

Versión pre-print. Artículo publicado en 2022. *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada*, 35(2), 565-595. <https://doi.org/10.1075/resla.20019.san>
<https://benjamins.com/catalog/resla.20019.san>

How do Andalusian journalism students perceive Andalusian and Castilian linguistic varieties?

Juana Santana Marrero

University of Seville

ORCID: 0000-0002-7715-0141

The media is currently one of the main channels of opinion on the Andalusian variety. They show the struggle between those who propagate the idea that it is just another Spanish dialect and those who disqualify Andalusian people because of their pronunciation. Additionally, there is a fluctuation between those communicators who maintain their Andalusian vernacular features in the media and those who change some of them for phonetic results closer to those of the central-northern part of Spain. In this research, using PRECAVES XXI methodology, we survey the perception that Andalusian journalism students have of Andalusian and Castilian varieties, as they are supposed to have an immediate impact on their future profession. Our results show that most of them identified Castilian Spanish as the most prestigious linguistic model, that affective characteristics of Andalusian Spanish were evaluated fairly positively, and that some negative stereotypes about the latter still persist.

Keywords: linguistic beliefs and attitudes, Andalusian journalism university students, Andalusian Spanish, Castilian Spanish, PRECAVES XXI

1. Introduction

It has been shown by a vast body of literature that there are negative social evaluations, both historic as well as recent, towards the Andalusian linguistic variety of Spanish. As

Rafael Cano explains (2009, pp. 82-89), this criticism dates back to the sixteenth century. Among the most prominent examples of this is its identification as a careless way of speaking, a product of a poor education, which makes comprehension difficult. Over time, the southern phonetic realisations (Andalusian Spanish) gradually diverged from those in the northern norm (Castilian Spanish) (José Mondéjar, 1991, pp. 153-159; Ralph Penny, 2000, pp. 118-127). The latter were felt to be more refined and cultured due to being used in the Royal Court. Therefore, from the eighteenth century onwards, the *Real Academia Española* ('Royal Spanish Academy') evaluated Andalusian dialectal variations negatively, because they were associated to contaminated linguistic results that were far from the original purity of the language (Elena Méndez, 1999, p. 122). The unfavourable characterisation of Andalusian dialect was also transferred to its speakers. As Cano points out (2009, pp. 93-95), along with some positive assessments, more abundant in the sixteenth century due to the economic and social significance of Seville at that time, Andalusian residents were often associated with being liars, tricksters, and malicious people. In the nineteenth century, certain negative clichés were spread and took hold, which still exist today, including the association between Andalusian and humour or exaggeration (Cano, 2009, pp. 102-107). The socioeconomic inferiority of Andalusia contributed to this negative perception, as for a long time it was a poor region with high levels of illiteracy (Pedro Carbonero, 2001, p. 20).

Such a negative social evaluation of the Andalusian variety and the Andalusian people has been echoed in multiple contexts, including literature (Cano, 2009, p. 89), education (Méndez, 2003; Víctor Cantero, 2013), and the media (Rafael Jiménez, 2002; Leticia Ureña, 2014). The last of these, with the undeniable power and enormous influence that it exercises on modern society, has contributed to spreading the conflict between the defenders and the critics of this linguistic modality. The debate revolves around those who believe it to be suitable for use in formal settings, such as politics or broadcast journalism, and those who perceive it as a pronunciation lacking in prestige that should be absent from such contexts, as it undermines the professional worth of those who use it. For its part, several television series have also helped further a negative stereotype of characters with this pronunciation, associated with low-level professions and even marginalised settings (Jiménez, 2002, p. 192; Ureña, 2014, p. 200).

Considering the important role of the mass media in public opinion, this study focuses on the field of journalism, which is assigned particular significance in the spreading of linguistic patterns and models due to these professionals being *transmisores de prestigio* ‘transmitters of prestige’ (Antonio Manjón-Cabeza, 2000). Specifically, we will provide data on the perceptions of a group of Andalusian journalism students regarding two linguistic varieties: Andalusian and Castilian. To do so, we use the empirical methods of the questionnaire designed by the *Proyecto para el estudio de creencias y actitudes hacia las variedades del español en el siglo XXI* (PRECAVES XXI) ‘Project for the study of beliefs and attitudes regarding varieties of Spanish in the twenty-first century.’ In this manner, we quantitatively examine these previous qualitative opinions regarding Andalusian Spanish, most of them lacking in scientific rigour. This is one of our main objectives. Delving into the university students’ assessment of the Spanish varieties is of particular interest, as these issues are part of the concerns they express in the university classroom. It is with good reason that they suspect that in their professional lives they will need to choose whether they adhere to vernacular pronunciation or opt for other phonetic realisations that are held in higher esteem.

2. The perception of the Andalusian linguistic variety

As mentioned above, a range of opinions have been circulated regarding the Spanish spoken in Andalusia, at different points in time and in various settings. In this section, we will focus on two specific contexts: the media and specialised research on linguistic beliefs and attitudes.

2.1 The media

The Andalusian dialect is constantly under the media spotlight, either for the opinions expressed in it regarding its pronunciation and, incidentally, its speakers, or for the phonetic realisations of Andalusian broadcast professionals, whether they use their vernacular or not.

In the former case, the Andalusian pronunciation often becomes a news item because of a certain one-off event, such as the dismissal of a public figure over its use (Agencias / Madrid, 2009; María Rionegro, 2017), or due to the columnists' opinions of it, or due to those of the readers themselves in the form of letters to the editor (Mariano Aguayo, 2009; Javier Caraballo, 2014, 2020). As Ureña points out (2014, p. 172), several clichés are projected in a large proportion of these texts: “*el acento andaluz como humorístico, el bajo nivel educativo del andaluz, de quien se afirma que habla mal, o la existencia de un hablar andaluz como una modalidad incomprensible.*” ‘The Andalusian accent as humorous, the low educational level of Andalusian people, who are said to speak badly, or the existence of Andalusian as an incomprehensible modality.’ In this respect, Carbonero (2001, pp. 15-19) rejects the *mitos* ‘myths’ about Andalusian Spanish spread in the media: “*mito de la ininteligibilidad, de la ortografía, de la gracia andaluza y de la vulgaridad*” ‘myth of unintelligibility, of spelling, of Andalusian humour, and of vulgarity.’ This is also condemned by Marta León-Castro (2016) in her analysis of texts from the Spanish press. There is no lack of examples of linguists using the media to argue against these unfounded linguistic attitudes (Carbonero, 1999; Fede Durán, 2014; Antonio Narbona, 2017).

The second aspect to be considered is that not all Andalusian professionals use their vernacular pronunciation in local media (José Luis Carrascosa, 1997, 2002; Jiménez, 2002). Usually, they include some phonic realisations of Castilian dialect, mainly *distinción* (instead of *seseo* or *ceceo*), no aspiration of coda /s/ or /x/ in syllable-onset position, or the use of [tʃ] instead of [ʃ] for /tʃ/ (José María Vaz de Soto, 1998; Elena Fernández de Molina, 2020), even when some of these dialectal phonetic allophones have been proven to be spread among middle and high sociolect in some Andalusian cities (Carbonero, 2003, p. 113; 2007, p. 122).¹ In fact, there is no general pattern and it often depends on the journalist's choice (Luis Carlos Díaz, 2002). In this regard, the

¹ *Ceceo* and the fricative allophone [ʃ] of /tʃ/ are not prestigious phonetic realisations, due to **being** used mainly by speakers with lower educational attainment level (Carbonero, 2003, p. 116; 2007, p. 122). That is why they are not supposed to be used in the media, **especially** in more formal programmes, such as **the** news (Carbonero, 2001, pp. 21-22).

*Libro de Estilo de Canal Sur Televisión y Canal 2 Andalucía*² ‘*Canal Sur Television and Andalusia Canal 2 Style Guide*’ (José María Allas & Díaz, 2004, p. 218) promotes the freedom to use dialectal phonic realisations, as long as the requirements of being intelligible and remaining in the formal register are being met. This lack of unanimity also affects Andalusian professionals who work for non-regional media (León-Castro, 2016, p. 1587; Fernández de Molina, 2020). The masking of southern features and their replacement with those of the central-northern pronunciation may lead the audience to think that the Andalusian linguistic modality is an insufficient way of speaking for serious formal settings, such as that of programmes dedicated to transmitting information or divulging knowledge (Jiménez, 2002, p. 190).

