

Different Ways to Hate a Language in Catalonia: Interpreting Low Solidarity Scores in Language Attitude Studies

Michael Newman
Queens College and Graduate Center CUNY

1. Introduction: Matched Guise Tests in Catalonia

As in other bilingual settings, matched guise tests have been used in Catalonia (Woolard 1984, 1989, Woolard and Gahng 1990, Newman, Trenchs-Parera, & Ng 2008, Woolard 2009) to access language attitudes indirectly and so more reliably than is possible with surveys or questionnaires. In such tests participants called “judges” listen to speakers usually reading a short passage and then rate them on various personal traits. To isolate the variable of language from extraneous individual factors that may characterize a person’s voice, these tests employ the famous “trick” of having speakers’ produce two versions—or guises—one in each target language. Judges’ evaluations of the two guises of the same speaker can then be assumed to vary according to their attitudes about the languages in question.

Due to the large number of personal traits asked about—sixteen in Newman, Trenchs-Parera, and Ng (2008)—the raw data are difficult to interpret. Therefore, these data are fed into a statistical factor analysis that groups the traits based on the similarity of the responses they elicit. For example, in Newman, Trenchs-Parera, and Ng (2008) judges rated our female guises similarly on the following traits: *Being Amusing, Likeable, Physically Attractive, Feminine, Sensitive, Generous, Open, and Having a Good Sense of Humor*. That is, if they thought guises were amusing, they tended to also think they were likeable, physically attractive, and so on. By the same token, if they thought they were lacking in one these traits, they typically thought they were lacking in the others. In the same way, they also tended to rate guises similarly along a second group of traits: *Intelligent, Cultured, Self-Confident, Hardworking, Being a Leader, and Trustworthy*. Note that the first group seems associated with social attractiveness whereas the second consists of qualities associated with respect. These factors—typically referred to as *Solidarity* and *Status* respectively—have appeared and over again in matched-guise and related subjective response tests (see e.g., summary in Campbell-Kibler 2006: 69-72).

In the end, findings are drawn from the ratings on these (and any other) factors that emerge from the factor analysis. In many cases, high Solidarity ratings have often been associated with guises using judges’ in-group language, whereas low ones—the focus of attention in this study—correspond to the language of an out-group. Status ratings, by contrast, have been associated with the relative socioeconomic position of the speakers of each language whatever the judges’ group affiliation may be (e.g., Lambert 1967). In such cases, the meanings of the scores seem easy to interpret, and they concord with the names given to the two factors. The assumptions are that individuals will show greater solidarity to members of their own group while recognizing the prestige of privileged groups whether they belong to those groups or not.

Frequently, however as Campbell-Kibler (2006) notes, the scores can require more complex and therefore more interesting, interpretations. Woolard and Gahng (1990) compare a matched guise study they conducted in 1987 in urban Catalonia with one Woolard (1984, 1989) performed seven years before. They note a reduction in the classic in-group support/out-group rejection dynamic with respect to Solidarity over those seven years, which corresponds to the introduction of Catalan-medium education in Catalonia. They argue that the increase in bilingualism following this change weakened the connection of language to group identity. In particular, the use of Catalan was no longer taken as a

reliable index of the social identity and loyalties of the speaker. Our study and Woolard (2009) reveal a furthering of this trend towards greater equanimity in response to language choice. However, we also observe an unexpected twist; on average, judges favored voices that were clearly non-native in each language, i.e., the Catalan guise of native Spanish speakers and vice versa. We interpret the lessening of in-group preference and the favoring of non-native guises as supportive of crossing ethnolinguistic boundaries, and so indicative of a language ideology we call *Linguistic Cosmopolitanism*. Linguistic Cosmopolitans support multilingualism as a marker of acceptance of the ethnolinguistically heterogeneous society that they value. For people holding this ideology, the in-group/out-group dynamic breaks down because they do not see group membership as a proper motive for assessing social attractiveness.

Interestingly, these results were most evident in the largest group in our sample, those we called “Spanish-background,” i.e., those raised speaking Spanish at home. This group is comprised of most of the children and grandchildren of what are called in Catalonia “Old Immigrants” meaning those from other parts of Spain who arrived mainly from 1950-1970. However, this is not to say that all Spanish background participants were Cosmopolitans; a minority favored Spanish and disfavored Catalan, and we refer to that group in Trenchs-Parera and Newman (2009) as “Linguistic Parochials.” The second largest ethnolinguistic group consisted of the Catalan-background participants who come from three demographic profiles: those whose families had been in Catalonia for centuries, the offspring of Old Immigrants who had shifted to Catalan, and those with mixed roots. The Catalan-background group also contained both Linguistic Cosmopolitans and Parochials, although the latter naturally favored Catalan and disfavored Spanish. A third group, those raised bilingually, showed mostly Cosmopolitan responses, although with some bias in favor of Catalan. The remaining participants were so-called “New Immigrants,” i.e., those from all over the world, who now make up almost 15% of the population in Catalonia. They showed a split response. Immigrants from non-Spanish speaking countries tended to dislike both languages, whereas those from Spanish speaking Latin America showed a marked preference for Spanish over Catalan guises. This last result confirms Huguet and Janés’s (2008) survey findings in western Catalonia that immigrants from this origin are the most resistant of any segment of the population to Catalan.

Nevertheless, a number of mysteries remain. One involves whether New Immigrants’ language attitudes can be described in terms of Cosmopolitanism and Parochialism. This question is discussed briefly below and in more detail in Trenchs-Parera and Newman (2009). The present paper focuses on other related but still outstanding issues: Is the dislike of Catalan found among the Latinos the same as that of Spanish Background Parochials? More generally, what can be extrapolated from any similarities and differences about the meaning of low Solidarity scores on a matched guise type study? Put more prosaically, what does it mean to dislike a language?

2. Methods

These questions were approached via a qualitative investigation that began with focus group interviews of a subset of the participants in the matched-guise research, although they have continued since that time with new participants. Focus groups are often used in opinion research (Fern 2001). They balance the need for detailed original responses with accessing the views of a relatively large number of individuals, and they support an intra-group dynamic that leads to an elaboration of the opinions expressed. Our focus groups were composed of friends or at least peers that knew each other and got along well, and this grouping tended to amplify that intra-group dynamic as participants built off each other’s often already familiar opinions. This process can easily be observed in many of the examples below.

Thirty-seven participants from the matched guise studies form the data set discussed in Trenchs-Parera and Newman (2009). These included 20 autochthonous participants classified as of Catalan, Spanish, or bilingual backgrounds. Only one of these was of long-established Catalan origins, and the rest were either the children or grandchildren of “Old Immigrants” or of mixed backgrounds. Seventeen “New Immigrants,” who arrived as adolescents, were also interviewed including a Russian, a Chinese, a Brazilian, an Albanian, and thirteen from various Spanish-speaking countries. Three more

focus groups conducted later are included here, adding ten more Spanish-speaking Latin Americans and a Moroccan.

Participants were between 14 and 18 years old and in their 3rd and 4th year of compulsory secondary education (ESO) or the subsequent optional college-preparatory track (Batxillerat). The interviews were done at their schools, which included three in Barcelona and two in the urban periphery. Students were volunteers who were invited by teachers based on our criteria of being friendly with each other and in the end provide an ethnolinguistically balanced sample of the school's population. Focus group size varied from, in one case two when no others could be recruited, to more typically four or five. Interviews lasted from 35 minutes to 55 minutes since they were constrained by students' class schedules. So some individuals participated twice when we felt that the interview was incomplete. Questions began with musical tastes, which typically provide a sense of teenagers' positions vis-à-vis peer cultures, before moving on to language and identity questions, attitudes towards out groups, and future plans. The technique is necessarily open ended, and sometimes resulted in extended but revealing digressions such as post-immigration incidents, family narratives, and prior school experiences. I conducted all but two interviews; the exceptions were run by Adriana Patiño, a Colombian who is bilingual in Catalan and consisted of Latin American students. All interviews were recorded and transcribed, and then analyzed thematically. Language choice was up to the interviewees, and we followed the choices they made.

3. Findings

3.1. *Linguistic Cosmopolitanism versus Linguistic Parochialism*

In Trenchs-Parera and Newman (2009) we show how five participants revealed unambiguously Cosmopolitan beliefs, which paired support for bilingualism with valuing of social diversity generally. Two of these teens downplayed social identity labels, such as Spanish or Catalan. The other three claimed multiple identities, as say Catalan *and* Spanish. These distinct orientations ended up being different routes to the same ethical stance, which constructed a view of identities as individual characteristics that should not entail group loyalties. All five valued forms of crossing (Rampton 2000) and hybrid linguistic codes and consequently opposed a view of language as proprietary cultural capital of any group. In this way, Linguistic Cosmopolitanism was revealed as a largely internally consistent and coherent ideology shared in relatively similar forms across a number of people, although they may differ in their particulars.

On the opposite end, four participants voiced support for monolingualism in Spanish and two did in Catalan.¹ In these cases, we also found coherent ideological systems, which to a large extent mirrored each other. Given the similar level of internal consistency, we felt that these were also coherent ideologies, which we dubbed *Linguistic Parochialism* (Trenchs-Parera & Newman 2009).² Since Parochials are those who manifest dislike for a language, this is the key group for this article, and it is worth examining their beliefs and motivations in detail.

Parochials were by definition invested in the in-group/out-group dynamic. However, in no case did we find overt bigotry against the other mainstream group members (Catalan or Spanish Background as the case may be) solely on the basis of their identity. This was not a general "Cosmopolitan Style" tolerance because it contrasted in some cases with expressions of open or barely hidden prejudice against immigrants and Roma (Gypsies), which was absent from Cosmopolitans. However, in terms of the local Spanish-Catalan division, animus was limited to those seen as advocates of an opposing cause. In fact, the struggle seemed largely to take place on an emblematic level involving opposing pair offs of musical styles, flags or other icons, sports teams, discourses, or political objectives. The other group's language, in both cases, was widely cast emblematically, and it was therefore treated as a kind of unwelcome intrusion that was at best tolerated. Parochials consequently avoided using the other group's language wherever possible.

¹ This included the entirely Catalan background participant, whose data was not used in Trenchs-Parera and Newman (2009).

² Seven participants combined Cosmopolitan beliefs with those favoring one language over the other, and we characterized these participants as *Mixed*.

Comparing the Spanish and Catalan Parochialisms it became evident that each revolved around incompatible constructions of geographic space, which is not surprising given the traditionally close association of political territory, nationalisms, and language. For example, the strongest pro-Spanish (called “Espanyolista” in Catalan) aspiration has long been a unitary state centered on Madrid, which reached both fulfillment and ignominy under the Franco regime. By contrast the strongest, pro-Catalan (called “Catalanista”) aspiration is for a unified and independent “Catalan Countries” corresponding to the lands Catalan has been traditionally spoken in. For Spanish Parochials, this equation creates a geographic dilemma because they are, after all, natives of Catalonia. It also creates a equally troublesome political one because right-wing politics remains anathema for the vast majority.

One way out was adopted by Emi, who displaced home loyalty to her parents’ generation. To state this baldly is an extreme response, which may account for laughter among the other focus group members, which she, in fact, joined in:

MN: ¿Te sientes catalana?

Emi: No, es que no me siento nada. Porque yo, toda mi familia es de Andalucía, ¿no? Entonces, pues yo, de catalana no me siento, la verdad. Me siento más, tirando pa’l sur. [risas]

MN: Do you feel Catalan?

Emi: No, it’s like I don’t feel that way at all. Because me, all my family is from Andalusia, right? So, well me, I don’t feel Catalan, actually. I feel more like about the south. [laughs]

A more common response was the traditional espanyolista discourse that subordinates Catalonia to Spain, but not as a subjugation but simply a matter of fact. In the following case, two Spanish Parochials use this subordination to justify a primarily Spanish identity as one of rationality, obviousness, and common sense. This is in fact a common trope:

Santiago: A mí, cuando me preguntan lo que soy, yo digo español, lo primero,

César: Catalán no.

Santiago: Luego ya, de Barcelona.

César: Claro, a lo mejor...

Santiago: Yo soy... Cataluña está en España, por supuesto.

César: Claro, porque a lo mejor vamos a un país “¿de dónde eres?”, y se te quedan “¿Cómo?”, entonces dices “de España.”

Santiago: Me, when people ask me what I am, I say first Spanish...

César Catalan no.

Santiago: ...and then from Barcelona.

César: Yeah, probably...

Santiago: I am... Catalonia is in Spain, of course.

César: Yeah, because imagine we go to a country, and they’re like where are you from? and they go “what?” [if you say Catalonia] and then you say from Spain.

By downplaying Catalonia with respect to Spain, it is natural to downplay the Catalan language as subsidiary, unimportant, and even likely to die out.³ Spanish Parochialism is also frequently associated with a certain variety of Spanish (Woolard 2009). This dialect is sometimes called “de Barriada,” which can be loosely translated in American idiom as *inner city* due to its association with urban working class areas. Barriada Spanish contains a number of innovative variants most prominently the voicing of intervocalic phonemically voiceless stops. However, a geographic rejection of Catalonia is maintained in folk linguistic evaluations since those variants are not typically noticed. Instead, Barriada Spanish is popularly associated with Andalusian Spanish (see Pujolar 2000) since variants

³ The maximal Catalanist position agrees with this view and so posits an independent Catalan state as needed to preserve the language.

traceable to Andalusian dialects such as coda /s/ aspiration and elision of sonorants in coda position are widely commented on. All the Spanish Parochial participants used features of this variety.

3.2. *Latinos' Feelings about Catalan*

More Latino focus-group participants gave statements expressing a dislike for Catalan than their local Spanish background cohorts, reflecting the quantitative findings in Hugueta and Janés (2008) and Newman, Trenchs-Parera, and Ng (2009). The following example is from two Ecuadorians, Johan and Nancy when I asked them what they thought of Catalan:

Johan: Yo creo que también no gusta mucho; para mí es un idioma secundario. O sea no es muy importante el catalán.

Nancy: Es que es uno de muy pocos sitios donde se puede hablar el catalán. No es como el inglés. No es como otros idiomas.

Johan: I think I also don't like it much; for me it's a minor language. I mean Catalan isn't very important.

Nancy: It's that it's is one of the very few places where they speak Catalan. It's not like English. It's not like other languages.

However, unlike those formulated by local Parochials, the immigrants' negative evaluations of Catalan were not associated with cultural symbols and were often preceded or followed by mixed or positive evaluations. Johan and Nancy actually expressed approval of having Catalan as language of instruction because it promoted learning new cultures and languages, a quintessentially Cosmopolitan position. They also respected the fact that the language mattered to Catalans. Johan and Nancy's approval of the policy of Catalan as instructional vehicle was not unique to them. Here it is expressed by Rulfo, a Colombian and his friend Randolph, an Ecuadorian.

MN: [A Randolph] ¿Y qué te crees de que aquí las clases que se hagan más que nada en catalán?

Randolph: [silencio] Qué se hable...

MN: ¿Que en clase se hable en catalán?

Randolph: Yo...

MN: Buena idea, ¿o es una tontería?

Randolph: Yo depende de si las entiendo, con tal las entienda sí. Hay cosas que no, ni una palabra que no entiendo, pero otras las entiendo, y no hay problema por mí.

Rulfo: Por una parte está bien porque así uno aprende a entenderlos y a hablarlo. Y palabras que no conozcas, que no entiendas, pues puedes preguntar al profesor, y así pues vas aprendiendo poco a poco.

MN: Así que es una buena idea.

Rulfo: Sí [con seguridad]

MN: [To Randolph] Do you think it's a good idea that classes are given in Catalan?

Randolph: [silence] That they speak...

MN: That in class they speak Catalan?

Randolph: Me...

MN: Good idea or stupid?

Randolph: Me, it depends on if I understand. As long as I understand, Ok. There are things that I don't, not even a single word, but others I understand, and it's not a problem for me.

Rulfo: In a way it's good because that way you learn to understand them and to speak it. And words you don't know, that you don't understand, well, you can ask the teacher and that way you learn little by little.

MN: So it's a good idea.

Rulfo: Yes [with confidence]

This view clearly explains the dislike of Catalan as a reaction to its role as an obstacle to communication in general and educational success in particular. In fact this turned out to be a constant theme. The geographic construction of space, so common among the local Parochials, for instance, was only barely echoed by Álvaro, another Ecuadorian, who framed it within this practical discourse by saying that if he could not pass his final year of ESO in Barcelona, he would go to Madrid to take it in Spanish. By contrast, at another point in the interview, Álvaro sees potential value of learning Catalan:

Álvaro: Si voy a un sitio que hablan catalán, y hablo yo [en castellano] a lo mejor no me entienden. Y entonces vale más aprender un idioma.

Álvaro: If I go someplace where they speak Catalan, and I speak [in Spanish], they probably won't understand me. So it's better to learn a language.

Related to the discourse of Catalan as obstacle, there was embarrassment expressed by some Latinos at not speaking it well. Thus, Rocío, a Colombian, became visibly uncomfortable when asked why she avoided speaking Catalan, which culminated in a shout: “¡¡Porque me da vergüenza!!” (*Because I get embarrassed!!*). Since proficiency seems to play such a central role in motivating dislike of Catalan, it is unsurprising that the most negative feelings were concentrated among the newest arrivals. Juan, a Dominican who had arrived from New York five months before, said with teenage hyperbole, “Yo no prefiero el catalán; prefiero otro lenguaje como [pause] francés” (*I don't like Catalan. I'd like another language like [pause] French.*), a language that was not a problem because it was not taught or used in school.

The focus on school makes sense from the perspective of these teens because it is easy to avoid speaking Catalan in the predominantly working class Spanish speaking neighborhoods they lived in. Johan seemed to separate the language, which he was doing better with, from the class it was taught in: “Ya le estoy pillando el truco al catalán..., pero la clase de catalán siempre me va mal.” (*I'm getting the hang of Catalan, but I always do bad in Catalan class.*) As with any language, oral competence does not imply a correspondingly high level of literacy. The emphasis in most Catalan classes is, in fact, reading and writing, not speaking. As for oral comprehension, the assumption seems to be that students will just pick it up.

Finally, many immigrants appeared far more open to the use of Catalan than local Spanish Parochials. The following example comes from the same interview with the Spanish Parochials, Santiago and César, who participated with two school friends: Dmitri, from Russia, and Ángel, from Colombia. In the following excerpt, I asked Dmitri what language he would use upon entering an unfamiliar store. Note how much more open the immigrants are to using Catalan despite their limited competence than Santiago and César.

Dmitri: Normalmente, aquí, en mi barrio, pregunto en castellano. Pero si voy por el centro, allí, hacen preguntas en catalán. Así, pregunto en catalán, como sé un poco, y te contestan de buena manera

MN: ¿Vosotros?

César: En castellano

Santiago: En castellano en todos los sitios.

...

MN: Imagínate que estás en Vic o en Girona [ciudades con muchos catalanohablantes].

Ángel: Girona... Estuve en Girona y toda la gente es como catalana. Todo, todo el mundo. Y no sé; allí me tocó hablar catalán.

César: Yo, como es que entiendo los dos, me hablan en catalán y yo en castellano igualmente.

Santiago: Yo en todos sitios hablo en castellano. