social and economic regard:

[A]unque el programa no consiga sus objetivos que se supone que tiene que conseguir – en el fondo [el bilingüismo] está implantando en la sociedad la necesidad del conocimiento de otro idioma. Entonces a la larga [el bilingüismo] se termine expandiendo.

Although the program doesn't achieve the goals it supposedly has to achieve – ultimately [bilingual education] is instilling in society the necessity of knowing another language. So, in the long run it ends up expanding.

With this in mind, certain assertions can be made about the hegemonic qualities of obligatory bilingual education as related to English hegemony in Spain in general. Bilingual programs simultaneously add to and feed off the social and economic significance attached to English in such a way that their success, measured in terms of growth and expansion, is effectively guaranteed.

Bilingualism in the context of hegemony

As argued above, public bilingual programs constitute an elemental component of a larger confluence of factors which serve to position English, in the minds of students, teachers and the general public, as an absolute necessity. Such other factors include the

use of English as an institutional barrier to access (to higher education, for example), or at the very least as a competitive advantage (in the case of private sector work as well as public servant positions) which ultimately and consequentially ends up being interpreted as a requisite.

As seen in research findings here, bilingual education equally foments and benefits from, as a public policy measure, the internalization of an English Imperative view expressed by practitioners and beneficiaries alike, an internalization which can be extended to the wider public and Spanish society at large. These internalized viewpoints, however, are not necessarily based in a *cultural* valuing of English, but rather an explicitly practical and economic one. They present an acknowledgment and ungrudging acceptance that, to quote one instructor, “English is fundamental nowadays. It doesn’t matter whether you like it or not. It is like that; it’s a fact.” In this light, the importance of bilingual education as a public provision in response to this fact becomes equally undeniable, and its success can be easily applauded simply for responding.

In considering the firm belief in the practical value of English reflected by research participants, interpretable as a societal demand for English learning and competency, it would be unfair to critically state that bilingual education presents an imposition. It is mandatory in an increasing number of centers, yes; but the demand for learning, equally evidenced by thriving private academies and huge enrolment numbers for English in public *Escuelas Oficiales de Idiomas* (EOI) (Luján-García, 2012), is so great that the removal or downgrading of bilingual projects from public schools – or even

relegating them back to being elective, in the case of Andalusia – would likely spark a public backlash. Indeed, the significant shift in implementation from elective to obligatory bilingualism was meant to meet this demand and to curb any accusations of favoritism, elitism or inequality in education. To paraphrase the words of a parent and friend: “If they want to make it so everybody has to learn English, that’s fine. I don’t have a problem with that. But then my daughter needs to learn it in public school; they need to teach her. If it’s necessary, why should I have to pay for her to go to a private academy?”

In closing, the views expressed by participants in this research, and the internalization of what has been referred to as an English Imperative perspective, reflect the significant and sophisticated workings of a global linguistic hegemony wherein *not* speaking English is seen as amounting to a detriment to one’s professional and economic future. Public bilingual education may not directly impose this view but does serve a distinct role in cultivating and benefiting and growing from it, in turn guaranteeing its continued success as a public policy measure.

Recommendations

Drawing from participant perspectives presented in the findings above, bureaucratic blockages inherent to the top-down communication and implementation style of “putting the load on the shoulders of the person [below]” do little to facilitate cohesion amongst actors at different levels of the policy chain. Not only has this been

shown to be ineffective for ensuring a fully-informed practitioner base, but consequentially presents an impediment to further program development which gives consideration to teachers' views, experiences and critiques of bilingual education at present. Thus, it is recommended here that some mechanism for augmenting the voice of instructors in policy and program design be implemented. Understanding bilingual content instructors as those with real on-the-ground experience, it is important to take into account their knowledge of direct, local-level involvement in bilingual education when making decisions that affect future program development. By all accounts comprising the perspectives of teachers in this research, such open communication does not currently exist, effectively leaving those instructors out of the policy conversation.

While one obvious recommendation to this effect is for regional governments to explicitly reach out for teacher feedback, it does not appear that there is enough confidence on the part of instructors to believe that such feedback would be faithfully heeded. Thus, the enlistment of a third party may help to facilitate such communications; a representative body of teachers, for example, may be more apt for independently soliciting and collecting instructor comments which reflect issues they see themselves as facing. At first thought, a teachers' union would seem an appropriate choice for leveraging political power in voicing concerns of bilingual educators. In Spain, however, there are several different unions representing teachers, some of which are not even education-specific but rather have an education branch of the organization. This, in combination with the fact that these unions are understood to be implicitly affiliated

along political party lines, would likely leave the cohesive presentation of bilingual teacher concerns a potentially difficult task.

Another option would be to enlist the efforts of an independent teachers' association, whether at the national or regional level. In Andalusia, for instance, there is the English Teachers Association of Andalusia (GRETA), a non-profit organization dedicated to improving English instruction and learning throughout the region. At the national level, the *Asociación Enseñanza Bilingüe* is a professional organization expressly committed to the study, analysis and improvement of bilingual education programs across Spain. It is likely that associations such as these could play a substantial part in facilitating dialogue between bilingual instructors and government educational bodies, and in providing an institutional platform for presenting teacher perspectives for the sake of weighing in on policy and program decision making.

Secondly, it is recommended that bilingual policy and program design be more aligned with those stated objectives of students enrolled in bilingual education. Referring to the notion of *nivel* and its practical translation into certified English titles, as well as the extent to which this seems to be at the crux of students' personal objectives in taking up English, the most positive alignment between educational policy and the personal policies of students would be the implementation of mechanisms to grant students officially-recognized certification titles at the end of their public bilingual education tenures. That is, in adapting program and policy design to the personal and professional

aims of students, it is recommended that there be a way for those students to obtain a certified English title *through* the public educational system.

As it stands, and as noted in this report, most individuals receive certified titles through private, for-profit academies. Dependence on such private entities for what is seen as an indispensable resource for professional success has been critiqued as stratifying access to English learning and, more importantly, required proof of competency levels; access to economic resources in the future (by way of English) become inhibited by what may be a lack of an individual's or family's economic resources in the present. Publicly-provisioned English titles upon completion of secondary bilingual education or through school-administered competency exams would significantly address such critiques and push equal-access beyond just learning opportunities. For, as illustrated in this report, language competency and material *proof* of that competency are not the same thing. At the very least, implementing mechanisms for the granting of B1 titles – now a mandatory requisite for full completion of any public university degree – would seem a logical step in realizing the public service narrative characteristic of bilingual policy. Finally, such mechanisms would also serve as *de facto* means for measuring and evaluating program learning outcomes, the kind of which is lamentably lacking at present. Already, this recommendation has found validation through the bilingual center in which I am currently positioned, where the school's parents' association, *Asociación de Madres y Padres de Alumnos* (AMPA), has pooled

funds to contract an outside private English teacher to prepare students for certification exams, administered at the end of the year, through extracurricular evening classes.

