AS ATAL ANDALUZAS. É POSSÍVEL UM PLANEAMENTO LINGUÍSTICO NÃO LINGUÍSTICO?

LAS ATAL ANDALUZAS. ¿ES POSIBLE UNA PLANIFICACIÓN LINGÜÍSTICA NO LINGÜÍSTICA?

THE ANDALUSIAN ATAL. IS NON-LINGUISTIC LINGUISTIC PLANNING POSSIBLE?

Francisco García MARCOS[1]

RESUMO: O artigo analisa o planejamento linguístico desenvolvido pela Junta de Andaluzia através dos ATAL desde 2007. O objetivo era formar estudantes imigrantes para a aquisição do espanhol como língua veicular. No entanto, este planeamento foi feito fora da linguística aplicada. Isto resultou numa proposta com resultados mais do que questionáveis.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Sociolinguística. Segunda língua. Planeamento linguístico. Imigração.

RESUMEN: *El artículo analiza sociolingüísticamente la planificación lingüística desarrollada por la Junta de Andalucía a través de las ATAL a partir de 2007. El objetivo consistía en formar a alumnos inmigrados en la adquisición del español como lengua vehicular. Sin embargo, esa planificación se hizo fuera de la lingüística aplicada. Ello dio como resultado una propuesta con resultados más que cuestionables.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Sociolingüística. Segundas lenguas. Planificación lingüística. Inmigración*

ABSTRACT: *The article analyses the language planning developed by the Junta de Andalucía through the ATAL's since 2007. The objective was to train immigrant students in the acquisition of Spanish as a vehicular language. However, this planning was done outside applied linguistics. This turned out to be a proposal with questionable results.*

KEYWORDS: *Sociolinguistics. Second languages. Linguistic planning. Immigration.*

Introduction

Linguistic planning emerged as a scientific concern in the late 1960s. Something different is that, since human history is constantly written, it is possible to register a succession

---

[1] University of Almería (UAL), Almería – Spain. Professor of General Linguistics. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5638-1859. E-mail: fgarcos@gmail.com

- practically uninterrupted - of interventions by social powers in the life of languages. Mesopotamian dictionaries, the *castellano drcho.* of Alfonso X, the reform of the Korean alphabet by Emperor Sejong or, not to prolong, the foundation of the Academie Française de Richelieu was nonetheless planning actions in the life of languages. As such facts contrasted, on several occasions (GARCÍA MARCOS, 1999; 2015), it was proposed to discriminate between two sociolinguistic approaches to the problem of language planning. On the one hand, it exists as a theme linked to diachronic sociolinguistics. Sejong, Alfonso X or Richelieu would enter this section. On the other hand, linguistic planning constitutes a synchronous domain of application of sociolinguistic knowledge in the solution of current problems related to languages.

This second aspect is what defines the theoretical framework on which this work will be developed. The temporary language adaptation classrooms (from now on ATAL) are an intervention carried out by the autonomous government of Andalusia in 2007, to try to regulate multilingualism in their classrooms, derived from foreign migrations received in Andalusia, from the second mid-1980s. There are previous experiences in the same direction, as will be seen, even though the legislative document is from that year 2007, when, then, the linguistic planning analyzed here begins strictly.

In the late 1960s, linguistic planning had been born subject to a very specific disciplinary and casuistic environment. What occupied those who initially formulated it, the sociologists of language, was to resolve the linguistic emergencies of African nations that at the time were being rewarded with their independence processes. J. Fishman, the reference par excellence of the sociology of language, was very explicit in this sense (FISHMAN, 1972). The fate of these languages depended, in the first instance, on the decisions made at that time. But, directly associated with them, the communities in which they acted as vehicles of intercommunication and, consequently, that of their citizens, were also involved. For this reason, professionals with high sociolinguistic specialization were needed, which is why Fishman (1972) did not hesitate to incorporate these concerns into the list of subject models he was trying to formulate.

Linguistic planning on the basis of applied linguistics

The initiative of Fishman and the sociologists of language met two recent proposals at the time. One related to the need to direct sociolinguistic research on society, according to the formulation of G. Mosca (1977). For the Italian sociolinguist, if research on the language / society interrelationship allowed access to unknown areas of the life of languages, the consistency would be to use this data to improve languages and societies. Obviously, Fishman does not explicitly depart from Mosca's approaches. Today, scientific intercommunication on both sides of the Atlantic is not fluid, at least in this area. But, in any case, it seems at the same time evident that they shared a little less than inevitable approach, which was detached from the intrinsic nature of the research they proposed. In addition, Fishman's proposal also coincided with the incipient applied linguistics that had emerged, only a few years earlier, closely linked to the teaching of foreign languages (CALVO, 1999). What matters little is that none of these links has been expressed in strictly formal terms. Most likely, sociologists of language had no knowledge of this. And if they had, Fishman's terminological heterodoxy would scarcely allow them to advance in greater epistemological depths.

But, in addition to the uniqueness of its elucidation, linguistics had its field of application defined in the early 1970s. Language planning was part of its first founding nucleus, along with the teaching of foreign languages and computational linguistics, in addition to always latent teaching of the mother tongue.

The delimitation of linguistic planning

Language planning quickly developed a taxonomy, so resolutive that, in general terms, it is still in effect today. It was H. Kloos (1969) responsible for discriminating between the planning of forms (or corpus) and the planning of functions. The first dealt with linguistic tasks, such as those that had to be solved in Africa: elaboration of grammars, normative dictionaries, orthographic transcription systems. The second would be responsible for building programs for the social expansion of a language, through the media, the educational system, administration and, in general, the more formal language registers used in a society.

Both could be developed through explicit or implicit procedures (GARCÍA MARCOS, 1992; 2015), always in correlation with linguistic policy, the necessary companion for language planning. The first provided the formal decision on a language by the powers of a society. The second developed specific actions to carry it out. The 1978 Spanish Constitution recognized bilingualism in the historical areas of that State with the coexistence of languages

from Catalonia, Galicia and the Basque Country. Their corresponding autonomy statutes, of course, did the same. These were all language policy decisions. The actions taken by the autonomous administrations to promote their vernacular languages in the new officially recognized social space, on the contrary, were part of linguistic planning. However, as was pointed out earlier, there were two major types of language planning procedures. Explicits developed formal political decisions, adopted by relevant bodies competent in the matter. The actions of the Spanish autonomies are an example of explicit linguistic planning. The implicit level appears when the hegemonic groups of a society develop practices that regulate the life of their languages, not supported by formal procedures. There was no law during Francoism that prohibited access to broadcasting for journalists with a dialect accent. But everyday reality, however, prevented them from exercising a profession for which, in any case, they were vetoed in their vernacular dialect.

By one method or another, language planning has undergone rapid and diverse expansion. When regulating the new situation of the African languages, it soon took charge of some minority languages, or those that enjoyed sufficient social strength in their respective communities. It also tried to regulate the situation in countries with profuse multilingualism, for which there was precedent for the intervention of Soviet linguists, before the explicit formulation of this branch of sociolinguistics. The success of Soviet linguists was certainly variable in this field, but the task undertaken had colossal dimensions and, in any case, indicated a direction that would be worth pursuing. Majority and hegemonic languages, finally, were also the focus of planning. This time, it was not a matter of normalizing them, of course, although it did not stop demanding regular updates, especially among the new coordinates that globalization has established in every way.

Immigration and language planning

Immigration soon joined this list of concerns, as a unique variant of multilingual contexts. Sometimes, more than one language coexisted in the same community, with only a group of immigrant speakers, who needed to incorporate themselves into the language of reception.

Until the mid-1980s, literature was debated, with great force, from two main options. Options in linguistic terms, but that evidently exceeded them and ended up having a full impact on the models of social integration of immigrants. Through acculturation, immigrants gradually re-adjust their cultural and linguistic standards, finally adopting those of the arriving

society. Assimilation, on the other hand, supposes the immediacy of this transit. As noted, the real differences between the two occurred more in the timing of the process than in their own final goal. In both cases, it was finally sought that immigrants leave their native language and culture to those of the reception. It has to be said that reality has imposed many nuances, in almost every sense. The strict observance of either of these models depended on each context in question, but also on the groups involved. In Germany, the majority of immigrant groups became linguistically and culturally integrated in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s. However, the Turkish minority maintained its identity signs relatively firmly, among which, undoubtedly, figured their language.

In France, on the other hand, in the 1970s, a program was chosen that preserved the teaching of immigrant languages. It is true that it covered only a few immigrant minorities - Portuguese, Italian, Spanish, Arabic and Serbo-Croatian - whose languages were incorporated as electives in the curriculum of elementary education. All of them met two requirements: they belonged to significant groups (quantitatively) of immigrants and, on the other hand, they were languages with curricular continuity in the university system. Despite its greater flexibility and guaranteeing the identity of some minorities, the French proposal did not have very satisfactory results (DELRIEU, 1983: 29).

The profound and radical change in language planning for immigrants had to wait until the second half of the 1980s and occurred in Australia. It started from a radically different social and ideological context. In 1986, the Australian Parliament passed a constitutional reform, according to which the country defines its national identity as a result of an intercultural conglomerate. Australia was recognized as the confluence of indigenous descendants, Saxon colonists and immigrants. This automatically involved considering languages of immigrants as Australian languages. The immediate consequence was a plan capable of combining the linguistic rights of all Australians with the necessary intercommunication between all groups.

Australian planning also provided a highly systematic and precisely sequenced methodology. First, it was based on a study of minority linguistic attitudes. For this, they developed concepts and procedures, hitherto unknown, that allowed to obtain a very accurate view of reality. *Core value* studies, founded by J. J. Smolicz (1979), made it possible to accurately calibrate the degree of adherence to the mother tongue by groups of immigrants. Australian data denied one of the most common topics in the literature. Linguistic loyalty to the mother tongue is far from universal among all groups of immigrants. While for Hispanics, Chinese or Arabs, language is a sign of cultural and personal identity (CLYNE, 1992) for others, it is perfectly expendable. Consequently, the planning needs were, more than

substantially different, radically opposed. This led to the development of a multicenter management of linguistic coexistence, based on four main strategies:

1.   English exercised as an instrument of intercommunication between all language groups.

2.   We opted for an asymmetric projection of the immigrated languages, depending on the demands and needs of each group in contact. Thus, while the descendants of the Dutch showed no interest in maintaining their native language, as mentioned above, Chinese, Arabs and Hispanics found themselves in the opposite case.

3.   Likewise, a multicentric application of the promotion of immigrant languages was proposed. This developed based on the implantation of groups of immigrants in specific areas of the country. Therefore, the development of a language in one state did not need to be extended to the rest of the country, where there is no majority implantation of that same group.

4.   A functional projection of the languages of immigrants involved in these planning programs has been activated. It begins with its incorporation into the educational system and then to the mass media, professional fields and even part of the administration's operation.

Australian planning anticipates the sociolinguistic formulas developed just a decade later. Calvet and Varela (2000) proposed the concept of minimum linguistic baggage. It was about responding to the transformation of linguistic coexistence that globalization would presumably trigger. To deal with this efficiently, they argue that it is necessary to abandon the concept of monolingualism as a natural and ideal situation. Quite the contrary, language's response to globalization requires at least efficient communication in the three major sociolinguistic domains among which individuals are likely to operate. Therefore, in this perspective of linguistic baggage necessary to move around the global village, there are at least three stages, with their corresponding languages:

A.   A *supercentral language*, capable of enabling communication in the international arena. In principle, this function could only be performed, in the opinion of Calvet and Varela, in English, Spanish and French.

B.   A *central language*, charged with promoting communication between all speakers of a country, regardless of their native language and culture. An example of this would be the use of English in Australia mentioned earlier.

C.   A familiar language, for the most intimate and vernacular interactions, restricted to private domains.

In practice, there are times when a single language can cover the three functions above. For a Córdoba speaker, his mother tongue, Andalusian Spanish, fulfills these three tasks. Thereafter, the series expands, as the minimum communication needs increase. According to the Calvet-Varela formula, a Vic Catalan speaker will need at least two languages, Spanish (supercentral and central) and Catalan (familiar). A migrant from Ankara in Germany would need three: Turkish (family), German (central) and English or Spanish (supercentral).

Calvet and Varela's approach, of course, admits nuances. The first, and most obvious, relates to the partner languages of Spanish and English at the supercentral level. With the international status of French diminished, it is not understood why Portuguese is not included in this position.

Anyway, as the discussion about the nuances of Calvet and Varela's text is interesting, they are also not decisive for the central issue here. If so, of course, the consequences of planning result from this. If the minimum linguistic baggage is essential to circulate in the future world, it follows that it is up to the countries to commit themselves inexcusably in two actions:

1. Facilitate the preservation and protection of intimate languages.

2. Form their citizens in languages that allow them to communicate in central spaces (second languages) and in supercentral spaces (foreign languages).

From the perspective of Calvet and Varela, the formation in Spanish of immigrants arriving in Andalusia would be included in the second of the previous sections: Spanish is the language of intercommunication of the host society, but it also allows them to have a communicative tool of the first magnitude in the international order. As ATALs come up with the task of providing these skills, a theme that is not insignificant.

The ATAL proposal

At least in the strictly formal field, the turning point that institutionalizes ATALs can be found in the *Order of January 15, 2007*, which promulgates the Junta de Andalucía. It will appear published almost immediately, in BOJA 33, of November 14 of the same year and, in addition, it is a prototypical case of explicit linguistic planning, supported by formal legislation. The *Order*, therefore, provides the linguistic policy component that underpins the standardized formulation of these actions in the life of languages. It is an adopted decision that will receive

successive developments from the political powers for its implementation in the Andalusian educational system.

However, the planning of the ATAL language had other origins deeper in time. It was born from a pedagogical initiative, promoted by teams of teachers from the province of Almería in 1997. It is an initial reference, contrasted and accepted by the bibliography that addressed the historical development of ATAL (CASTILLA, 2016). This means that, initially, ATALs are part of an implicit linguistic planning, which also does not arise from exactly hegemonic groups in the social sphere. It is not the leading strata that promote it, but a group of professionals, aware of the immediacy of the problems they face as teachers. This initiative is incorporated by the political powers that, in doing so, increase their status.

The initiative promoted by the Almerian school was reinforced in the years immediately following by educational legislation, which is increasingly involved in immigration management, both at the state level and in the strictly autonomous area. *Law 9/1999 on Solidarity in Education* seeks to address the special needs that arise in the educational system. Potentially targeting vulnerable groups include students from cultural minorities. Two years later, the Andalusian government promotes the Educational Assistance Plan for Immigrant Students. For Del Río (2015, p. 99), this is the formal text from which, over time, the ATALs will be configured.

Prior to that, the Andalusian government had taken a new approach to the issue of incorporating immigrant students into Andalusian classrooms. *Decree 167/203, Art. 26* (BOJA 18, 06/17/2003) deals with the actions that should be used in order to give adequate attention to students with special needs. Immigrants are considered as such and, consequently, also as recipients of these actions (DEL RÍO, 2015; CASTILLA, 2016).

So, the 2007 text was not exactly the result of improvisation. On the contrary, in principle, it should have been based on a proven educational practice, after a decade of application, on a previous legal corpus and, of course, on the specialization that Andalusian sociolinguistics specialized in this subject could provide.

The result, as will be seen immediately, is partially in line with a canonical outline of linguistic planning and, therefore, will only take advantage of part of that potential. With the 2007 Order, the Government of Andalusia pursued three main fundamental objectives, which, moreover, stated very explicitly

- Enable the integration of young immigrants in the Andalusian school system.
- Promote the learning of Spanish as the vehicle language of this system.

- Preserving the original culture of immigrant groups.

The *Decree*, which applies to Andalusian public schools of elementary and compulsory secondary education, intended to regulate educational activities, directing them in that path. Finally, as stated in its pages, the Andalusian educational centers would become axes for the integration and development of interculturality. Thus, lawmakers understood that the promotion of immigrant students would be guaranteed.

This prescriptive statement of principles would be specified in the development of the text in an exhaustive organization that would cover several aspects: from the actions of provincial departments, centers or delegations of Education, to the establishment of deadlines, types of reports and number of students, including planning centers or the skills of teachers and heads of study. In short, the teachers were given two basic functions: organizing the center's activities on immigration and facilitating the learning of Spanish.

Undoubtedly, it was a normative verbose, that took care of many details, it is true that, with greater emphasis on some aspects than others. Linguistics remained in the sector of those little treated by the decree of the Board of Andalusia, a circumstance that initially causes some strangeness. ATALs were - in principle - an instrument for acquiring a second language. Despite this, the linguistic issue was only addressed in a testimonial manner. It can be said that the priorities were focused on the organization of the school, neglecting the objective in which it should be applied and offering performance, the language.

Part of this neglect was mitigated in the annexes that established the levels contemplated by ATAL, as well as its contents and skills. The Andalusian government's proposal, however, was not entirely original either. In short, it carried out an adaptation - it is true that it is quite irregular - of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR from now on) to the Andalusian migratory assumption. As a result, it establishes four levels, always coordinated with those contemplated by the European Union itself, after its countries adopted it in their linguistic policies.

Table 1 - Levels covered by ATAL

JJ.AA.	MCER
Level 0	Complete lack of proficiency in Spanish
Level 1	A1
Level 2	A2
Level 3	B1, B2, C1, C2

Source: Devised by the author.

Likewise, two fundamental modalities of ATAL are established, those based on a center and the so-called itinerant ones. In the latter, teachers are those who move within a province, meeting the needs detected during each course.

For each of the previous levels, the summarized objectives of the CEFR are transferred, without referring to the existence of a noticeably more extensive version in the Council of Europe's own text. In any case, the Andalusian government sets the standard for guiding ATALs, in accordance with institutionalized procedures for teaching foreign languages. Subsequently, in a document entitled "*Teaching Spanish and integration*", it refers to the Cervantes Institute; more specifically, your level tests and the AVE.

With this baggage and this structure, ATALs continue to function for more than a decade. Del Río (2015, p. 120) highlights that it is common for teachers to focus their teachings on orality. The transcription of these general guidelines, in any case, was not easy, immediate or homogeneous. Evidently, as happened in 1997, it had the praiseworthy initiative of the teachers. The 20th edition of *Themes for Education* (2012) presented an extensive proposal of materials. It included manuals in Spanish for foreigners (*Between friends* 1 and 2, in the Castilian and Arabic version, *Español para ti, Mañana*), handwriting or spelling brochures or dictionaries, as well as access to websites of the Instituto Cervantes or educamadrid.org.

Likewise, centers such as IES Albayzin in Granada or IES Aguadulce in Almeria have created their own curriculum plans and have also made them available to the general public on the Internet. They are, however, exponents of a very general trend, involved in the design of their own materials. Jiménez *et al.* (2009) confirm that 42% of the materials used at ATAL in Cádiz are from this source. Cadiz's highly rigorous study examines other relevant data on the transcription of legal texts for the daily life of ATAL classrooms. The enrollment of students is made at the request of tutors, applying a sequence that separates them from instrumental disciplines (Language, Mathematics, Science of nature), keeping them in Physical Education, Music or Fine Arts. On the other hand, although a minimum of 10 teaching hours is established in elementary and 15 in high school, the reality is that 6.5 are practiced on average.

The diagnosis by Jiménez *et al.* (2009), is based on contrasting empirical data. Because of this, it is added to a generalized trend in the bibliography related to this type of planning. Castilla (2011), in another equally exhaustive and systematic study, analyzes, among many other things, the production that dealt with ATAL, directly or indirectly, from 2000 to 2014. In total, there were 45 works, with peak productivity between 2011 and 2012 (CASTILLA, 2011, p. 228). 51.11% were of university origin, while the administration itself produced 20%

and educational centers 15.5%. Of the remaining 13.34%, professional groups were in charge. A diverse group, no doubt, that shows the impact that ATALs have had on Andalusian social life.

Apart from the reports prepared by the administration itself, the not always positive evaluations of the activity carried out by ATAL, moreover, predominated from different angles. Its practical development has been questioned, as in the case of the research by Jiménez *et al.* (2009), already mentioned, which, in addition, was no exception. Castilla Segura (2011, p. 503-506) recalls that, in the criteria for selecting teachers, the administration explicitly prioritizes personal awareness of the problem of diversity and a positive attitude towards interculturality. Thus, ATAL teachers end up being specialists in immigration and interculturality. In addition, the figure of the itinerant teacher predominates in daily practice. In a monographic survey on the attitudes of teachers in Almeria towards ATAL, Molina (2013) documents a considerably negative assessment, especially in some very specific aspects. The teachers themselves were dissatisfied with the limited specific formation of ATAL teachers. With its allocation criteria, with the bureaucracy involved in its management and with the negative perception that truly tangible results would be obtained. Rodríguez and Madrid (2016) also document negative attitudes towards the formation of teachers specializing in ATAL among university students in the final year of undergraduate education in elementary education.