From what has been said so far, a mostly negative assessment of the Andalusian Spanish can be deduced, fuelled by the opinions portrayed in the media³ that dismiss those who use this dialectal pronunciation in their public activity, often in the world of politics, and due to the lack of homogeneity in the phonetic realisations used when this region's professionals speak into a microphone. As Ureña points out (2014, p. 180), the image of Andalusian as a linguistic variety that lacks prestige broadcast by the media is founded mainly on perceptions and opinions that are not empirically supported. It simplifies a multifaceted dialect, which is associated with pronunciation features that, as far as they are mainly used by middle and low sociolects, do not have a high social esteem (Carbonero, 2003, p. 119): *ceceo*, fricative allophone [ʃ] of /tʃ/, or phonetic realisation [r] for /l/ in word-internal syllable-coda position, to name some examples. Therefore, it is necessary to consider the empirical data to see whether this opinion corresponds with that held by Spanish speakers in general, and Andalusians in particular, with regard to this linguistic modality.

² This is a regional Andalusian news outlet.

³ As Fernández de Molina (2020) shows, social networks are widely used by the audience to express their opinion about pronunciation of Andalusian communicators, both in regional and in Spanish national media.

2.2 Specialised research on linguistic attitudes⁴

Recent research on the linguistic beliefs and attitudes towards the Spanish varieties shows perceptions of the entire Andalusian dialect and some of specific phonetic features.

In the study by Ana María Cestero & Florentino Paredes (2018a, p. 39), which, following PRECAVES XXI methodology, provides a summary of the perceptions of university students from both sides of the Atlantic regarding the Spanish linguistic varieties, finds that Andalusian is among those that rated most poorly. In the same research context, surveys carried out on respondents from the central-northern part of Spain (Cestero & Paredes, 2018b, pp. 79-81) reveal that the Andalusian dialect is among those that are perceived most negatively. In addition, the social status portrayed by people who use it and the psychological qualities attributed to them are rated the least positively.⁵ Beatriz Méndez Guerrero (2018, pp. 108-110) also shows that for Mallorcan university students, the Andalusian Spanish is among the least well-regarded. The use of this variety is also perceived by the participants, much more clearly than other evaluated dialects, as an indication of the speaker having a low level of formal education, income, or a low-status job. Lastly, research by Aitor Yraola (2014), in which he surveys people from the city of Madrid, highlights the combination of positive and negative results. On the one hand, Andalusian is found among the top three regions whose Spanish is liked by the respondents (Yraola, 2014, pp. 583-584), but it also occupies the first place among the regions where the participants do not like the way they speak Spanish (Yraola, 2014, pp. 594-595). Among the reasons given for the latter

⁴ As this article was accepted earlier, we could not include the results of the following monograph on the perception of the Andalusian variety: Santana, J. & Manjón-Cabeza, A. (Coords.) (2021). *Percepción del andaluz culto: creencias y actitudes de jóvenes hispanohablantes y estudiantes de ELE*. *Monográfico Philologia Hispalensis*, 35(1). <https://doi.org/10.12795/PH.2021.v35.i01>

⁵ This does not necessarily mean that the evaluation is negative, since the personal qualities (intelligence, sympathy, closeness, cultural level, or educated character) attributed to Andalusians receive high scores, but rather lower than in other varieties.

assessment are some of the topics mentioned above (for example, they are difficult to understand, they speak poorly and use incorrect Spanish, or they do not pronounce all the letters). According to their answers, the image of the Andalusian linguistic variety outside its borders is fairly negative.

Focusing on the opinion of Andalusian speakers, data from the cities of Almeria (Francisco Torres, 1997, pp. 640-641) and Granada (Manjón-Cabeza, 2018, p. 162) show that they share a positive evaluation of their dialect, especially when they are asked about affective features (pleasant nature, closeness, or simplicity), although without scoring as highly as possible. The perception of the personal qualities of the Andalusian population, as well as of their region and culture, is also rated highly by people from Granada (Manjón-Cabeza, 2018, pp. 168-172). However, this opinion contrasts with the belief that the prestige language model is based on the Castilian linguistic variety (Manjón-Cabeza, 2018, p. 152, 2020, p. 136). In this respect, Cestero & Paredes (2018a, pp. 34-35) state that the Andalusian respondents, in this case from Granada and Seville, are the group of participants of which the smallest proportion believe that their own variety is the best way of speaking. Another negative data point is the connection the surveyed students make between their dialect and the social image of those who use it. In this regard, young people from Granada (Manjón-Cabeza, 2018, p. 167; 2020, 146-147) associate Andalusians with lower levels of income, academic training, and job status than they relate to central-northern Spanish speakers.

The analysis of the linguistic beliefs and attitudes of people from Seville towards their own dialectal variety produces similar results to what has been observed in other Andalusian areas. In a survey carried out in the 1980s (Miguel Roperó & Francisco Javier Pérez, 1998, p. 283), the majority of the respondents, from the city of Seville, associate their vernacular pronunciation with a good and correct way of speaking and, therefore, would not change it outside of Andalusia. At the same time, a large number of respondents believe that the most prestigious language model is that used in Castile. Approximately three decades later, surveys carried out on respondents from the city and the province of Seville (Juana Santana, 2018a) once more show a positive perception of their own variety, especially on affective factors, although not rating as highly as possible on the proposed scale for measuring the participants' judgments. The psychological features attributed to people from the area, their traditions, and the region

in which they live are also valued highly. However, the Castilian dialect continues to take precedence as the prestige language model.

It is worth remembering that the perceptions of university students from Granada (Manjón-Cabeza, 2018, pp. 157-158 and 167; 2020, 142-148) and from Seville (Santana, 2018b, 2020a) towards the Castilian variety also show similar results. Concerning the direct assessment, features related to the cognitive component rate more positively, especially urbanity and clarity of pronunciation. Furthermore, in the indirect evaluation, the central-northern area recordings make Andalusian respondents consider that those speakers have a higher social and economic position.

Attending to specific phonetic features of Andalusian, specialised research also shows very different assessments. In this regard, surveyed people from Madrid (Yraola, 2014, p. 495) point out *ceceo* and *seseo* among the reasons to consider Andalusian as the least appreciated regional dialect in Spain. Participants from Granada (Juan Antonio Moya & Emilio García, 1995, p. 254; García, 1997, p. 530; María Dolores Martínez & Moya, 2000, p. 157), however, evaluate positively *distinción* and *seseo*. The former represents prestige and social status, in relation to the national language model, and the latter is a prestigious phonic realisation regionally (Juan Andrés Villena, 2012, p. 65). Recently, university students from this city have considered the omission of coda consonants in Andalusian Spanish the phonetic feature they like the least (Manjón-Cabeza, 2018, p. 156). If we focus on the western part of Andalusia, there is no unanimous evaluation of *seseo*, *ceceo* and *distinción*. On the one hand, Sevillian university students rate *seseo* both positively and negatively (Santana, 2018a, p. 129). On the other hand, focusing on *ceceo*, subjects from Lepe, Huelva (Brendan Regan, 2019, p. 110), mainly those with higher educational level, “favour *distinción* over *ceceo*”, while *ceceo* is a widely accepted local feature among people from Jerez de la Frontera, Cádiz (Jannis Harjus, 2018, p. 426).

Particularly interesting for our research is the study carried out by Díaz (2002) on journalists from Seville, who had to evaluate certain features of their phonetic realisations by arranging them according to their level of prestige and correctness, as well as distinguishing between those that they use privately and those they maintain in their professional activity. The latter are considered the most prestigious, namely:

elision of word-final /d/, aspiration of /x/ in syllable-onset position, aspiration of coda /s/, *yeísmo*, and *seseo*.

From these studies, it can be deduced that Andalusian Spanish, in general, sparks positive opinions and feelings for the Andalusian respondents. However, some negative stereotypes persist, such as the more rural nature attributed to its speakers, the lack of clarity of their dialectal pronunciation, the belief that people speak better in the north than in the south, and the perception that the Castilian linguistic variety involves a higher social position. We believe that these key aspects could lead Andalusian communicators to abandon their vernacular phonetic realisations when faced with a microphone. If we add to this the underlying debate in the media between a positive and a negative assessment of Andalusian Spanish and its speakers, with some professionals using vernacular features and others adopting central-northern features, we find ourselves continuously fluctuating between defence and rejection of this dialectal pronunciation. This contradiction fully affects Andalusian journalism students, who struggle between valuing or renouncing their regional phones with regard to their future careers. For this reason, using empirical data, we intend to find out how they view their linguistic variety, and whether they have internalised some of the aforementioned negative stereotypes of Andalusian Spanish.