Limitations to Research

In considering limitations to this research and its subsequent findings, it is proposed that additional qualitative data collected from parents of bilingual students would be beneficial for further contextualizing English uptake and English Imperative views. More pointedly, the perspective of parents would be fruitful in understanding the demand for English learning, insofar as students may seldom be in total control of decisions regarding their education. While bilingual education is obligatory in bilingual centers across Andalusia, for example, there remains the choice as to enrollment in a bilingual or non-bilingual high school, and the influence of parents regarding such a choice is likely significant. However, due to time restrictions and other logistical barriers, focus groups with parents (the method most likely to have been employed in this case) were deemed unfeasible for this research.

Likewise, qualitative data gathered from government representatives of the regional Educational Department, namely those charged with overseeing the implementation of bilingual programs, would be a worthwhile addition to data already collected. Again, however, restrictions of time, in addition to the bureaucratic difficulty in speaking face-to-face with such representatives, rendered such data collection practically untenable for this research project. Instead, supplemental documents and

policy statements were relied upon as representations of governmental positions on bilingual education programs. Furthermore, presenting government education officials equally as protagonists in this research may have served to deviate from focus on those stakeholders most directly implicated in bilingual education projects as they occur on the ground – students and teachers.

Directions for Future Research

Further research on the topic of mandatory bilingual education, both in policy and in practice, may be guided by inquiries into the mechanisms for project evaluation. By all accounts from teachers represented in this report, such mechanisms appear to be effectively absent from current implementation strategies. Such evaluation, whether qualitative, quantitative or both, may well serve to verify and justify obvious political motivations for growth and expansion of bilingual programs, yet from a more pedagogically-substantiated viewpoint. That is, a true look as to whether bilingual programs are working to achieve the proposed policy aims of creating a multi-lingual, multi-cultural citizenry is worthy of further investigation. As noted by one program coordinator in this research, however, current means for measuring student competencies may lie largely, if not solely, in those students who receive certifications from outside, private entities – another area for further investigation.

The role of private English academies in what could fairly be described as the “English boom” spreading across Spain certainly warrants further research. To what

extent are such private academies seen as necessary – whether as supplemental to, or in the face of, public bilingual schooling – in taking up English to meet one’s desired economic ends? What is the significance of such academies as economic and social institutions themselves? It is significant that, despite receiving bilingual instruction in public schools, and in order to capitalize on this specialized form of public education, students must seek the services of private outside parties to later “prove” themselves and their linguistic competencies by paying for a certified title which validates and demonstrates their level of English. Similarly, English studies through private academies are commonly adopted by those young Spaniards unwillingly caught between university study and the world of work – popularly referred to as “*ninis*” (*gente que ni estudia, ni trabaja* – people who are neither studying nor working) – as the most logical and practical option for staying productive. Deeper understanding of the role played by these private institutions would help to complete the picture of English Imperative views in contemporary Spain and the current role of English in Spanish society.

REFERENCES

- Alejo, R., & Piquer-Píriz, A. (2016). Urban vs. rural CLIL: An analysis of input-related variables, motivation and language attainment. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 29(3), 245-262.
- Arribas, M. (2016). Analysing a whole CLIL school: Students' attitudes, motivation, and receptive vocabulary outcomes. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, 9(2), 267-292.
- Bledsoe, C. (2010). Sociocultural anthropology's encounters with large public data sets. *Anthropological Theory*, 10(1-2), 103-111.
- Bonnet, A., & Dalton-Puffer, C. (2013). Great expectations? Competence and standard related questions concerning CLIL moving into the mainstream. In S. Breidbach & B. Viebrock (Eds.), *Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) in Europe – Research perspectives on policy and practice*. Frankfurt/Main: Lang, 269-284.
- Brüning, C.I., & Purrmann, M. (2014). CLIL pedagogy in Europe: CLIL teacher education in Germany. *Utrecht Studies in Language and Communication*, 27, 315-338.
- Bruton, A. (2011a). Are the differences between CLIL and non-CLIL groups in Andalusia due to CLIL? A reply to Lorenzo, Casal and Moore (2010). *Applied Linguistics*, 32(2), 236-241.
- Bruton, A. (2011b). Is CLIL so beneficial, or just selective? Re-evaluating some of the research. *System*, 39(4), 523-532.
- Bruton, A. (2013). CLIL: Some reasons why...and why not. *System*, 41(3), 587-597.
- Busch, B. (2011). Trends and innovative practices in multilingual education in Europe: An overview. *International Review of Education*, 57(5), 541-549.
- Central Sindical Independiente y de Funcionarios. (2016a). *Informa: Opositores no excluidos del cuerpo de profesores de enseñanza secundaria* [Data file.] Retrieved from <https://www.csif.es/sites/default/files/field/file/20160506-ratios-Oposiciones-2016-01.pdf>
- Central Sindical Independiente y de Funcionarios. (2016b). *Publicada la convocatoria de oposiciones 2016*. Retrieved from <https://www.csif.es/contenido/andalucia/educacion/205024>
- Central Sindical Independiente y de Funcionarios. (2018). *Informa: Profesores de enseñanza secundaria – 590* [Data file]. Retrieved from

https://www.csif.es/sites/default/files/field/file/Ratios-DEFINITIVAS-590-0_0.pdf

- Cinganotto, L. (2016). CLIL in Italy: An overview. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning*, 9(2), 374-400.
- Commission of the European Communities. (2005). *Communication from the commission to the council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: A new framework strategy for multilingualism*. Retrieved from <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2005:0596:FIN:EN:PDF>
- Consejería de Turismo y Deporte. (2018a). *La economía del turismo en Andalucía. Año 2017*. Retrieved from http://www.juntadeandalucia.es/turismoydeporte/publicaciones/estadisticas/empleo_2017.%20pdf
- Consejería de Turismo y Deporte. (2018b). *Empleo del sector turístico en Andalucía: Año 2017*. Retrieved from http://www.juntadeandalucia.es/turismoydeporte/publicaciones/estadisticas/impacto_2017.%20pdf
- Dewey, M. (2007). English as a lingua franca and globalization: An interconnected perspective. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 17(3), 332-354.
- Eurostat. (2018a). [Table of European unemployment figures by country, 2007-2017]. *File: Unemployment rate 2007-2017 (%) new.png*. Retrieved from [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=File:Unemployment_rate_2007-2017_\(%25\)_new.png](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=File:Unemployment_rate_2007-2017_(%25)_new.png)
- Eurostat. (2018b). [Table of European youth unemployment figures by country, 2007-2017]. *File: Youth unemployment figures, 2007-2017 (%) new.png*. Retrieved from [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=File:Youth_unemployment_figures,_2007-2017_\(%25\)_T1.png](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=File:Youth_unemployment_figures,_2007-2017_(%25)_T1.png)
- Farrell, T., & Kun, T. (2008). Language policy, language teachers' beliefs, and classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics*, 20(3), 381-403.
- Fundación Pública Andaluza Progreso y Salud. (2018). [Illustrative map of Andalusia and its provinces]. *Mapa de recursos de investigación biomédica y asistencia sanitaria del sistema sanitario pública de Andalucía*. Retrieved from <http://www.juntadeandalucia.es/fundacionprogresoysalud/investigamas/solucion/ecRecursosCentros/1220>