Other critics addressed underlying problems. Again Castilla Segura (2011) summed them up very carefully. In fact, ATAL was interpreted as proposing an assimilation strategy, despite its formal declaration of interculturality. In addition, some of their practices stigmatized immigrant students when they were removed from the classroom and, therefore, from the group in which they were to be integrated. Similarly, Castaño *et al.*, (2012) ask whether differences do not end up becoming inequalities. On the other hand, in addition to declarations of principles, their ethnographic objectives have also not been clearly established. Castilla himself (2016) made a more disturbing reading of ATAL. He considers them an ideological construction that turns diversity into a problem, which justifies the exceptional nature of these teachings. In this sense, he maintains that there is a discourse that promotes the division of the administration installed by ethnicity, to the teachers themselves or even to the students. In fact, there are several examples of voluntary isolation among the cases he deals with from immigrant students who, in principle, should be from their peer group. In short, Goenechea (2015) openly raised the possibility that they are an extinct resource.

The linguistic assessment of ATAL

Among these numerous assessments by ATAL, the scarcity of strictly linguistic studies stands out. It is still an indication of the ultimate nature of this planning, practically from its legal basis, focused mainly on more ethnographic and school organization issues. In spite of everything, however, the axis behind them - at least on paper - was none other than promoting the acquisition of Spanish by immigrant students, which was also announced as an essential requirement for their integration into the host community, in this case, the Andalusian.

Therefore, evaluating the linguistic component of ATAL seems, besides being pertinent, reasonably recommended. In this sense, however, it is convenient to define two levels. On the one hand, it seems appropriate to analyze the linguistic foundations of the proposal, even if it is part of an action whose ultimate objectives exceed it. On the other hand, it seems equally pertinent to contrast the actual results of this ATAL performance from the standardized parameters in applied linguistics.

The linguistic foundation of the proposal

As noted above, ATAL requires learning Spanish as an instrumental language as part of a proposal for the development of interculturality in Andalusian classrooms. Neither of the two tasks assigned to this is supported sociolinguistically. Spanish is not just an instrumental language for these students. Starting from the strictest scientific rigor, it is a second language, a circumstance that introduces nuances of enormous importance that, in addition, affect various levels of the ATAL proposal. As a second language, it is an essential tool for part of your interactions in the host community. The school is yet another component within a communicative universe that ostensibly demotes it. Furthermore, interculturality does not depend solely and exclusively on language learning. Even if so, it would not have an irreversible effect on the language learning of all students; that is, the vernacular would have to learn all immigrant languages, or at least a significant number of them, something that obviously does not happen.

The confusion in the sociolinguistic cataloging of Spanish leads to other dysfunctions. ATAL worked on a theoretical and methodological basis that corresponded to the teaching of foreign languages. From the formulation of its levels, directly (and defectively), derived from the CEFR, to the recommended manuals or the resources provided by Instituto Cervantes, everything develops in this domain. The specialized bibliography clearly distinguishes between foreign languages and second languages (GARCÍA MARCOS, 2018). The former

are acquired through formal instruction outside their communities of speakers. The motivations are extremely variable. They can range from inclusion in school programs or professional reasons to mere scholarships in languages. Anyway, it is the subject who chooses, with some freedom, to approach a language other than his mother tongue. Second languages are communication tools typical of the communities in which they live - and interact - with another mother tongue. They are, therefore, necessary to continue their socialization, which, for all these reasons, develop in immersion in their learning context.

Two new consequences stem from this error in ATAL's linguistic cataloging: one, the sociolinguistic scenario from which it is operating is seriously wrong; Second, the immersion in which this acquisition process takes place is undoubtedly a situation more than privileged in the teaching of non-mother tongue.

Furthermore, this transfer to the domains of foreign language teaching is carried out in a hasty and manifestly distorted manner. There is no scientific basis to support the homogenization of CEFR levels B1 to C2 in a single sequence. The degrees of communicative competence involved in each one of them turn out to be absolutely incomparable. The decision of the Andalusian government cannot be justified.

Likewise, all types of immigrant students are homogenized, contrary to another basic rule of linguistics applied to language teaching. There are non-spelling immigrants compared to those who use an alphabet with ease, even if it is always Latin. These alphabets, distinct from Spanish graphemics, maintain degrees that are not comparable to translatability, namely Cyrillic, Arabic or, obviously, Chinese. Some students come from multilingual environments, compared to others who come from strongly homogeneous communities around one language. This can be associated with important identity marks or, on the contrary, it is more of an element of communication within a polyglot social fabric. Some experienced very formalized school processes - for example, those in Eastern Europe - and others lacked contact with schooling. For this reason, there are those who place great expectations on the educational system - wish to aspire to university - or simply conceive it as a passing stage. Moreover, it is not the same as settling in marginal environments or in areas where the vernacular population lives, in rural areas or in urban areas. In short, there are, on the one hand, those who come from cultural environments with great restrictions for some social groups - such as Arab women - or, on the other hand, operate within much more open contexts.