3. Methodology

As mentioned above, to carry out this research we have followed the PRECAVES XXI methodological guidelines (Cestero & Paredes, 2015, 2018b). This project seeks to learn about Spanish speakers' perceptions of the educated varieties of Spanish. Following Francisco Moreno Fernández (2009, p. 79), these varieties are grouped around a series of dialectal linguistic features used primarily by speakers with higher educational attainment level, while acknowledging the existence of internal subdivisions in each of them. There is a total of eight educated varieties: Andalusian, Castilian, Canarian, Caribbean, Andean, Río de la Plata, Mexican, and Chilean. Thus, through an on-line application designed for the project (<https://www.variedadesdelespanol.es>), participants are asked to fill out a questionnaire

where they listen and evaluate recordings containing each of those dialectal modalities. The evaluations of the audios of the Andalusian and the Castilian varieties were the only ones included in this study.

3.1 The questionnaire

First, the participants (listeners) provide their personal and sociogeographical information (country / province they are from, sex, age, educational attainment level, profession, native language, travel habits, among others) that is sociolinguistically relevant. Next, they evaluate the eight varieties of Spanish, which are represented in the questionnaire through sixteen recordings, two for each dialect area, differentiated according to the speech style: an audio close to spontaneous conversation, where a person is talking about traffic in the city, and a read speech about housing. It should be noted that voices for the audios (speakers) include men and women with high level of formal education from each of the considered dialectal areas. Specifically, Andalusian speakers are from Seville and Castilian ones from Madrid. According to this, since voice is considered a variable,⁶ each variety is represented by one man and by one woman, so that some respondents evaluate a male voice and others a female one.

The survey consists of twelve sections with questions that include closed responses (under a semantic gradation scale from 1 to 6) and open-ended comments (which are later coded). First, participants are asked about the variety they consider to be the most prestigious. Then, they have to evaluate each recording directly, through specific questions about the varieties' linguistic aspects (affective and cognitive characteristics perceived,⁷ linguistic features that they have liked or disliked, and what degree of identification they feel between their vernacular dialectal modality and the one evaluated). Lastly, they proceed to the indirect assessment of each variety, which means what perception they have about the person who is speaking and the area they think

⁶ In PRECAVES XXI methodology it is called “*voz evaluada*” ‘evaluated voice’ (Cestero & Paredes, 2015, p. 664).

⁷ Cestero & Paredes (2015, p. 654) state that these components are necessary for breaking down the beliefs and attitudes towards a linguistic variety.

he/she is from (they are asked to relate each audio to the socioeconomic level and personal qualities that, in their opinion, the speaker is supposed to have, and to identify the evaluated voice's dialectal origin, whose region and culture they will have to assess as well). For reasons of space, in this study we only deal with the direct evaluation of the Andalusian and the Castilian varieties, so we break down that part of the survey in more detail.⁸

The characteristics of the affective and cognitive components, which are interspersed in the survey to avoid automatic answers, are presented in the form of closed responses. Specifically, the listener has to choose between pairs of antonymic adjectives, arranged on a scale of 1 (most negative) to 6 (most positive).⁹ There are six pairs for affective parameter: *desagradable / agradable* 'unpleasant / pleasant', *complicada / simple* 'complicated / simple', *distante / cercana* 'distant / close', *dura / blanda* 'hard / soft', *aburrida / divertida* 'boring / fun', and *fea / bonita* 'ugly / beautiful'; and five pairs for the cognitive parameter: *áspera / suave* 'rough / soft', *monótona / variada* 'monotonous / varied', *rural / urbana* 'rural / urban', *lenta / rápida* 'slow / fast', and *confusa / clara* 'confusing / clear'.¹⁰ Next, the respondents are asked to indicate the linguistic features of the recording that they like (positively evaluated) and those that they do not like (negatively evaluated). So, in this case, we obtain open ended comments that are codified on these criteria, based on PRECAVES XXI guidelines: phonic, grammatical, lexical, and pragmatic-discursive features; other aspects that do not fit in the previous categories; no phenomenon; and no answer. And lastly, again in the form of closed responses, there are some questions to examine to what extent the listeners identify (or not) with the variety they are judging. That is, whether or not they consider it to be the same or similar to their vernacular. The proposed scale ranges from 1 (completely different) to 6 (totally identical).

⁸ For further information see Cestero and Paredes (2015, 2018b).

⁹ Gradation of each pair of characteristics is represented by these six steps: 1. extremely, 2. enough, 3. slightly + negative feature (e.g., unpleasant); 4. slightly, 5. enough, 6. extremely + positive feature (e.g., pleasant).

¹⁰ Henceforth we use the English translations.

3.2 The sample

To carry out this research, the questionnaire described above was filled out by 159 students of the degree in Journalism and the double degree in Journalism and Audiovisual Communication of the University of Seville during the academic years 2017-2018 and 2018-2019.¹¹

Regarding the respondents' characteristics (Table 1), all of them were from Western Andalusia, specifically from the provinces of Seville (105), Cádiz (29), and Huelva (25). As said above, the voices that were recorded to represent the Andalusian linguistic variety in the questionnaire were those of a man and woman from Seville. For this reason, we consider that the geographic origin of the listeners is an interesting variable, especially with regard to the identification and perception of their own vernacular. We are starting from the hypothesis that Sevillian participants could identify their local linguistic modality more easily and, furthermore, that they might show more positive evaluations, mainly in affective characteristics.

The participants were divided into two categories according to year of study: those who were enrolled in the first or second year of their degree (99), and those who were in the third or fourth year (60). The first group consisted mainly of 84 Journalism students who had recently enrolled at the university and of 15 second year students from the double degree. The second was comprised of 60 individuals, mainly in their fourth year at university, all of them from the Journalism degree. We are starting from the hypothesis that the perceptions towards Hispanic varieties may have changed between the first two years of their university degree and their third, and, especially, fourth and final year, at which point they have already acquired most of their specialised

¹¹ Most first- and second-year students completed the questionnaire during a practice session for one of their Spanish language subjects. Some third- and fourth-year students did the same, although most of the participants in this category were recruited from two sessions of other subjects. Only a small percentage of students had to fill out the questionnaire at home due to problems with the internet connection during the practical workshop in the classroom.

knowledge and reached a higher level of awareness of what their future career in Journalism entails.

In addition, the listeners were also divided by sex and age. In the case of sex, the questionnaires were filled out by 72 men and 87 women. In the case of age, the listeners were divided into two categories: under 20 years old, with 90 students, and 20-34 years old, with 69 students. Nevertheless, most of the time this factor coincides with the division between first- and second-year students and those in the final two years of their degree. We believe that academic stage is more relevant to differences in perception. Therefore, while age was originally considered, it was removed in the end.

In regard to recordings (Table 1), we selected four audios by each questionnaire: two of the Andalusian variety and two of the Castilian variety. Each of those dialectal varieties included two speech styles: spontaneous and read. So, as we handled 159 questionnaires, there were 636 audios evaluated: 318 of each variety and 318 of each speech style. Apart from that, 78 participants fulfilled the questionnaire listening to the version with the male voices (312 audios) and 81 students listened to the version with the female voices (324 audios).

Table 1. The sample

Respondents	Province they are from	Seville	105
		Cadiz	29
		Huelva	25
	Academic stage	First two years	99
		Last two years	60
	Sex	Men	72
Women		87	
Audios	Variety	Andalusian	318
		Castilian	318
	Speech style	Spontaneous	318
		Read	318
	Voice	Male	312
		Female	324

As the statistical significance of the results allows, we will link the dependent variables (prestige linguistic model, identification of the varieties, affective parameters,

and cognitive features)¹² to the independent variables related to the respondents' or listeners' characteristics (province, academic stage, and sex) and related to the audios or speakers (variety, speech style, and voice). For quantitative data processing, we have used the IBM SPSS 26 programme. Specifically, to determine whether there was any prestige language model, in the identification of the dialectal varieties, and for the evaluation of linguistic features, we used absolute numbers and percentages. In the comparison of the affective and cognitive components' averages with the independent variables, we calculated p-values with the ANOVA test. Results were considered significant when $p < 0.05$. Due to a lack of space, only the most relevant data for this study will be available in table form.

4. Beliefs and attitudes of Andalusian journalism students

Bellow, we examine whether the participants identify any prestige language model in Spanish, and what perceptions they have of the Andalusian and Castilian linguistic varieties.

4.1 Where is the best Spanish spoken?

The first unknown that we are considering is whether the future journalists start out with a hierarchical view of the Spanish dialects. That is to say, whether they believe that Spanish is better or worse in certain areas than in others, or whether they are starting out with a perspective of solidarity, according to which the linguistic differences do not affect the dialects' worth.

Table 2. Prestige linguistic model

Linguistic variety	n	%
Castilian	101	63.5
Andalusian	32	20.1
Spain	7	4.4

¹² Due to the great variety of comments obtained for positively and negatively evaluated linguistic features, many of them with few responses among the students surveyed, we could not compare this data with the selected independent variables.

Latin America	1	0.6
Canarian	1	0.6
None	16	10.1
No answer	1	0.6
Total	159	100

The results in Table 2 strongly suggest that our respondents mainly believed that there is a prestige language model that prevails over the other ways of speaking Spanish (142/159, 89.3%). Therefore, the majority of participants considered that dialectal variation is associated with a hierarchical perspective. The belief that no variety is better than any other was held by a small minority of the participants (16/159, 10.1%). Most of the surveyed students identified the Castilian linguistic variety as the most prestigious language model. Additionally, it is particularly interesting that the second-place option, although a considerable way behind the first, was their own dialect, Andalusian.

On this occasion, the independent variables categorising the students surveyed did not show statistically significant results.

4.2 Direct assessment of Andalusian and Castilian linguistic varieties

The next objective of our analysis focuses on finding out this group's opinions of the two linguistic modalities that are presented as prestige models among the respondents, primarily Castilian Spanish and, in second place, Andalusian Spanish. In particular, we explore affective and cognitive aspects, and, subsequently, we review their opinions of specific linguistic features of these two dialects. For this, we only select those recordings that the surveyed students correctly associated with the corresponding variety. Table 3 presents the results of the identification for Andalusian and Castilian Spanish.

Table 3. Linguistic varieties identification

Identification	Andalusian		Castilian	
	n	%	n	%
Exact	236	74.2	228	71.7
Wrong	26	8.2	12	3.8
Generic*	53	16.7	73	22.9
No answer	3	0.9	5	1.6

*Responses as “*España*” (‘Spain,’) “*español*” or “*española*” (‘Spanish’)

It is worth noting that most of the surveyed students identified both varieties quite clearly. The exact identification of the Castilian variety had a high success rate, only slightly lower than that of participants' own variety. Furthermore, we consider it relevant to point out that there were significantly more errors when recognising Andalusian. The reason for the highly successful exact identification of Castilian Spanish may be because this dialectal modality is constantly in focus for our respondents, since it is often considered the prestige language model, because of its continuous presence in the media, and because it is the model they use as a reference when considering which linguistic features they prefer in their professional future in case they move away from their vernacular. In turn, we believe that the increased rate of errors when recognising Andalusian may be due to internal variation within this dialect, where there can be differentiating features from one speaker to another, even within Western Andalusia, where the participants are from, or within a single province.

For further analyses, only the 464 evaluations that correctly identified the speakers' variety (Andalusian or Castilian) were selected (see Table 3), and they were distributed according to the independent variables, as shown in Table 4:

Table 4. Selected evaluations and independent variables

Respondents	Province they are from	Seville	315
		Cadiz	86
		Huelva	63
	Academic stage	First two years	275
		Last two years	189
	Sex	Men	210
Women		254	
Audios	Variety	Andalusian	236
		Castilian	228
	Speech style	Spontaneous	261
		Read	203
	Voice	Male	242
		Female	222

4.2.1 Affective and cognitive components

The average scores obtained by the two studied linguistic varieties are largely similar, as shown in Table 5, in all cases with positive ratings.

Table 5. Direct assessment averages

Averages	Andalusian	Castilian
General*	4.0	3.8
Affective component	4.1	3.5
Cognitive component	3.8	4.0

*Average between affective and cognitive parameters.

The most notable data is the higher affective component average that the Andalusian journalism students show towards their own dialectal variety. This was influenced by the respondents' sex (Table 6), the speakers' speech style (Table 7), and the speakers' voice (Table 8). First, women showed greater levels of affectivity towards their own dialectal variety. Secondly, for the Andalusian linguistic modality, perceptions of spontaneous speech were more positive than those of read speech. Third, for the Andalusian variety, the female voices received higher ratings than the male ones, but for Castilian, results were opposite, with male voices receiving higher ratings.

Table 6. Direct assessment averages by respondents' sex

Averages	Andalusian			Castilian		
	Men	Women	p-value	Men	Women	p-value
Affective component	4.0	4.2	0.016	3.4	3.5	0.367
Cognitive component	3.7	3.8	0,512	4.0	4.0	0.472

Table 7. Direct assessment averages by speech style

Averages	Andalusian			Castilian		
	Spontaneous	Read	p-value	Spontaneous	Read	p-value
Affective component	4.3	3.8	0.002	3.5	3.3	0.755
Cognitive component	3.9	3.6	0.773	4.1	3.8	0.237

Table 8. Direct assessment averages by speakers' voice

Averages	Andalusian			Castilian		
	Male	Female	p-value	Male	Female	p-value
Affective component	3.9	4.3	0.034	3.7	3.2	0.004
Cognitive component	3.6	4.0	0.029	4.2	3.7	0.000

In general terms, the affective component ratings of the two selected linguistic varieties were fairly positive, as seen in Table 9, with the exception of the boring/funny parameter, in which the respondents perceived that Castilian Spanish was rather boring. Furthermore, the evaluation of the Andalusian variety as very close to the respondents' pronunciation stands out.

Table 9. Affective characteristics

	Andalusian	Castilian	p-value
Unpleasant-pleasant	4.1	4.1	0.045
Complicated-simple	4.3	4.2	0.151
Distant-close	4.8	3.1	0.000
Hard-soft	3.7	3.4	0.007
Boring-funny	3.6	2.2	0.000
Ugly-beautiful	3.9	3.7	0.053

The speech style influenced the participants' perceptions (Table 10), indicating that the spontaneous speech audios in the Andalusian variety were perceived as more pleasant, closer to the listeners' pronunciation, softer, funnier, and more beautiful than those of read speech. The spontaneous speech in the Castilian variety was also judged as more beautiful. Furthermore, the female voice received more positive evaluations than the male one in the Andalusian variety (Table 11): simpler, softer, and more beautiful. Conversely, the male voice received better ratings in the Castilian variety: more pleasant, funnier, and more beautiful.

Table 10. Affective characteristics by speech style

	Andalusian			Castilian		
	Spontaneous	Read	p-value	Spontaneous	Read	p-value
Unpleasant-pleasant	4.3	3.8	0.018	4.3	3.8	0.111
Complicated-simple	4.2	4.3	0.406	4.2	4.2	0.488
Distant-close	5.0	4.4	0.008	3.2	3.1	0.997
Hard-soft	3.9	3.4	0.009	3.5	3.2	0.242
Boring-funny	4.0	2.9	0.000	2.2	2.3	0.134
Ugly-beautiful	4.2	3.6	0.033	3.8	3.6	0.004

Table 11. Affective characteristics by speakers' voice

	Andalusian			Castilian		
	Male	Female	p-value	Male	Female	p-value
Unpleasant-pleasant	3.8	4.3	0.100	4.5	3.6	0.000
Complicated-simple	4.0	4.5	0.017	4.2	4.2	0.721
Distant-close	4.7	4.8	0.771	3.3	3.0	0.620
Hard-soft	3.2	4.2	0.000	3.4	3.3	0.572
Boring-funny	3.5	3.6	0.429	2.5	2.0	0.000
Ugly-beautiful	3.7	4.2	0.007	4.2	3.2	0.000

As indicated in Table 12, there were two cognitive characteristics for which Andalusian had a more positive rating: variety and speed. In this respect, the Castilian Spanish especially stands out for its monotony, which rated rather lower than the cognitive average (Table 5). There were two parameters more favourable for the Castilian variety: urbanity and clarity.

Table 12. Cognitive characteristics

	Andalusian	Castilian	p-value
Rough-soft	3.5	3.5	0.010
Monotonous-varied	3.6	2.8	0.000
Rural-urban	3.7	5.1	0.000
Slow-fast	3.8	3.3	0.000
Confusing-clear	4.3	5.3	0.000

The spontaneous speech (Table 13) made participants think that Andalusian Spanish was rather more varied and made them perceive Castilian Spanish as more urban. Softness rated higher for the Andalusian variety when evaluating a female voice (Table 14), while the male voice had a positive impact on the rating of the Castilian variety with regard to most of the cognitive characteristics: variety, urbanity, speed, and clarity.

Table 13. Cognitive characteristics by speech style

	Andalusian			Castilian		
	Spontaneous	Read	p-value	Spontaneous	Read	p-value
Rough-soft	3.6	3.4	0.077	3.7	3.2	0.059
Monotonous-varied	4.0	3.1	0.000	2.9	2.6	0.629
Rural-urban	3.7	3.7	0.691	5.4	4.8	0.008
Slow-fast	3.9	3.8	0.816	3.1	3.5	0.110
Confusing-clear	5.2	5.1	0.426	5.3	5.2	0.374

Table 14. Cognitive characteristics by speakers' voice

	Andalusian			Castilian		
	Male	Female	p-value	Male	Female	p-value
Rough-soft	3.0	4.1	0.000	3.6	3.3	0.236
Monotonous-varied	3.4	3.8	0.163	3.2	2.3	0.000
Rural-urban	3.5	3.9	0.056	5.4	4.8	0.001
Slow-fast	4.0	3.6	0.074	3.5	3.0	0.000
Confusing-clear	5.3	5.1	0.205	5.5	5.0	0.000

Thus, according to the data presented above, the most influential variables on participants' direct assessments were speech style (spontaneous or read) and speakers' voice (male or female).

4.2.2 Linguistic features

This section focuses on those specific features of the Andalusian and Castilian voices evaluated that triggered positive or negative linguistic attitudes.

Table 15 demonstrates that pronunciation received the greatest number of comments.

This is not unusual, as it is the most significant aspect that characterises a dialectal

variety, and, furthermore, the phonetic domain is what most differentiates Andalusian and Castilian Spanish.¹³

Table 15. Positively and negatively evaluated linguistic features

Features	Positive		Negative	
	Andalusian	Castilian	Andalusian	Castilian
Phonic	119	157	110	113
Grammatical	1	0	0	0
Lexical	2	0	1	0
Pragmatic-discursive	0	3	23	9
Others	70	29	17	44
None	23	13	52	38
No answer	21	26	33	24

On the phonic level, both for the positive and for the negative evaluations, we were able to divide the responses obtained into two categories: generic and specific features. In addition, the obtained results allow new groupings to be made, as seen in Table 16.

Table 16. Positively and negatively evaluated phonic features

Features	Positive		Negative	
	Andalusian	Castilian	Andalusian	Castilian
Accent	17	4	0	0
Clarity	9	80	10	0
Intonation	13	3	11	0
Good pronunciation	4	21	0	0
Sonority / rhythm	7	0	0	0
Speed	3	9	20	18
Roughness / softness	2	4	3	5
Variety	2	0	0	0
Monotony	0	0	10	42
Vocalisation	0	3	4	0
Pronunciation of all sounds	0	5	0	0
Eating letters / syllables	0	0	7	0

¹³ For Andalusian voices, as there is very much phonic variation within the variety, it is important to highlight that the speakers' pronunciation, both that of the man and of the woman, included all these features: *seseo* and dento-interdental realisation [θ] (participants identified the latter as *distinción*), aspiration and retention of coda /s/ (mainly the former), aspiration of syllable-onset /x/, affricative allophone [tʃ] for /tʃ/, and omission as well as retention of some syllable-coda consonants, such as /r/ and /d/.

Specific	Lack of naturalness	0	0	6	0
	Instability	0	0	1	0
	Others	0	3	4	5
	Coda /s/	20	16	12	32
	<i>Seseo</i>	15	0	7	0
	<i>Distinción</i> *	5	3	3	1
	Mixing <i>seseo</i> and <i>distinción</i>	0	0	4	0
	Consonant aspiration	9	0	0	0
	Syllable-onset /x/	5	3	2	3
	Syllable-onset /tʃ/	4	0	5	0
	Intervocalic /d/	0	1	0	3
	Others	4	2	1	4

*This is the way the respondents identify the dento-interdental phonic realisation [θ].

Beginning with the features that were deemed favourable by the respondents, a series of aspects that stood out for one of the two linguistic varieties can be distinguished. With regard to the Andalusian variety, the surveyed students overwhelmingly judged the accent positively, with all its particularities, along with the tone or intonation and the sonority or rhythm. Meanwhile, if we consider specific features, *seseo* had a significant place among those who perceived it to be an aspect worthy of approval. In fact, it took second place, behind pronouncing coda /s/. The participants evaluated *seseo* more positively than Andalusian *distinción*. Although with few responses, the latter received more positive assessments than it did in Castilian pronunciation. The fricative allophone [ʃ] for /tʃ/ in Andalusian Spanish was evaluated positively by a few respondents.

Concerning the Castilian linguistic variety, two phonic features that are particularly significant for our research stand out: clarity and good pronunciation. Furthermore, this dialect was associated with better articulation and pronunciation of all the sounds.

Lastly, there are conflicting features in both linguistic varieties: although the aspiration of coda /s/ was positively evaluated in the Andalusian variety, it is precisely the opposite, its retention, which received praise in the Castilian variety. Then, regarding this phonic feature, the participants combine praise for both their allophonic realisations and those of the central-northern variety in their comments. Furthermore, as already inferred from the breakdown of the cognitive characteristics (Table 12), while the speed of the speech was highlighted for Andalusian Spanish, for Castilian Spanish the calm, paused, and slow tone was valued.

With regard to the negatively evaluated pronunciation features, the respondents detected more diversity in the Andalusian linguistic variety (17 different comments) than in the Castilian (9 different comments). In the latter, there was a greater level of similarity between the students' responses. Furthermore, a large part of the phenomena, both generic and specific, that had been positively assessed, coincide with those that were the subject of reproach: speed, vocalisation, roughness/softness, coda /s/, syllable-onset /x/, and intervocalic /d/. Additionally, the same feature was often evaluated both positively and negatively in Andalusian Spanish: intonation, the allophone [j] of /t/, *seseo*, *ceceo* and *distinción*. Apart from that, the alternation between *seseo* and *distinción* in the Andalusian voices received negative ratings, because it was judged as lack of naturalness or a sensation of instability. However, this rejection was not very generalised, as few such responses were reported.

The most criticised phonic feature of the Andalusian linguistic variety was the speed of diction, although the participants showed opposing perceptions, as for some of them, the pronunciation was very fast, and for others, it was very slow. Therefore, there is no consensus regarding this criterion. Clarity was the most highly valued aspect of the Castilian variety, and lack of clarity was attributed to the Andalusian variety as a flaw. The elision of sounds was also negatively assessed in the latter.

In Castilian Spanish, monotony stands out as the most criticised feature among our participants, as already seen in the cognitive characteristics (Table 12). However, this aspect was also attributed to the Andalusian audios, although to a lesser extent. The slowness of the Castilian Spanish received negative comments as well. Nevertheless, this same calm nature had also been positively assessed, with a greater percentage, to which the negative criticism of the speed of the Andalusian audios must be added. Therefore, what is positively evaluated by some respondents is negatively evaluated by others. Lastly, the coda /s/ was once again the centre of attention for the students, in relation to its aspiration in the Andalusian variety and its retention in the Castilian variety, but now as negatively evaluated allophonic variants.

The second noteworthy category with regard to the number of responses obtained is that which covers those features that did not enter the distribution on a linguistic level (labelled "Others" in Table 15). As seen in Table 17, there was little consistency in the qualities attributed to one linguistic variety or another in general.

Table 17. Other positively and negatively evaluated features

	Features	Andalusian	Castilian
Positive	Closeness	39	0
	Pleasant	6	4
	Simplicity	4	0
	Naturalness	3	0
	Fun / humour	2	0
	Correctness	0	6
	Urbanity	0	2
	Others	16	17
Negative	Boringness	0	12
	Distance	0	6
	Correctness	0	3
	Seriousness	0	2
	Ugliness	0	2
	Dryness	0	2
	Unrefined	2	0
	Others	15	17

Concerning the features that received positive opinions, the most noteworthy in Andalusian variety was closeness. On the qualities that obtained more than one response, pleasantness, simplicity, naturalness, and fun/humour were some of the much less prominent ones. The most prominent aspect of the Castilian linguistic variety, which shows a clear difference compared to the Andalusian variety, was its association with correctness and perfection. Other qualities attributed to this variety with more than one answer were pleasantness and urbanity.

With regard to negative ratings, there was little consistency between the responses given for one linguistic variety or another. For the Andalusian variety, there were only a couple of answers attributing the same quality to the audio, lack of refinement, which recalls the rurality that was associated with it in the cognitive parameters (Table 12). Conversely, boringness and distance were the most criticised aspects of the Castilian variety. Lastly, we would like to point out that there were respondents who found the correctness of Castilian Spanish to be a factor worthy of reproach, a feature which, as we have already stated, was also recorded among the praised characteristics. Specifically, they alluded to excessive correctness, which for one student rendered it a very refined pronunciation.

5. Discussion

The first result worth highlighting deals with the hierarchical consideration of the varieties of Spanish and the identification of Castilian Spanish as the national prestige language model. Both are similar results to those obtained in research carried out previously, also using PRECAVES XXI methodology, but with university students from degrees in Spanish language from Andalusia (Manjón-Cabeza, 2018, p. 152 and 2020, p.136; Santana, 2018a, pp. 121-122) and from the central-northern part of Spain (Cestero & Paredes, 2018b, pp. 54-55; Paredes & Cestero, 2018, pp. 95-96; Méndez Guerrero, 2018, pp. 94-96). From this data, it can be stated that these perceptions are quite generalised among young people with some specialised knowledge about Spanish dialects. In addition, the struggle between a positive evaluation of their own dialect and the perception of the Castilian variety as the most prestigious language model continues to persist among Andalusians (Roperó & Pérez, 1998; Manjón-Cabeza, 2018, 2020; Santana, 2018a, 2018b, 2020a).

It was also noteworthy that the affective component rated higher when the listeners evaluated Andalusian voices, a recurring aspect in similar research (Manjón-Cabeza, 2018, p. 162; Santana, 2018a, p. 128). Indeed, it seems normal to show more appreciation towards what you perceive as your own variety. Additionally, the influence of the speech style and evaluated voice variables can also be seen in previous research. Specifically, when evaluating the Andalusian variety, our respondents perceived the read speech as more boring and more monotonous, and the audios with a female voice usually received better scores than those with a male voice. This data is consistent with a study of university students from Granada (Manjón-Cabeza 2018, pp. 164-166). We have observed some similar patterns in the perceptions of young Andalusians, although these results should be tested in further research.

Furthermore, it is relevant to note that some stereotypes, related to the *mitos* ('myths') pointed out by Carbonero (2001, pp. 18-19) and to the clichés observed by Ureña (2014, p.172), could be detected among the participants' evaluations. First, regarding affective characteristics, the Andalusian variety was perceived as much funnier than Castilian Spanish. Apart from that, a few participants highlighted humour or fun when they were evaluating the phonic features of Andalusian voices. These

results can be related to the myth of the Andalusian humour, although not in a prominent manner. Second, cognitive parameters urbanity and clarity rated higher when evaluating Castilian Spanish, similar to Majón-Cabeza's findings (2018, pp. 157-158 and p. 167; 2020, 142-143 and 146-148). Then, if we understand that the former item has positive connotations, such as advancement or modernity, and, therefore, rurality is associated with being backwards or outdated, we could perceive a reflection of the myth of vulgarity. Third, the Castilian variety was considered clearer. From this result it cannot be inferred that Andalusian is a dialectal modality with which the speaker cannot communicate effectively, as the ratings were higher than average for the cognitive component (Table 5); but in relative terms, central-northern pronunciation was supposed to give the message with greater clarity. These results might connect our data to the myth of unintelligibility. Moreover, some participants associated Castilian Spanish with better articulation and pronunciation of all the sounds, and Andalusian Spanish with the elision of sounds. These data reflect the myth of spelling: Andalusian people *se comen las letras* 'eat the letters'.

Finally, the conflicting comments that some Andalusian phonic features received (phonic realisation [j] of /t/, *seseo*, *ceceo* and *distinción*), both positively and negatively evaluated, may be based on their sociolinguistic distribution. With regard to the fricative allophone [j], Carbonero (2003, p. 116) notes that this feature is evaluated differently depending on the area: positively in places as Jerez de la Frontera and negatively in cities like Huelva. Nevertheless, as this scholar shows, it is not a widely accepted phenomenon. Even so, this is a feature of pronunciation often used to identify Andalusian speakers in the media, although especially in the parodies of the accent or in humorous contexts. This fluctuation may explain the opposing assessments obtained in our research: despite being a poorly rated phonetic realisation, it often appears as a hallmark of the Andalusian linguistic variety. The positive and negative perceptions of *seseo*, *ceceo* and *distinción* might be related to the processes of convergence to the central-northern norm that have been detected in different Andalusian cities for years, such as Málaga (Villena, 2012; Villena & Matilde Vida, 2017), Granada (Moya, 2018a, 2018b), Seville (Santana, 2016, 2016-2017, 2017, 2020b, 2022), Huelva (Regan, 2017a,

2017b), and maybe Jerez de la Frontera (Lorenzo J. García-Amaya, 2008).¹⁴ That is to say, *seseo* and *ceceo* have been progressively replaced by *distinción*, which is associated with the central-northern linguistic pattern. In general, this change is usually led by people with a higher level of formal education and, at times, also by women. Nevertheless, there are cities, such as Seville, where the *seseante* vernacular norm continues to have a significant presence (Santana, 2016-2017, pp. 153-154; 2020b, p. 179; 2022, p. 126). Therefore, our results show this process of change at a point in which both *seseo* and *distinción* receive, at the same time, praise and reproach. On the one hand, *seseo* is a southern prestige pronunciation pattern (Villena, 2012, p. 65), and, on the other, *distinción* is associated with Castilian Spanish, which was reported as the main linguistic reference for many of our respondents. However, at the same time, *seseo* could be considered a prominent feature of their vernacular, which the participants might wish to distance themselves from, and *distinción*, in turn, could mean otherness and, therefore, might trigger feelings of rejection. Among the surveyed students, there were those who use *seseo*, others who use *ceceo*, and others who use *distinción*, which may have accounted for the response provided, and which would enable us to understand this difference of criteria. In addition, the mixture of *seseo* and *distinción* in Andalusian speakers was negatively evaluated, although recent research has proven that this is a fairly common feature in the city of Seville (Santana, 2016-2017, pp. 163-166; 2020b, p. 182; 2022, p. 127).

6. Conclusions

The main results of this research suggest that the Andalusian journalism students surveyed (from Seville, Cádiz, and Huelva) are sustaining an underlying conflict between their vernacular pronunciation, with fluctuations between positive assessments and the transmission of negative clichés, and the central-northern norm, also including positive and negative perceptions. This debate may transfer to their future profession,

¹⁴ In contrast to the findings of Harjius (2018) that *ceceo* is a rather widespread local feature.

which means that we might be facing the continuity of the plurality of phonetic realisations that we currently encounter in the Andalusian media.

According to this general data, most of the participants identified the Castilian linguistic variety as the prestige language model. But, at the same time, the evaluation of the Andalusian variety as a good reference also occupied a moderate place. So, the journalism students do not definitively reject their vernacular. Furthermore, although the affective characteristics of the Andalusian variety rated high overall, the breakdown of the affective and cognitive parameters showed that some of the negative stereotypes often broadcast in the media persist in a moderate manner: it was perceived as funnier, more rural, and more confusing than Castilian Spanish. This could therefore mean that using central-northern pronunciation might be perceived as a type of communication that is more serious, more closely associated with modernity and progress, and, above all, clearer.

In regard to the evaluation of the specific linguistic aspects, similar fluctuations were observed. It must be highlighted that the most praiseworthy generic aspect for Andalusian Spanish was the accent as a whole, which seems positive. However, Castilian pronunciation was better evaluated in a fundamental aspect in the sphere of the media, clarity, which may be related to lack of ambiguity in communication. Among the specific features, the following fluctuating perceptions were registered as well. Concerning coda /s/, the phonic phenomenon that the students most identified as a differentiator of the two linguistic varieties evaluated, both coda /s/ aspiration in Andalusian Spanish, as well as its retention in Castilian Spanish, were the subject of praise and criticism. Additionally, our survey highlighted the instability in the assessment of other typical features of Andalusian Spanish, such as the fricative allophone [j] for /t/ or *seseo*. With regard to the latter, we may suggest that the process of change towards divergence with the dento-interdental realisation [θ], characteristic of the central-northern norm, is reflected in the combination of positive and negative evaluations that both pronunciation alternatives received. The students did not opt fully for one or the other, although it is worth highlighting that *seseo* received more positive than negative responses. Finally, beyond the phonic domain, the positive assessments regarding closeness, simplicity, and naturalness, stand out for the Andalusian linguistic variety, while for the Castilian variety, although less well-represented, there appears to

be an association with correctness and perfection. These dogmatic opinions continue to associate the central-northern linguistic norm with the national prestige language model that, as a result, is better socially perceived than the Andalusian variety, and which, perhaps, might lead these journalism students to choose it if working in broadcast media in the future.

Regarding the independent variables related to the respondents' characteristics, we did not find any significant data. Otherwise, some influences were identified depending on the evaluated audios. In particular, for the Andalusian variety, recordings with spontaneous speech usually received more positive assessments. In this regard, it is worth considering that read speech can be perceived as less natural than spontaneous speech, an aspect that could be judged more negatively by the surveyed students. Conversely, female voice often rated higher when evaluating the Andalusian variety, and male voice usually received better ratings when evaluating the Castilian variety. Perhaps there is a latent belief among Andalusian speakers that the prestigious idiomatic model is mainly represented by men with a central-northern pronunciation. However, we need further data to test this hypothesis.

The findings obtained in this research should be supplemented by further studies that probe the assessment made by these students of personal qualities inferred from the evaluated voices, as well as the perception of the region and culture to which the voices belong. New data would help to bring more clarity to the presence of the Andalusian variety in the media, which, at this point in time, continues to be in a somewhat unstable situation, and continues to be subject to criticism by media professionals, linguists, and the public in general.

Funding

This research belongs to the project *Agenda 2050. El español de Sevilla y Las Palmas de Gran Canaria: procesos de variación y cambio espaciales y sociales 'Agenda 2050. The Spanish of Seville and Las Palmas de Gran Canaria: processes of spatial and social variation and change'* (Ref. PID2019-104982GB-C54/AEI/10.13039/501100011033), funded by the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación

(España) ('Ministry of Science and Innovation, Spain') and the Agencia Estatal de Investigación ('State Investigation Agency').

References

- Agencias / Madrid (11 January 2009). Tiene un acento que parece un chiste. *Diario de Sevilla*. https://www.diariodesevilla.es/sociedad/acento-parece-chiste_0_222277811.html/
- Aguayo, M. (31 November 2009). Defensa del habla andaluza. *Diario de Córdoba*. https://www.diariocordoba.com/noticias/opinion/defensa-habla-andaluza_525397.html/
- Allas, J. M.^a & Díaz, L. C. (Coords.). (2004). *Libro de estilo. Canal Sur Televisión y Canal 2 Andalucía*. RTVA.
- Cano, R. (2009). Lengua e identidad en Andalucía: visión desde la historia. In A. Narbona (Coord.), *La identidad lingüística de Andalucía* (pp. 67-131). Centro de Estudios Andaluces - Consejería de la Presidencia (Junta de Andalucía).
- Cantero, V. (2013). Hacia una propuesta curricular para la enseñanza del andaluz en la ESO. In P. Carbonero (Dir.) & R. Guillén & R. Millán (Eds.), *Estudios descriptivos y aplicados sobre el andaluz. Sociolingüística Andaluza*, 16 (pp. 313-331). Publicaciones de la Universidad de Sevilla.
- Caraballo, J. (4 September 2014). Andaluz y culto, raro raro... *El Confidencial*. https://blogs.elconfidencial.com/espana/matacan/2014-09-04/andaluz-y-culto-raro-raro_185352/
- Caraballo, J. (26 April 2020). El andaluz y el acento de la ministra. *El Confidencial*. https://blogs.elconfidencial.com/espana/matacan/2020-04-26/andaluz-acento-ministra-maria-jesus-montero_2566696/
- Carbonero, P. (6 December 1999). La visión española del habla andaluza. *Diario de Sevilla*.
- Carbonero, P. (2001). Habla andaluza, identidad cultural y medios de comunicación. In M.^a A. Castillo & J. M. García (Eds.), *Las hablas andaluzas: problemas y perspectivas* (pp. 13-23). Signatura Ediciones.

- Carbonero, P. (2003). Norma culta y actitudes lingüísticas de los andaluces. In *Estudios de sociolingüística andaluza* (pp. 109-120). Secretariado de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Sevilla.
- Carbonero, P. (2007). Formas de pronunciación en Andalucía: modelos de referencia y evaluación sociolingüística. In P. Carbonero (Dir.) & J. Santana (Ed.), *Estudios dedicados al profesor Miguel Ropero. Sociolingüística Andaluza, 15* (pp. 121-132). Publicaciones de la Universidad de Sevilla.
- Carrascosa, J. L. (1997). El habla en Canal Sur Satélite (radio y televisión). In A. Narbona & M. Ropero (Eds.), *El habla andaluza* (pp. 421-432). Sevilla: Ayuntamiento de Sevilla - Universidad de Sevilla.
- Carrascosa, J. L. (2002). El habla en los informativos andaluces de radio y televisión y en el cine. In J. de las Heras, P. Carbonero, A. Costa, M. Martín & V. Torrejón (Eds.), *Modalidad lingüística andaluza, medios de comunicación y aula* (pp. 38-45). J. Carrasco.
- Cestero, A. M.^a & Paredes, F. (2015). Creencias y actitudes hacia las variedades del español en el siglo XXI: avance de un proyecto de investigación. In J. L. Demerval da Hora & R. M. Lucena (Eds.), *ALFAL 50 anos: contribuições para os estudos linguísticos e filológicos* (pp. 652-683). Ideia.
- Cestero, A. M.^a & Paredes, F. (2018a). Creencias y actitudes hacia las variedades cultas del español actual: el proyecto PRECAVES XXI. *Percepción de las variedades cultas del español: creencias y actitudes de jóvenes universitarios hispanohablantes. Monográfico Boletín de Filología de la Universidad de Chile*, 53(2), 11-43.
<https://boletinfilologia.uchile.cl/index.php/BDF/article/view/51940/54405/>
- Cestero, A. M.^a & Paredes, F. (2018b). Creencias y actitudes de los jóvenes universitarios del centro-norte de España hacia las variedades cultas del español. *Percepción de las variedades cultas del español: creencias y actitudes de jóvenes universitarios hispanohablantes. Monográfico Boletín de Filología de la Universidad de Chile*, 53(2), 45-86.
<https://boletinfilologia.uchile.cl/index.php/BDF/article/view/51941/54406/>
- Díaz, L. C. (2002). Creencias y actitudes sobre usos fónicos innovadores del andaluz en los periodistas sevillanos de Canal Sur Televisión. *TonosDigital (Revista*

- Electrónica de Estudios Filológicos*), 3.
<https://www.um.es/tonosdigital/znum3/estudios/fonosimbolismo.htm/>
- Durán, F. (28 June 2014). El andaluz es la avanzadilla del español del futuro. *Diario de Sevilla*. https://www.diariodesevilla.es/entrevistas/andaluz-avanzadilla-espanol-futuro_0_820417965.html/
- Fernández de Molina, E. (2020). ¿Cómo hablan los presentadores andaluces en television? Percepción de los espectadores y análisis lingüístico de la posible variación (socio)estilística en los medios. *Lingüística en la Red*, XVII(1).
<https://doi.org/10.37536/LINRED.2020.XVII.1>
- García, J. (1997). Valoración subjetiva y planificación lingüística. In A. Narbona & M. Ropero (Eds.), *El habla andaluza* (pp. 515-543). Ayuntamiento de Sevilla - Universidad de Sevilla.
- García-Amaya, L. J. (2008). Variable norms in the production of /θ/ in Jerez de la Frontera, Spain. In J. F. Siegel, T. C. Nagle, A. Lorente-Lapole & J. Auger (Eds.), *Indiana University Working Papers in Linguistics*. VII. *Gender in language: classic questions, new contexts* (pp. 49-71). IULC.
- Harjus, J. (2018). *Sociofonética andaluza y lingüística perceptiva de la variación: el español hablado en Jerez de la Frontera*. Iberoamericana-Vervuert.
- Jiménez, R. (2002). El andaluz en los medios de comunicación: la caricatura lingüística del sur. In J. de las Heras, P. Carbonero, A. Costa, M. Martín & V. Torrejón (Eds.), *Modalidad lingüística andaluza. Medios de comunicación y aula* (pp. 187-194). J. Carrasco.
- León-Castro, M. (2016). La presencia del andaluz en los medios de comunicación. In R. Mancinas (Coord.), *Actas del I Congreso Internacional Comunicación y Pensamiento. Comunicracia y desarrollo social* (pp. 1583-1600). Egregius.
- Manjón-Cabeza, A. (2000). Actitudes de los transmisores del prestigio lingüístico en Toledo: primeros datos. *Docencia e Investigación*, 25, 89-123.
- Manjón-Cabeza, A. (2018). Creencias y actitudes de los jóvenes universitarios granadinos hacia las variedades cultas del español. *Percepción de las variedades cultas del español: creencias y actitudes de jóvenes universitarios hispanohablantes*. *Monográfico Boletín de Filología de la Universidad de Chile*, 53(2), 145-177.

- <https://boletinfilologia.uchile.cl/index.php/BDF/article/view/51944/54409/>
<http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-93032018000200145>
- Manjón-Cabeza, A. (2020). Valoraciones de futuros profesores de español hacia las variedades cultas de su lengua. Datos de Granada. *Estudios de Lingüística de la Universidad de Alicante*, 34, 131-152.
https://rua.ua.es/dspace/bitstream/10045/108314/1/ELUA_34_06.pdf
<https://doi.org/10.14198/ELUA2020.34.6>
- Martínez, M.^a D. & Moya, J. A. (2000). Reacciones actitudinales hacia la variación dialectal en hablantes granadinos. *Lingüística Española Actual*, 22(2), 137-160.
- Méndez, E. (1999). La norma idiomática del español: visión histórica. *Philologia Hispalensis*, 13, 109-132.
- Méndez, E. (2003). El habla andaluza en los libros de texto escolares. *Cauce. Revista de Filología y su Didáctica*, 27, 207-230.
- Méndez Guerrero, B. (2018). Creencias y actitudes de los jóvenes universitarios mallorquines hacia las variedades cultas del español. *Percepción de las variedades cultas del español: creencias y actitudes de jóvenes universitarios hispanohablantes. Monográfico Boletín de Filología de la Universidad de Chile*, 53(2), 87-114.
<https://boletinfilologia.uchile.cl/index.php/BDF/article/view/51942/54407/>
<http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-93032018000200087>
- Mondéjar, J. (1991). *Dialectología andaluza. Estudios*. Editorial Don Quijote.
- Moreno Fernández, F. (2009). *La lengua española en su geografía*. Arco/Libros.
- Moya, J. A. (2018a). Sobre el equilibrado reajuste de las hablas andaluzas. *Itinerarios*, 28, 35-66. <http://itinerarios.uw.edu.pl/sobre-el-equilibrado-reajuste-de-las-hablas-andaluzas/>
- Moya, J. A. (2018b). La evaluación del cambio. A propósito de los cambios prestigiosos en Andalucía. In *Actas do XIII Congreso Internacional de Lingüística Xeral* (pp. 662-668). Vigo. <http://cilx2018.uvigo.gal/actas/pdf/660664.pdf>
- Moya, J. A. & García, E. (1995). *El habla de Granada y sus barrios*. Universidad de Granada.

- Narbona, A. (27 March 2017). A vueltas con la defensa del andaluz. *Diario de Sevilla*.
https://www.diariodesevilla.es/opinion/tribuna/vueltas-defensa-andaluz_0_1120988170.html/
- Paredes, F. & Cestero, A. M.^a (2018). Percepciones de las variedades cultas del español por parte de hablantes del centro-norte de España según los datos del proyecto PRECAVES XXI: el español ejemplar y la variedad propia. *Oralia*, 21(1), 87-112.
- Penny, R. (2000). *Variation and change in Spanish*. Cambridge: CUP.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139164566>
- Regan, B. (2017a). A study of *ceceo* variation in Western Andalusia (Huelva). *Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics*, 10(1), 119-160.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/shll-2017-0004>
- Regan, B. (2017b). *The effect of dialect contact and social identity on fricative demerger*. [Doctoral dissertation]. Universidad de Texas.
- Regan, B. (2019). Dialectology meets sociophonetics: the social evaluation of *ceceo* and *distinción* in Lepe, Spain. In W. Chappell (Ed.), *Recent Advances in the Study of Spanish Sociophonetic Perception* (pp. 85-121). John Benjamins.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/ihll.21.04reg>
- Rionegro, M.^a (6 March 2017). Susana Díaz responde al periodista madrileño: “Mi acento es de igualdad y tolerancia”. *El Español*.
https://www.elespanol.com/espana/20170306/198730483_0.html/
- Ropero, M. & Pérez, F. J. (1998). *Análisis estadístico-sociológico de los comportamientos lingüísticos en la ciudad de Sevilla. Sociolingüística Andaluza, 11*. Publicaciones de la Universidad de Sevilla.
- Santana, J. (2016). Seseo, ceceo y distinción en el sociolecto alto de la ciudad de Sevilla: nuevos datos a partir de los materiales de PRESEEA. *Boletín de Filología de la Universidad de Chile*, LI(2), 255-280.
<http://www.boletinfilologia.uchile.cl/index.php/BDF/article/view/44879/46949/>
- Santana, J. (2016-2017). Factores externos e internos influyentes en la variación de /θs/ en la ciudad de Sevilla. *Analecta Malacitana*, XXXIX, 143-177.
<http://www.revistas.uma.es/index.php/analecta/article/view/5613/5262/>

- Santana, J. (2017). Variación de las realizaciones de /θ^s/ en el sociolecto bajo de la ciudad de Sevilla: datos de PRESEEA-SE. *Procesos de variación y cambio en el español de España. Estudios sobre corpus PRESEEA. Monográfico XV Lingüística en la Red*. http://www.linred.es/monograficos_pdf/LR-monografico15-articulo2.pdf
- Santana, J. (2018a). Creencias y actitudes de los jóvenes universitarios sevillanos hacia las variedades cultas del español. *Percepción de las variedades cultas del español: creencias y actitudes de jóvenes universitarios hispanohablantes. Monográfico Boletín de Filología de la Universidad de Chile, LIII(2)*, 115-144. <https://boletinfilologia.uchile.cl/index.php/BDF/article/view/51943/54408/>. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-93032018000200115>
- Santana, J. (2018b). Creencias y actitudes de jóvenes universitarios sevillanos hacia las variedades normativas del español de España: andaluza, canaria y castellana. *Pragmática Sociocultural / Sociocultural Pragmatics*, 6(1), 71-97. <https://doi.org/10.1515/soprag-2018-0003/>
- Santana, J. (2020a). Percepción de las variedades andaluza y castellana de los jóvenes sevillanos: un análisis contrastivo. *Onomázein*, 50, 71-89. http://onomazein.letras.uc.cl/Articulos/N50/50_5.pdf
- Santana, J. (2020b). Patrones sociolingüísticos de pronunciación en la ciudad de Sevilla: variación sociofonética de seseo y ceceo. In D. Repede & M. León-Castro (Eds.), *Patrones sociolingüísticos del español hablado en la ciudad de Sevilla* (pp. 169-207). Peter Lang.
- Santana, J. (2022). Convergence patterns in the city of Seville: sociolinguistic study of seseo. *Spanish in Context*, 19(1), 122-145. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sic.20003.san>
- Torres, F. (1997): Actitudes lingüísticas en la ciudad de Almería. In A. Narbona & M. Ropero (Eds.), *El habla andaluza* (pp. 635-646). Sevilla: Ayuntamiento de Sevilla - Universidad de Sevilla.
- Ureña, L. (2014). España contra Andalucía, o la vigencia mediática de ciertos tópicos lingüísticos. In F. M. Carriscondo (Ed.), *La lengua en el candelero. Repercusión mediática de asuntos lingüísticos* (pp. 171-204). Academia del Hispanismo.
- Vaz de Soto, J. M.^a (1998). Pautas para locutores andaluces. *El Siglo que Viene*, 33, 42-45.

- Villena, J. A. (2012). Patrones sociolingüísticos del español de Andalucía. In J. A. Villena & A. M. Ávila (Eds.), *Estudios sobre el español de Málaga. Pronunciación, vocabulario y sintaxis* (pp. 27-66). Sarriá.
- Villena, J. A. & Vida, M. (2017). Variación, identidad y coherencia en el español meridional. Sobre la indexicalidad en las variables convergentes del español de Málaga. *Procesos de variación y cambio en el español de España. Estudios sobre corpus PRESEEA. Monográfico XV de Lingüística en la Red*.
http://www.linred.es/numero15_monografico_Art1.html/
- Yraola, A. (2014). Actitudes lingüísticas en España. In A. B. Chiquito & M. Á. Quesada (Eds.), *Bergen Language and Linguistic Studies 5. Actitudes lingüísticas de los hispanohablantes hacia el idioma español y sus variantes* (pp. 551-636).
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/307174734_actitudes_linguisticas_de_los_hispanohablantes_hacia_el_idioma_espanol_y_sus_variantes/link/57fca1f208ae6ce92eb42e5a/download/. <https://doi.org/10.15845/bells.v5i0.685>

Dirección de contacto

Juana Santana Marrero

jsantana@us.es