- Gerena, L., & Ramírez-Verdugo, M. (2014). Analyzing bilingual teaching and learning in Madrid, Spain: A Fulbright scholar collaborative research project. *Gist Education and Learning Research Journal*, 8, 118-136.
- Guillamón-Suesta, F., & Renau, M. (2015). A critical vision of the CLIL approach in secondary education: A study in the Valencian Community in Spain. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, 8(1), 1-12.
- Heller, M. (2010). The commodification of language. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 39, 101-114.
- Hornberger, N., & Johnson, D. (2007). Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(3), 509-532.
- Hüttner, J., & Smit, U. (2013). CLIL (content and language integrated learning): The bigger picture. A response to: A. Bruton. 2013. CLIL: Some of the reasons why...and why not. *System*, 44, 160-167.
- J.L.P. (2018, January 4). Un 40% de las academias de inglés no cumplen con los requisitos legales. *Ideal*. Retrieved from <https://www.ideal.es/almeria/provincia-almeria/academias-ingles-cumplen-20180104004717-ntvo.html>
- Junta de Andalucía. (2009). [Illustrative map of Spain and its Autonomous Communities]. *Mapa de España*. Retrieved from <https://www.juntadeandalucia.es/empleo/carl/portal/web/guest/sercla/otros-sistemas-extrajudiciales>
- Lasagabaster, D. & Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (Eds.). (2010). *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, results and teacher training*. London: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Lanvers, U. (2018). Public debates of the Englishization of education in Germany: A critical discourse analysis. *European Journal of Language Policy*, 10(1), 39-76.
- Lorenzo, F. (2010) CLIL in Andalusia. In D. Lasagabaster & Y. Ruiz de Zarobe (Eds.), *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, results and teacher training* (2-11). London: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Lorenzo, F., Casal, S., & Moore, P. (2010). The effects of content and language integrated learning in European education: Key findings from the Andalusian bilingual sections evaluation project. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(3), 418-442.
- Lorenzo, F., & Moore, P. (2009). European language policies in monolingual southern Europe. *European Journal of Language Policy*, 1(2), 121-136.
- Lorenzo, F., Moore, P., & Casal, S. (2011). On complexity in bilingual research: The causes, effects, and breadth of content and language integrated learning – a reply to Bruton (2011). *Applied Linguistics*, 32(4), 450-455.

- Luján-García, C. (2012). The impact of English on Spanish daily life and some pedagogical implications. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 11(1), 1-21.
- Mann, S. (2011). A critical review of qualitative interviews in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 32(1), 6-24.
- Moore, R. (2012). "Taking up speech" in an endangered language: Bilingual discourse in a heritage language classroom. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 27(2), 57-78.
- Mosse, D. (2004). Is good policy unimplementable? Reflections on the ethnography of aid policy and practice. *Development and Change*, 35(4), 639-671.
- Muñoz Bolaños, S. (2014). *Nota de prensa ACEIA-UCE (mayo 14, 2014)*. Retrieved from <https://www.aceia.es/comunicacion/notas-de-prensa>
- Muñoz Bolaños, S. (2018). *Todas las escuelas de ACEIA en toda Andalucía podrán convertirse en Centros Examinadores de Trinity College London, tras la firma de un acuerdo de cooperación (septiembre 20, 2018)*. Retrieved from <https://www.aceia.es/comunicacion/notas-de-prensa>
- Ordóñez, C.L. (2011). Education for bilingualism: Connecting Spanish and English from the curriculum, into the classroom, and beyond. *PROFILE*, 13(2), 147-161.
- Park, J. (2009). "English fever" in South Korea: Its history and symptoms. *English Today*, 25(1), 50-57.
- Phillipson, R. (2001). English for globalization or for the world's people? *International Review of Education*, 47(3-4), 185-200.
- Phillipson, R. (2008). Lingua franca or lingua frankensteinia? English in European integration and globalization. *World Englishes*, 27(2), 250-267.
- Porto, M. (2014). The role and status of English in Spanish-speaking Argentina and its education system: Nationalism or imperialism? *SAGE Open*, 4(1).
- Relaño Pastor, A.M. (2015). The commodification of English in 'Madrid, comunidad bilingüe': Insights from the CLIL classroom. *Language Policy*, 14(2), 131-152.
- Rivas, C. (2012). Coding and analysing qualitative data. In C. Seale (Ed.), *Researching society and culture* (3rd ed) (366-392). London: SAGE.
- Rose, H., & Galloway, N. (2017). Debating standard language ideology in the classroom: Using the 'Speak Good English Movement' to raise awareness of global Englishes. *Regional Language Centre, RELC Journal*, 48(3), 294-301.
- Rubdy, R. (2002). Creative destruction: Singapore's Speak Good English Movement. *World Englishes*, 20(3), 341-355.

- Ruiz de Zarobe, Y., & Lasagabaster, D. (2010). The emergence of CLIL in Spain: An educational challenge. In D. Lasagabaster & Y. Ruiz de Zarobe (Eds.), *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, results and teacher training* (ix-xvii). London: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Salaberri Ramiro, M.S. (2010). Teacher training programmes for CLIL in Andalusia. In D. Lasagabaster & Y. Ruiz de Zarobe (Eds.), *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, results and teacher training* (140-161). London: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Sánchez Torres, J. (2014). *Los papeles que desempeñan el "auxiliar de conversación" y el "profesor-coordinador" en centros bilingües español/inglés de Sevilla. Un estudio empírico de casos* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Universidad de Sevilla, Sevilla.
- Sayer, P. (2018). Does English really open doors? Social class and English teaching in public primary schools in Mexico. *System*, 73, 58-70.
- Shim, D., & Park, J. (2008). The language politics of "English fever" in South Korea. *Korea Journal*, 48(2), 136-159.
- Smithson, J. (2000). Using and analysing focus groups: Limitations and possibilities. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 3(2), 103-119.
- Tan, M., & Saw Lan, O. (2011). Teaching science and mathematics in English in Malaysian classrooms: The impact of teacher beliefs on classroom practices and student learning. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 10(1), 5-18.
- Tedick, D., & Cammarata, L. (2012). Content and language integration in k-12 contexts: Student outcomes, teacher practices, and stakeholder perspectives. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45(s1), s28-s53.
- Tender, T., & Vihalemm, T. (2009). "Two languages in addition to mother tongue" – Will this policy preserve linguistic diversity in Europe? *TRAMES*, 13(1), 41-63.
- TopTrendingVideo. (2014, June 3). *El club de la comedia – Luis Merlo: "En España hablamos inglés nivel medio"* [Video file]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D5mc4I_vX9c
- Tsuchiya, K., & Pérez Murillo, M.D. (2015). Comparing the language policies and the students' perceptions of CLIL in tertiary education in Spain and Japan. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, 8(1), 25-35.
- Urciuoli, B., & LaDousa, C. (2013). Language management/labor. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 42, 175-190.
- Vigh, H. (2009). Motion squared. *Anthropological Theory*, 9(4), 419-438.

Zamora-Kapoor, A., & Coller, X. (2014). The effects of the crisis: Why southern Europe? *American Behavioral Scientist*, 58(12), 1511-1516.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Informed consent form

UNIVERSIDAD DE HUMBOLDT STATE (CALIFORNIA)

Formulario de Consentimiento Informado

Café Para Todos: Una Narrativa Analítica de la Política y Práctica de Educación Bilingüe en Andalucía

Formulario de Consentimiento Informado

El propósito de esta investigación es para explorar los puntos de vista y las opiniones de las personas involucradas en la educación bilingüe (profesores bilingües, estudiantes, padres, directores de centros bilingües y consejeros de educación) sobre el tema de bilingüismo. La investigación se centrará en la implementación y funcionamiento de programas bilingües y las experiencias y perspectivas de gente involucrada en educación bilingüe. Intentará conseguir un entendimiento del bilingüismo en un contexto más amplio de la sociedad andaluza. El investigador utilizará cómo métodos entrevistas, grupos focales de 5 a 10 personas y observaciones de clases bilingües. Cada entrevista y grupo focal sean audio grabado en acuerdo con el consentimiento de los participantes. Todas las actividades se llevarán a cabo en los institutos o en otros sitios elegidos por los participantes. El compromiso de tiempo de cada participante será de 1 a 3 horas, dividido en sesiones de 1 hora. El beneficio de su participación es ayudar a entender bilingüismo en institutos andaluces, sus políticas y prácticas.

Para asegurar la confidencialidad de los participantes, el investigador no compartirá ninguna información escrita ni información grabada con otras personas. El investigador usará códigos o alias en lugar de nombres reales. Información escrita y documentos de consentimiento serán guardados en un lugar protegido en el hogar del investigador. Información en un formato electrónico será guardada sin riesgo en el ordenador del investigador protegido por contraseña. La información se mantendrá para un periodo de dos años para utilizar durante toda la investigación sobre educación bilingüe. Citas exactas pueden ser utilizadas en la reseña final, pero no se utilizará su nombre. Participación en esta investigación no resultará en remuneración y es completamente voluntaria.

Método:

Esta investigación incluirá componentes diferentes, y usted puede participar en uno o en todos. Si accede a participar en esta investigación, puede ocurrir lo siguiente:

Firma con las iniciales la casilla de los métodos que usted se compromete a participar.

☐

Entrevistas: Entrevistas privadas de una hora o menos de duración. Las entrevistas se llevarán a cabo en el instituto u otro lugar elegido por el participante. Las preguntas serán sobre sus experiencias en enseñanza bilingüe.

☐

Observaciones: El investigador observará una clase bilingüe suya. La clase puede ser de cualquier asignatura que tiene, o que tiene con el auxiliar de conversación de su escuela. Esto es para ver cómo funciona la clase y cómo las personas se comunican entre sí en la clase.

☐

Grupos Focales: El investigador guiará una conversación con un grupo de entre 5 y 10 participantes sobre ciertos tópicos con el objetivo de sacar las opiniones y perspectivas de los participantes sobre aquellos tópicos. Esta sesión durará más o menos una hora.

DARSE CUENTA: Este formulario será guardado durante tres años después de la terminación de esta investigación.

El investigador responderá a cualquier pregunta sobre la investigación. Su participación es voluntaria y puede parar en cualquier momento. Si usted tiene alguna duda al respecto o preguntas sobre sus derechos como participante, póngase en contacto con el Consejo de Revisión Institucional por la Protección de Seres Humanos, irb@humboldt.edu, o por teléfono +1 707 826 5165.

Investigador Principal:

Grant Skoglund

Gas24@humboldt.edu

644 96 53 80

Supervisora del Investigador Principal:

Mary Scoggin

ms34@humboldt.edu

+1 707 826 5268

Entiendo el propósito y los procedimientos de la investigación como se indicó anteriormente, y accedo a participar.

X_____

Fecha_____

(Firma de Participante)

Appendix B: Recruitment letter to bilingual centers

Estimado/a Señor/a,

Buenos días. Me llamo Grant Skoglund y soy auxiliar de conversación de inglés. Le escribo a usted con la intención de ponerme en contacto con el profesor o la profesora que está encargado/a con el programa bilingüe en su instituto. Hasta ahora he trabajado en varios centros bilingües de Andalucía, aunque ahora me encuentro en Cáceres, Extremadura. Mi motivo por contactar con el/la coordinador/a bilingüe es que actualmente, además de mi posición de auxiliar, realizo como estudiante una investigación para el fin de carrera enfocada en la educación bilingüe en Andalucía.

Por lo tanto, si usted me puede enviar el correo electrónico del coordinador o la coordinadora del equipo bilingüe del instituto, lo agradecería mucho. Si fuera más fácil, también podría reenviar este correo a dicha persona para que se pusiera en contacto conmigo. Muchas gracias.

Un saludo cordial,

Grant Skoglund

Appendix C: Recruitment letter to bilingual coordinators

Estimado/a Coordinador/a,

Buenos días. Me llamo Grant Skoglund y soy auxiliar de conversación de inglés, habiendo trabajado los tres últimos años en Andalucía, en la provincia de Granada. Actualmente sigo en mi ocupación de auxiliar, aunque ahora me encuentro en Cáceres ciudad. Me pongo en contacto con usted porque, además de mi posición de lector, realizo como estudiante una investigación para el fin de carrera enfocada en la educación bilingüe en Andalucía. La carrera es un máster de antropología que llevo a cabo a través de Humboldt State University en California.

Por lo tanto, estoy contactando con centros bilingües ubicados en Andalucía en búsqueda de profesores/as bilingües y coordinadores/as de programas bilingües que estarían dispuestos a hacer entrevistas para la investigación. Adjunto a este correo, usted puede encontrar un archivo que explica el objeto del estudio y que también sirve en función de formulario de consentimiento.

Si usted podría compartir este correo con los docentes del bilingüismo en su centro o reenviarlo a ellos, lo agradecería mucho. En el caso que hay docentes interesados y dispuestos, yo podría organizar una fecha para desplazarme al instituto y conocer el equipo bilingüe antes de hacer entrevistas. Le aviso a usted que los lunes son mi día libre del trabajo, por si hay un lunes en las semanas que vienen que le vendría bien. Muchas gracias de antemano.

Un cordial saludo,

Grant Skoglund

Appendix D: Parental consent form

Humboldt State University (California)
 Permiso Parental de un Menor a Participar en una Investigación

**Café Para Todos: Una narrativa analítica de la política y práctica de la
 educación bilingüe en Andalucía**

Propósito y Antecedentes

El propósito de esta investigación es aprender más sobre la educación bilingüe en los institutos secundarios, y entender mejor las opiniones de los alumnos y el profesorado sobre las clases bilingües y la enseñanza del inglés.

El investigador, Grant Skoglund, es estudiante de postgrado en Humboldt State University en California. Está cursando un master de Antropología.

El investigador invita a su hijo/hija a participar en la investigación, porque él/ella es estudiante en un centro bilingüe.

Procedimientos

Esta investigación incluirá componentes diferentes, y puede permitir que su hijo/hija participe en uno o en todos. Si usted permite que su hijo/hija participe en esta investigación, puede ocurrir lo siguiente:

Firma con las iniciales la casilla de los métodos que usted se permite a participar su hijo/hija. Por sus iniciales en la casilla, usted está de acuerdo en permitir que su hijo/hija participe en el método correspondiente.

☐

- Sé pedirá a su hijo/hija completar un cuestionario sobre su experiencia en el programa bilingüe. Esto sucederá en la clase durante el horario normal del instituto. El cuestionario tendrá una duración de 30 minutos aproximadamente.

☐

- Su hijo/hija participará en un grupo de conversación en su clase de tutoría sobre sus opiniones de clases bilingües la enseñanza del inglés en su instituto. Las conversaciones serán grabadas y tardarán una hora.

☐

- El investigador observará y audio grabará una clase bilingüe de su hijo/hija. Esto tendrá una duración de una hora.

El tiempo total que su hijo/hija estará involucrado/a es de 1-3 horas.

Riesgos

Hay un riesgo de pérdida de privacidad. Sin embargo, no se utilizarán nombres ni identidades en ninguna reseña publicada. Solo el investigador tendrá acceso a los datos de la investigación.

Confidencialidad

Los datos de la investigación serán guardados en un ordenador protegido por contraseña, y solo el investigador tendrá acceso a los datos. En el final de la investigación, todas las identidades serán eliminadas. Los datos serán guardados en un disco duro protegido por contraseña. Los datos serán guardados durante dos años después de la investigación, y podrían ser utilizados por la tesis final del investigador.

Beneficios

La participación de su hijo/hija en este proyecto no habrá beneficios directos.

Costes

No hay costes para la participación de su hijo/hija en este proyecto.

Remuneración

No habrá remuneración por participar en esta investigación.

Preguntas

Si tiene cualquier pregunta, puede contactar con el investigador por correo electrónico a gas24@humboldt.edu o por teléfono a 644 96 53 80. Puede dirigirse también a Mary Scoggin, la asesora del investigador, a +1 707 826 5268 o por correo electrónico a mary.scoggin@humboldt.edu.

Preguntas sobre los derechos de su hijo/hija como un participante, o comentarios o quejas sobre la investigación, pueden ser abordados a la Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects a irb@humboldt.edu o +1 707 826 5165.

Consentimiento

Se entregará una copia de este documento. La participación en esta investigación es voluntaria. Usted es libre de negarse a que su hijo participe en esta investigación. Usted puede retirar la participación de su hijo/hija en cualquier momento sin sanción. Su decisión de establecer o no la participación de su hijo/hija no influirá el estatus del presente ni futuro de su hijo/hija en su instituto.

Nombre de su hijo/hija _____

Firma _____

Fecha _____

Padres

Firma _____
Investigador

Fecha _____

Appendix E: Minor assent form

HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY (CALIFORNIA)

Acuerdo de Participar en una Investigación

Café Para Todos: Una narrativa analítica de la política y práctica de la educación bilingüe en Andalucía

PROPÓSITO Y ANTECEDENTES

Soy Grant Skoglund. Soy estudiante de postgrado en Humboldt State University (California). Estoy haciendo una investigación sobre la educación bilingüe en institutos españoles. Le invito a participar en la investigación porque usted es estudiante en un centro bilingüe.

PROCEDIMIENTOS

Esta investigación incluirá componentes diferentes, y se puede participar en uno o en todos. Si accede a participar en esta investigación, puede ocurrir lo siguiente:

Firma con las iniciales la casilla de los métodos que usted se compromete a participar. Por sus iniciales en la casilla, usted está de acuerdo en participar en el método correspondiente.

☐

- Le presentaré un cuestionario con preguntas sobre sus clases bilingües en el instituto, y sus pensamientos sobre el aprendizaje de inglés.

☐

- Participará en un grupo de conversación conmigo, y algunos de tus compañeros y compañeras de la clase. Le preguntaré sobre las clases bilingües, sus experiencias en ellas, y sus opiniones sobre la enseñanza del inglés. Esta conversación será audio grabado para poder escucharlo luego para entender mejor tus pensamientos.

☐

- Observaré y audio grabaré una clase bilingüe suya. La clase puede ser de cualquier asignatura que tiene con el auxiliar de conversación de su escuela. Esto es para ver cómo funciona la clase y cómo las personas se comunican entre sí en la clase.

RIESGOS

Hay un riesgo de pérdida de privacidad. Sin embargo, no se utilizarán nombres ni identidades en ningunas reseñas publicadas. Citas exactas pueden ser utilizadas en la reseña final, pero no se utilizará su nombre. Solo el investigador tendrá acceso de los datos de la investigación. Los datos de la investigación serán guardados en un ordenador protegido por contraseña. Solo el investigador tendrá acceso a los datos.

En el final de la investigación, toda la información de identidad será eliminada y los datos serán guardados en un disco duro protegido por contraseña. Los datos serán guardados durante dos años después que la investigación está terminada y podrían ser utilizados por la tesis final del investigador.

Porque la conversación del grupo incluye otros compañeros y compañeras suyos, existe la posibilidad que puedan repetirse información a otras personas. El investigador no puede garantizar que esto no suceda. Sin embargo, la conversación del grupo comenzará por un discurso sobre el respeto para la privacidad y la confidencialidad de todos los participantes.

BENEFICIOS DIRECTOS

Su participación en este proyecto no resultará en beneficios directos.

COSTOS

No hay costos para su participación en este proyecto.

REMUNERACIÓN

No habrá remuneración por participar en esta investigación.

ALTERNATIVAS

La alternativa es no participar en la investigación.

PREGUNTAS

Usted puede dirigirse a Grant Skoglund y hacer cualquier pregunta al respecto. Si tiene alguna otra pregunta, puede contactar con el investigador por correo electrónico a gas24@humboldt.edu o por teléfono a 644 96 53 80. Puede dirigirse también a Mary Scoggin, la asesora del investigador, a +1 707 826 5268 o por correo electrónico a mary.scoggin@humboldt.edu.

Preguntas sobre sus derechos como un participante, o comentarios o quejas sobre la investigación, pueden ser abordados a la Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects a irb@humboldt.edu o +1 707 826 5165.

La participación en esta investigación es voluntaria. Usted es libre de negarse a participar en esta investigación. Puede retirar su participación en cualquier momento sin sanción.

CONSENTIMIENTO

Se le ha dado una copia de este documento para guardar.

Entiendo el propósito y los procedimientos de la investigación como se indicó anteriormente, y accedo a participar.

.

Nombre del Participante (con letra de molde)_____

Firma _____

Fecha: _____

Participante

Appendix F: Spanish language certificate

10007483 - E.O.I. Cáceres
 Gómez Becerra, 6 1ª Planta
 Cáceres (Cáceres)
 Tlf: 927004845
 Fax: 927004863

JUNTA DE EXTREMADURA
 Consejería de Educación y Empleo

ANEXO I (Continuación)**TRASLADOS DE MATRÍCULA / EXPEDIENTE *(1)**

CENTRO DE PROCEDENCIA	CENTRO DE DESTINO	NIVEL, CURSO E IDIOMA	TIPO *(1)	FECHA

*(1) Traslado de expediente / traslado de matrícula viva

ANULACIÓN DE MATRÍCULA

CURSO ACADÉMICO	EOI	IDIOMA	NIVEL	CURSO	MODALIDAD DE ENSEÑANZA	OBSERVACIONES

PRUEBAS DE CERTIFICACIÓN

IDIOMA	NIVEL	MODALIDAD DE ENSEÑANZA	CALIFICACIÓN		DESTREZAS SUPERADAS *(1)	FECHA PROPUESTA EXPEDICIÓN CERTIFICADO
			ORD	EXT		
Idioma Español	Nivel avanzado (B2) del MCER	Idioma presencial (Español)	Apto 9	--	EE / CL / CO / EO	--

*(1) A cumplimentar si procede

En Cáceres, a 29 de Octubre de 2018

EL SECRETARIO

Fdo: José Manuel Galán Pérez



Vº Bº LA DIRECTORA

Fdo: María del Pilar Mayoral Valsera

Appendix G: Interview schedule

How long have you been teaching? How long in bilingual education specifically?

How did you come to teach in bilingual programs here in Andalusia?

How has your experience been at your current school?

How would you describe the process of program implementation?

Can you describe your experiences at some of the other bilingual centers where you worked?

What do you see as the objectives of the bilingual program at your school? The objectives of bilingual education in general?

How do you see your responsibilities as a bilingual teacher?

How do you see the obligatory nature of bilingual content classes?

Can you discuss any changes in bilingual education policy over the course of your career? How have these policy changes affected you as a teacher?

As a bilingual teacher, what kinds of professional development or training have you been offered?

What are some of the obstacles, if any, that you have come across in your experience in bilingual teaching?

How do you see the future of bilingual education in Andalusia?

Appendix H: Focus group schedules

Vocational program students

How long have you all been studying English?

How would you describe your experience learning English in public school?

Who has had bilingual classes in secondary education? How would you describe that experience?

What is your opinion about English as an obligatory component to your education?

How many have gone to a private academy? How did you make that decision?

How or when do you use English in your daily lives?

How do you see yourselves using English in the future?

- (in event answer re: English as necessary for work):
- What has led you to that belief? What signs do you see that point to English as being necessary in the future?

How many of you have had experience looking for work? To what extent did English play a role that search?

Bilingual high school students

How long have you been studying English? How long have you been studying in bilingual programs?

How would you describe your experiences in bilingual classes?

What do think are some of the benefits of bilingual classes? Some of the challenges?

What do you think about English and bilingual classes being obligatory?

How many of you attend private academies of private classes? How did you make that decision?

In what ways do you use English in your daily lives?

How do you see yourselves using English in the future, if at all?

If English is important then, what signs do you see of that? What has led you to believe that it's important?

Appendix I: Interview transcript excerpt

JLMC

El participante ha elegido hacer la entrevista en castellano.

G: ¿Cuántos años llevas en la enseñanza en general, bilingüe o no bilingüe?

JL: Desde el 2012. Este sería mi sexto curso.

G: De estos seis años, ¿cuántos llevas en el bilingüismo concretamente?

JL: En bilingüismo cuatro años.

G: Y enseñas matemáticas, ¿no?

JL: Sí, matemáticas.

G: Entonces, estos cuatro años, ¿cómo elegiste, o cómo te has encontrado, en la enseñanza bilingüe? ¿Cómo decidiste dar clases bilingües?

Motive

JL: Por casualidad, porque yo trabajaba en otra cosa. Entonces...yo sí sabía inglés. Bueno, como salieron bolsas bilingües que se entraba simplemente teniendo título de inglés, pues yo lo eché y me llamaron para trabajar. Yo no fui...yo empecé ya directamente con el bilingüismo. Cuando yo entré a la primera clase, era bilingüe.

G: Entonces, si no tuvieras el título en inglés...

JL: No hubiera...quizás no estaría aquí. Así de fácil.

English title - as entrance to teaching

G: ¿Y eso es cómo funciona? Como, tener título en inglés, y sale una lista para plazas bilingües, solo.

JL: Sólo.

G: A parte de plazas en general.

JL: Exacto. Básicamente, cómo yo empecé a trabajar fue porque habían...hay un examen de oposición en lo que tú te presentas, y te preguntan de conocimiento matemático, pero no se preguntan nada de idioma. Entonces, esa gente que aprueba, digamos son los primeros para si salen plazas provisionales, llaman a esas personas. Pero, no había personas que tuvieran el título correspondiente en inglés para poder impartir. Se te piden un mínimo de B2, entonces no tenían gente que tuviera ese B2. Entonces abren una convocatoria pública para que todo el mundo que tenga ese título, y que pueda dar clases de matemáticas...

G: ¿Y que han aprobado las oposiciones también?

JL: No tiene porque. No. Yo no me había presentado nunca. Entonces, se te pide que tienes ciertos títulos...que sea matemático, ingeniero, o arquitecto...si tienes cualquier de esos títulos, puedas dar clases de matemáticas. Se supone que tienes los conocimientos mínimos para dar clases de matemáticas en un instituto.

G: Si nunca te has presentado a las oposiciones, ¿qué significa esto para tu plaza? Es decir...

JL: No, en aquel momento no lo había hecho. En aquel momento. Y bueno, el sistema de la oposición, de la plaza, se valora tu examen y se valora tu experiencia. Entonces, justo...incluso ahora, es una oportunidad por ser tanta gente estudiando idiomas en España con carrera. Porque si quieres dedicarte a la docencia, al día de hoy es mucho más fácil empezar a ser profesor con bilingüismo que si lo intentas sin el bilingüismo.

English title / Motives

Bilingualism as an ENTRANCE TO teaching

Here, the participant discusses and describes the process of official examinations involved in becoming a public high school teacher, and a way in which one can work in education WITHOUT passing, or even taking, said exams. He illustrates how bilingual education gives candidates a CLEAR ADVANTAGE in receiving a position and beginning their career as an instructor. This initial "in" then allows the person in question to begin accumulating "points" in the form of experience, made possible exclusively by their capacity and technical qualifications to teach bilingual classes.

Piensa que el número de plazas total es más o menos constante de profesores. No sé, por poner un número, 1,000. Pero sin embargo, cada vez hay más institutos bilingües. Entonces, si antiguamente cuando yo empecé, quizás de esa 1,000 plazas, 100 eran bilingüe. Pues si 100 eran bilingüe entonces, al día de hoy seguro que hay más de 300. Que no sé de los números globales, pero hazte la idea...Porque cada vez hay más profesores interinos, provisionales, trabajando en el bilingüismo. Y las listas se van agotando. La vuelven a abrir.

El sistema, digamos, va creciendo y se va transformando en bilingüismo. Y probablemente, los objetivos...no lo sé cuáles serán los números que maneje la Junta, pero el objetivo final es convertir todo el sistema en bilingüe. Si no todo...Todo. Porque visto al largo plazo...cuando el problema que tiene ahora mismo el sistema para convertirse en bilingüe, es que hay muchos profesores que no tienen conocimientos de idiomas. Entonces, cada vez van aumentando...se oyen rumores que van a pedir que tú tengas un título en inglés. Por ejemplo, al día de hoy, para poder acabar con una carrera necesitas tener un nivel de B1 en otro idioma.

Motives and measures of success

Stating what I suspect; that greater #'s is the objective of the Junta

G: Sí, en cualquier idioma extranjero. (5:13)

English imperative

JL: Claro. Y no me extrañaría que en un futuro no muy lejano, si quieres ser profesor se te pida que acredites ya el nivel de idioma extranjero. Entonces al final, cuando pasen 30 años, todo el sistema será bilingüe.

This point of view, while strictly a projection into the future on the part of the participant, may well represent the fervor with which he sees the Junta as implementing and expanding bilingual programs and bilingual education in public schools.

G: Entonces, como un profe bilingüe aquí en el centro y en general, ¿cómo describiría el proceso de implementación de programas bilingües público, aquí en un centro bilingüe? ¿Cómo funciones, de tu experiencia?

JL: **¿Cómo se pone en práctica?**

G: Exacto.

JL: Bueno. Yo creo que el principal problema es que no existe una...yo entiendo que el bilingüismo, en el fondo, es una forma en la que los profesores buscan su perfeccionamiento. Si tú eres profesor y quieres ser bilingüe, pues tienes que estudiar un idioma. Entonces **se supone que es un esfuerzo añadido. El problema es que ese esfuerzo añadido no tiene reconocimiento. No tiene reconocimiento salarial – da igual que tú seas profesor bilingüe o que no lo seas. Tampoco tiene un reconocimiento laboral,** porque nadie te va a venir a decir “qué bien que tú das tus clases al 100% en inglés.” Nadie te va a decir eso. Todo lo que puede llevarte es lo contrario, que digan: “No, es que como tú hablas todo el rato en inglés, nadie te entiende.”

Después, nadie realmente conoce bien las normativas, porque las normativas se dicen muchas cosas que no son reales.

G: ¿Te refieres a la política, las normativas de la Junta?

JL: Sí. La Junta establece una normativa de implementación de **cómo debería implementarse el bilingüismo.** Entonces, la Junta te da unas directrices. Por ejemplo, te dicen qué tipo de metodología es la más adecuada para implementar el bilingüismo. Y de hecho, ciertas medidas fuerzan a los centros a que se implementen unidades integradas. Es decir, que se trabaje por metodología cercana, a basada en proyectos, y que sean interactivas entre diferentes áreas. Que no sean sólo de matemáticas o sólo de ciencias sociales, sino que...todas las áreas bilingües trabajaran de forma conjunta. ¿Vale? (13:15) Por ejemplo, que se haga un proyecto en el que tenga una parte de matemática, una parte...y que toda encajen y engranen. Porque se supone que el alumno adquiere un aprendizaje significativo porque usa lo mismo en diferentes ámbitos, pero todos tienen un lazo en unión.

Problema – **no hay tiempo de coordinación reconocido para eso.** Entonces, como profesor lo tienes que añadir tú por tu voluntad. Ya te he dicho antes que no se te pagan más dinero, ¿no? No se te reconoce nada, entonces tiene que salir de ti. O que los centros recojan, vale...porque **antes se reconocía tiempo de coordinación.** Entonces dentro mi horario había una parte que era...que nos pusiéramos todo de acuerdo en cómo hacer ese tipo de trabajo.

G: ¿Y que tenía en común todos los profesores, todo el equipo bilingüe?

JL: Exacto. Entonces por ejemplo, **en este centro se da la importancia...aunque la normativa no nos recogía así, se nos reconoce dentro de nuestro horario una media hora a la semana para ponernos en común,** para poner ese trabajo en común. **Pero media hora...** para mi punto de vista es totalmente...o sea, es media hora entre todos los profesores de todos los niveles, yo lo veo descabellado. Encima, no se coordina un trabajo...se precisaría mucho más tiempo de coordinación en esas personas y, además, reuniones diferentes dependiendo de los grupos. No podemos juntarnos todos los profesores bilingües del centro y hablar de 1º, 2º, 3º, y 4º de la ESO, de todas las áreas en media hora. Es imposible. **Yo lo veo totalmente insuficiente.** Es muy difícil ponerse de acuerdo porque todos vamos por puntos diferentes del temario. Entonces, ¿cómo hacemos un proyecto que valora, por ejemplo, para música, para matemáticas, para ciencias naturales y para educación física? Es complicado. No es fácil.

G: Entonces, ¿esto fue un gran cambio en la normativa, que afectaba a los profesores? Quitar esa hora (de coordinación) del horario de los profesores bilingües.

JL: Este tiempo se quitó el año pasado. Antes había una hora de reconocimiento semanal, y el año pasado se elimina y pasa a no haber reconocimiento semanal. Entonces si se te da es porque el centro considera, que se precisa, y te reconocen, pues no sé...depende. En algunos institutos no reconocerán nada, en otros – con este, por ejemplo reconocen media hora. Pero ya hay que forzar mucho los horarios de todo el mundo para encontrar eso. Nosotros nos reunimos ahora mismo en un recreo.

The participant has been speaking about the common topic of reduction of a previously established coordination hour. This is a common complaint or criticism amongst bilingual teachers. It may be seen as another sign of the imposed “self-responsibility” for carrying out a bilingual program. That is to say, whereas this hour was previously built-in as a program measure/mandate, it has been removed and is thus left to the centers and instructors to find it/carve it out for themselves. This comes in the form of ADDITIONAL time and effort which, as stated above, comes with no added benefits or recognitions. For example, he states that it is quite difficult to make schedules so that the entire bilingual team has a free hour (half-hour in this case) free at the same time. Here this simply takes place during the midday break, meaning that even the half hour is not part of the teachers’ timetables.

G: ¿Había una **justificación** o una razón para quitar esa hora?

JL: **Económica.** Sí porque, date cuenta. Imagínate en un centro puede haber profesores bilingües – en un centro como este – son 12 o 15. Una hora de cada de ellos hace 15 horas lectivas. Y la jornada de un profesor, entero, son ahora mismo 19 horas. Entonces es ya casi un profesor menos. Entonces si tú quitas esa hora (de coordinación), en los centros al final quitan un profesor. Con esa decisión, y con algunas otras más, parecidas, consigues un profesor menos en un centro. **Entonces, ten en cuenta eso porque es meramente económico.**

Good point to follow up on - What are those other decisions that help eliminate a teacher?

"bad" implementation?

- in his view, No material nor immaterial remuneration = problem of implementation.

Policy and "bad" implementation

Navigating the policy

- (even if inadequately)
- another example, in addition to the center in Granada province and parallel tracks

layers of policy and individual responsibility of teachers/center

Appendix J: Focus group transcript excerpt

Focus group transcript sample excerpt

Focus Group, 4ºESO, 19.3.18

15 estudiantes, sección bilingüe

G: ¿Cuánto tiempo lleváis estudiando inglés, aprendiendo inglés?

Est: ¿Inglés o la sección bilingüe?

G: El inglés.

Est: 10 años.

Est: Desde infantil.

Est: Entre 10 y 12 años.

G: Vale, **entonces más que 10 años más o menos**. ¿Fuisteis a un colegio bilingüe también?

Est: No. *(Todos responden NO. Nadie en el grupo ha ido a un colegio bilingüe.)*

G: Entonces cuando entrasteis aquí, era la primera vez que entrasteis a una sección bilingüe.

Est: Sí. *(Todos responde Sí.)*

G: ¿Cómo ha sido la experiencia? ¿Cómo describiríais vuestra experiencia de clases bilingües aquí en el instituto?

Est: Es **un cambio muy grande tener, aparte de inglés**, otras asignaturas en inglés.

Challenges of bilingualism

G: Ah. Y, ¿cómo lo lleváis?

Est: Te acostumbras.

Est: Bien.

Est: Sí, bien. *(Todos están de acuerdo.)*

G: ¿Cómo fue en el principio?

Est: Mal, un poco mal.

Est: **Cuesta acostumbrarse**. *(Todos de acuerdo con eso – que en principio fue difícil y se va acostumbrándose.)*

Est: Depende de las asignaturas que sean en inglés. Por ejemplo, en 2º teníamos en inglés ciencias naturales, y esa era muy difícil en inglés.

Est: Sí. Era difícil porque era mucho contenido nuevo y conceptos que no sabíamos todavía muy bien. Entonces nos costó más aprenderlos, hasta que lo aprendíamos por no lleva más tiempo.

G: ¿Cómo ha sido el proceso de acostumbraros a la sección bilingüe, o a clases bilingües?

Est: Lento, pero de acabamos acostumbrados.

G: Lento, pero al final se acostumbra, ¿no?

Est: Sí, sí. *(Todos de acuerdo.)*

G: Acabo de descubrir que el bilingüismo en este instituto no es obligatorio. Entonces, elegisteis...

Est: Hicimos un examen cuando llegamos si queríamos entrar en la sección bilingüe. Hicimos el examen, y de allí nos eligieron. Según cómo tenemos el examen, nos eligieron y nos separaron.

G: ¿Por qué os apuntasteis al bilingüismo?

Est: Porque ahora, **fundamentalmente en todas las carreras, te piden un nivel básica de inglés**.

English Imperative - English as a requirement in university; stated in terms of **Nivel**

Note: This is an interesting point of MISinformation. The student is under the impression that a basic level of ENGLISH is needed to complete a university degree, when in fact it is a basic level (B1) of ANY foreign language, such as French, Italian, English, etc. This misconception about what is needed at the bureaucratic level of the university as a requisite for fully completing a degree (the misconception being that English specifically is required), may indicate the extent to which, or the manner in which, the students understand English to be "supreme" in different ambits of professional life and advancement.

G: Entonces tiene algo que ver con la universidad. ¿Alguien más? ¿Por qué elegiste el bilingüismo?

Est: Yo en ese momento no pensé en la carrera. Pensé que **mís primos habían elegido** estar en bilingüe y dije, "¿Por qué no?"

This social component to choosing bilingualism, when choice is a relevant factor, has appeared in other student focus group of 3^oESO.

Est: Y porque **me gusta el inglés**.

Est: Sí. Porque a mí también me gusta el inglés. Por eso.

G: Que bien. Alguien más, ¿por qué?

Est: Pues porque se daba bien en inglés antes. (**chequea ¿? 3:30**)

G: ¿Otros motivos por haber elegido?

Est: En 6^o de primaria **teníamos una profesora que nos incitó mucho a meternos en el tema**. Porque ella había dado clases antes aquí, y nos ayudó a prepararnos el examen e incluso nos hizo clases después de terminar el colegio para ayudarnos con el examen.

G: Ah, entonces ella os motivó.

Est: Sí. (*Otros Sí.*)

Est: Pero no todos venimos del mismo colegio. A nosotros nos fue más difícil porque nos prepararon menos. Pero de todas formas nos sacábamos el examen.

G: ¿Qué opináis sobre el hecho que el inglés es un componente obligatorio de vuestra educación? Es decir, e inglés siempre ha sido obligatorio. ¿Cómo lo veis? (5:20)

Est: Yo lo veo bien porque **ahora el idioma universal es el inglés**. Y con eso te puedes comunicar con la mayoría de la gente **cuando vas a un país extranjero**, aunque no sepas el idioma de ese país.

Note: MOBILITY, LINGUA FRANCA The student expresses the common theme of English as facilitating communication when travelling abroad.

What is unclear is whether the students see this as an OBJECTIVE BENEFIT from a hypothetical perspective, or whether it actually speaks to their personal aspirations.

This notion of being able to communicate regardless of knowing the native language of a destination country, on account of the KNOWING (believing) that most people there will speak English may also represent something of Spain's perceived deficit in English speaking abilities.

Est: Por esa parte está bien. **Pero no te dejan elegir otro idioma que tú quieras**. Por ejemplo, portugués, italiano, alemán...lo que tú quieras. Te tienes que apuntar a clases extraescolares para aprender otro idioma. Por una parte, sí todo el mundo habla el inglés prácticamente. Pero no nos dejan hablar otros idiomas, no te enseñan otro idioma.

Est: No te dan la oportunidad de aprender otro idioma en el instituto. Aparte de francés, que...bueno.

G: Entonces, hemos dicho movilidad – poder comunicar con otra gente en otros países, aun no sea un país dónde inglés es la lengua nativa – ¿otros beneficios que veis del uso de inglés, o de saber inglés? ¿Otros beneficios que lleva?

Est: Saber no ocupa lugar.

G: ¿Pensáis en otros beneficios, o incluso en otros obstáculos del bilingüismo?

Est: Porque a lo mejor, **más adelante, tú no tienes por qué encontrar trabajo aquí en España**. A lo mejor tienes que encontrarlo fuera, en Inglaterra o en Francia o en algún país de esos. Y allí sí que ya te piden un **nivel** de inglés un poco más alto.

Note: Economic Benefit The student is speaking to the reality, present and possibly future, of not being able to find work domestically, and of having to go abroad in search of a job. In which case, English is seen as unlocking possibilities of doing so.

Note: The frequency of the word NIVEL is telling. The students seem not concerned with qualitative or subjectively sufficient speaking abilities, but rather with having the requisite LEVEL of English "que te piden." This is a very interesting point, and suggests the power of the bureaucratic framework in which English "qualifications" exist. The point is not to be able to speak, but to have the LEVEL. The ubiquity of the Common European Framework (B1, B2, etc.) is evident here, and is by all appearances how students, and to a lesser extent teachers, understand language competency. This VERY MUCH adds to the commodification of the language, and fits perfectly within an economic lens/context for understanding the ACQUISITION of English.

G: Con ésta edad que tenéis – sería 15 o 16 años, ¿no? – ¿Cómo veis la relación entre el inglés y la búsqueda del trabajo en el futuro?

Est: **Que influye mucho**. **Si tienes un buen nivel de inglés**, es más fácil que entres en un trabajo. **Y tienes más puntos**.

Est: Ahora mismo en todos los trabajos **te piden un nivel básico de inglés**.

G: Y, ¿qué os lleva a creer en eso? ¿Cómo lo sabéis?

Est: **La televisión, medias de comunicación**. (palabras ¿? 8:35. El volumen es bajo) no vas a tener un buen trabajo en el futuro.

G: ¿**Los profesores?**

Est: Sí, los profesores...

Est: ...tu familia.

Est: **Todo el mundo te lo dice, porque es la verdad**. **Porque sí siempre te piden un nivel de inglés**. (9:00)

Teacher encouragement; motivation from *within* school

English imperative with English positioned as *lingua franca* **Mobility** is linked to this importance

Choice - e.g. other L2 options for study
Here, choice is presented as important for participants

English-for-work

English-for-work
Nivel and **puntos** - curiously, 'puntos' is the same term used in teacher discussions of professional standing (i.e. oposiciones). Here, though, "puntos" is a vague idea which may not correspond to private sector work
- Is there assumption re: desirability of public-sector jobs?

English Imperative and reasons/signs which point to its truth value