All of this inexorably determines teaching practice. Adapting to learning categories and controlling the curriculum environment are inevitable requirements for linguistics applied to language teaching. To neglect them is certainly to yield to failure, at least in the most

rigorous scientific theory. ATAL's linguistic planning should have been based on what is technically known as an analysis of the needs and expectations of the students to whom the intervention was directed. Then, a specific curriculum project should have been prepared, to accommodate the necessary programming in each context. In their absence, it would be convenient to make contrasting references in the specific field of teaching second languages to immigrants. Since Mateo (1995), there were open lines in Andalusia itself, still active today.

With all these conditions, in addition to the intrinsic complexity of the proposed language acquisition, a solid formation in linguistics applied to the teaching of non-native languages would be essential for teachers, in the first instance, with singular specificity in the migratory assumption. Formation in the use of foreign languages solves only part of the problem that second language teachers have to face, which is why greater specialization is needed. Anyway, it is a discussion that does not take place in relation to ATAL, according to the requirements of its teachers, as mentioned above (CASTILLA, 2011). To all of this, we must add that the sequence of functioning of ATAL implicitly develops processes of sociolinguistic stigmatization, separating immigrant students from the peer group.

In summary, from a strictly linguistic perspective, the proposed planning for ATAL in the 2007 text contains serious deficiencies at virtually all levels.

The assessment of linguistic performance

Nor have there been many investigations charged with measuring the linguistic performance of school-age immigrant children in Andalusia after participating in the ATAL program. Even the research that came close to that, are also not exactly monographs focused on this specific problem. On the contrary, it is necessary to deduce them from other broader references on the acquisition of Spanish by the immigrant population of Andalusia, from which the actions of ATAL can be inferred indirectly.

Within the basic program of the Center for the Study of Migration and Intercultural Relations (CEMyRI[2] from now on), a broad framework of references on the sociolinguistic acquisition of immigrant speakers in southeastern Spain has been included (GARCÍA MARCOS, 2010). The research covered the scenarios of the provinces of Almeria, Granada, Jaén and Murcia, in an attempt to develop a detailed sociolinguistic profile of this population sector. For this reason, a framework of broad references was approached, from which more

---

[2] O CEMyRI é um Instituto de pesquisa conjunto do Governo da Espanha e da Universidade de Almeria, onde fica sua sede.

specific researches of this broad and heterogeneous process could be established. Thus, attitudes towards Spanish and the host community were tabulated, the subjective indices of difficulty, the number of languages spoken by the speakers, their degree of satisfaction with the teachings received, the language skills they had - in Spanish and in their mother language - and your degree of awareness of learning.

All data were stratified according to social factors such as age, sex, education, location and origin. Among the countless data provided by the research, some constants linked to the problem addressed here were revealed. First, there was a deep and constant heterogeneity in all parameters analyzed in the immigrant community. Despite this, four major groups have been clearly defined: Europeans, the Maghrebes, Sub-Saharans and Asians. At no time were Spanish-speaking immigrants considered when it came to linguistic issues. Anyway, the group of origin proved to be the real stratification agent of the analyzed parameters, with decisive action in relation to language and integration:

A. European speakers - with the exception of the British - were the ones who showed the greatest expectations regarding language learning. All of them from highly educated backgrounds, many of whom belong to bilingual environments - especially those in Eastern Europe - and did not highlight uniquely difficult degrees of difficulty.

B. The Maghreb community had received considerably more irregular instruction, as had their expectations of learning Spanish. With relevant cultural restrictions - limitations on women's education - they came from generally monolingual families, with great value for the language of origin. The biggest difficulty was in spelling and grammar.

C. For the sub-Saharan, the problem of learning Spanish lies in the same linguistic aspects. In any case, it should be mentioned that this was the group with the largest number of illiterate speakers. Their expectations for learning Spanish were high, although at the same time they recognized structural difficulties in accessing this instruction. Multilingual in origin on many occasions, many of them were used to dealing with more languages than their mother tongue.

D. Asians, on the other hand, developed in monolingual family environments, with an instruction of very formal origin. They had written skills in their mother tongue, although, due to the distance from the Latin alphabet, they expressed greater concern with writing, in addition to grammar and vocabulary. They were the least inclined to regular language learning.

All groups agreed on two aspects. First, the second generations were more or less integrated into the Spanish-speaking community, totally in the case of Europeans and the Maghrebes, and the other two with greater difficulty. Second, they all also agreed to negatively assess the instructional processes received. It must be said that these do not correspond exclusively to the actions of ATAL. There are other institutions that also work with teaching Spanish to immigrants: Red Acoge, Red Cross, municipalities and even immigrant associations themselves, the case of ACALAN for the Senegalese people in Almeria. The existence and permanence of this other educational offer is already a relevant indication of the limitations of official Spanish teaching to immigrants in Andalusia.

A year later, Mateo and García Marcos (2011) led a new CEMyRI project, this time limited to the behavior of the social factor sex. The research collected the data on which the analysis presented by Mateo and Trigo (2013) was based, confirming a stratification of this factor that followed the general guidelines obtained in 2010.

For his part, Fernández García (2013) carried out a very meticulous and detailed research in Jaén, although more oriented to the analysis of the multilingual reality of this community of speakers, as a result of the migratory movements received. Fernández García documents a situation that is certainly profuse, not only in terms of the number of languages in contact, more than 90, but also in relation to the typological diversity he analyzes.

All of these investigations shared the common denominator of dealing with the linguistic acquisition of immigrants across the generational spectrum. Consequently, they allowed an approximation very relative to the possible results of the ATAL action. A. García's studies (2010; 2019), on the other hand, focused on a segment of the school population and, above all, specifically examined the issue of linguistic performance that ATAL could have achieved. More specifically, in the last year of elementary school and at the beginning of compulsory high school, based on empirical research that contrasted free and directed school texts. A. García used stratification hues similar to those used in CEMyRI to examine three standardized indexes in the applied linguistics bibliography: lapsography, syntactic maturity and lexical richness.

In the first study, A. García (2010) observed two groups of students, one with specific training in ATAL and the other with vernacular students, logically outside that program. The results this time were considerably indicative of the mark that the ATALs could have printed on the communicative reality of immigrant students. ATAL, based on these data, did not achieve its goal of providing students with an instrumental language, with levels significantly lower than those shown by the control group in all indexes used. Six years later (A. GARCÍA,

2019[3]) refines the advanced analysis in the previous research, with an ostensible expansion of the data and greater under-specification in the treatment of social factors. In general terms, the linguistic performance of all students analyzed is below the average contrasted with the Hispanic world, as stated in the specialized bibliography. This general trend is intensified in the case of immigrant students who have really low rates, both in syntactic maturity and lexical richness, and with high lapsography problems. These negative data, in any case, are not evenly distributed. On the one hand, the most significant exceptions to this general pattern are registered, precisely, among students of immigrant origin. Some of these students are those who provide the best results for the entire sample, even above their vernacular companions. At the same time, on the other hand, there is a constant in all data analyzes carried out by García in relation to students from Eastern Europe, whose performance is systematically better than the rest of the immigrants, even a substantial part of their vernacular classmates. A. García's final diagnosis leaves no room for doubt or speculation. In his opinion, a situation of authentic linguistic deficit is being witnessed, in the most Bernsteinian sense of that terminology, especially acute among immigrant students.

For what interests us here, this research provides very conclusive data to assess the linguistic performance of ATAL. They also come from Almeria, the same social context in which they started in 1997. Their impact on the development of that vehicular language that the Andalusian government aspired to was minimal. Factors unrelated to the programming proposed by the Board of Andalusia acted on the good linguistic results obtained by some immigrant students, be it a culture of formal origin in terms of education and mere individual exceptions, without direct motivation with the training received.

Final considerations

The linguistic planning proposal promoted by the Andalusian government through ATAL has been, at the very least, problematic. Its main linguistic objective, the development of communicative competence in Spanish as an instrumental language, was already far from a solid scientific base. Completely removed from the core of applied linguistics, the adequate model was lacking in terms of characterizing the processes of acquiring Spanish as a second language, the didactic sequences, the typification of the courses and their contents or the orientation of the recommended materials.

---

[3] O trabalho publicado em 2019 baseia-se numa tese de doutorado defendida em 2016.

This happened despite being an explicit linguistic planning, with more importance than the Andalusian government itself was aware of. The aim was not only to organize the acquisition of an instrumental language, but, in fact, it was the attempt to provide communicative competence to speakers in one of the supercentral languages of the contemporary world. In addition, this proposal emerged from the foundation of the Andalusian educational system itself. Finally, ATAL's obstacles also imply the failure to take advantage of an implicit linguistic planning that emerged from the social base itself.

The results of the implementation of this planning showed that the proposed objectives were not achieved. According to empirical data, there was no widespread acquisition of instrumental Spanish among immigrant students, nor did it develop positive expectations regarding the same educational process promoted by the government of Andalusia. On the contrary, an evident discontent spread among all the protagonists of the educational process. Neither the students, nor the parents, nor the teachers themselves show positive attitudes towards the management of ATAL.

The Andalusian government's proposal took an evident risk, given its considerable exceptional nature in the historical landscape of linguistic planning. The modern proposals derived from the sociology of language required the essential presence of sociolinguists, both in its outline and in its progressive implementation and final management. In earlier times, outside of an explicit scientific structure as it is today, in any case, it remained in the most specialized circles of each era. Alfonso X in Castile or Sejong in Korea were sovereign, but also distinguished scholars and intellectuals. They united the figure of the ruler, but also that of the expert on the subject. Richelieu promoted the Academie Française in 1635, of which he would be appointed protector and chief by Louis XIII. But that will not apply to your dictionary or grammar. This will correspond to the wise men who urged on it and who, therefore, specialize in this task.

The Andalusian government renounces scientific expertise to outline and implement its planning, to the point of renouncing the specific formation of its teachers. This linguistic impression is not a questionable question, insofar as it is a verifiable reality, an objective fact. Of course, this does not guarantee your success, but the opposite, in view of the results. Thus, in response to the question that motivated this work, there is a linguistic planning that, in any case, does not guarantee that effective results will be deduced from it or that, consequently, will solve with minimum efficiency the problems that must be dealt with. Implicitly, this also answers Goenechea's (2015) question: the most rational thing, of this already, would be to suppress a resource like ATAL, sociolinguistically sterile.

REFERENCES

CALVET, L. J.; VARELA, L. XXIe siècle: le crépuscle des langues? Critique du discours Politico-Linguistiquement Correct. **Estudios de Sociolingüística**, n. 1, p. 47-64, 2000.

CALVO, J. Lingüística aplicada. *In*: LÓPEZ, A. (Coord.). **Lingüística General y Aplicada**. Valencia: Universidad de Valencia, p. 323-349, 1999.

CASTAÑO, F. J. G.; SEGURA, J. C.; GÓMEZ, M. R. Inmigración extranjera y escuela en Andalucía: diferencias que terminan siendo desigualdades. *In*: **La inmigración en Andalucía**: instituciones, aspectos juridicos-sociales y culturales. Granada, Comares, p. 339-380, 2012.

CASTILLA SEGURA, J. C. Las ATAL: una experiencia andaluza de atención al alumnado de nueva incorporación de origen extranjero. *In*: CONGRESO INTERNACIONAL SOBRE MIGRACIONES EN ANDALUCÍA, 1., 2011. Granada. **Anais** […]. Granada, Instituto de Migraciones, p. 503-512, 2011.

CASTILLA SEGURA, J. C. Las ATAL. Una experiencia andaluza de atención al alumnado de nueva incorporación de origen extranjero. *In*: GARCÍA CASTAÑO, F. J.; KRESSOVA, N. (Coords.). **Diversidad cultural y migraciones**. Granada: Comares, p. 229-246, 2013.

CLYNE, M. **Pluricentric languages**. Berlín/Nueva York: Mouton/De Gruyter, 1992.

DELRIEU, J. Scolarization des enfants migrants et enseignement des langues dórigine. *In*: DABÈNE, L. *et al.* (Coords.). **Status of Migrant Mother Tongues.** Estrasburgo: European Science Foundation, p. 23-29, 1983.

DEL RÍO FERNÁNDEZ, J. L. **Evaluación de las posibilidades educativas del aula ATAL en los centros escolares de Málaga**: estudio de casos. 2015. 338 f. Tese. (Doutorado) - Universidad de Málaga. Dpto. de Didáctica y organización escolar, 2015.

FERNÁNDEZ GARCÍA, F. **Lenguas e inmigración em la ciudad de Jaén**. Barcelona: Octaedro, 2013.

FISHMAN, J. **Sociología del lenguaje**. Madrid, Cátedra, 1988.

GARCÍA, A. **Adquisición del español como segunda lengua**. Evaluación empírica y alternativas en lingüística aplicada. Jaén, Universidad de Jaén. TFM, 2010.

GARCÍA, A. **Adquisición del español como segunda lengua**. El caso de la integración lingüística de escolares inmigrantes en Almería. Almería, Universidad de Almería, 2019

GARCÍA MARCOS, F. **Fundamentos críticos de sociolingüística**. Almería: Universidad de Almería, 1999.

GARCÍA MARCOS, F. Gestión integral del multilingüismo en el Sureste Español. *In*: **Memoria Anual CEMyRI**, 123-535, 2011.

GARCÍA MARCOS, F. **Sociolingüística.** Madrid: Síntesis, 2015.

GARCÍA MARCOS, F. **La trastienda de la enseñanza de lenguas extranjeras.** Granada, Comares, 2018.

GOENECHEA, C. (2015). Evolución de las ATAL en la provincia de Cádiz: ¿un recurso a extinguir? *In*: CONGRESO SOBRE MIGRACIONES INTERNACIONALES, 8., 2015. Granada. **Anais** […]. Granada, Instituto de Migraciones, 16-18 set. 2015.

KLOOS, H. **Research possibilities on group bilingualism**: a report. Quebec: International Center of Research on Bilingualism, 1969.

MATEO, M. Enseñanza del español a inmigrantes: datos empíricos y propuestas teóricas. **REALE: Revista de Estudios de Adquisición de la Lengua Española**, v. 3, p. 119-130, 1995.

MATEO, M. V.; GARCÍA MARCOS, F. **Gestión del multilingüismo y la importancia de la mujer en la adquisición de la lengua**. Almería: CEMyRI. Proyecto de investigación, 2011.

MATEO, M. V.; TRIGO, E. **Migración y contacto lingüístico**. Lenguas de origen en Almería según el factor social edad. De lingüística, traducción y léxico-fraseología**.** Granada: Comares, p. 215-226, 2013.

MOLINA LÓPEZ, G. Aulas temporales de adaptación lingüística. Almería: Universidad de Almería, 2013.

MOSCA, G. Un esperimento di sociolingüística aplicata. *In*: SIMONE, R.; RUGGIERO, G. (Coords.). **Aspetti sociolinguistici dell'Italia contemporanea**. Roma: Bulzoni, p. 449-462, 1977.

RODRÍGUEZ MUÑOZ, F. J.; MADRID NAVARRO, V. Aulas temporales de adaptación lingüística: una incógnita sin despejar para los futuros maestros de Educación Primaria. **Fuentes**, v. 18, n. 2, p. 153-166, 2016.

SMOLICZ J. J. **Culture and education in plural society**: culture and curriculum series. Camberra: Curriculum Development Centre, 1979.

How to quote this article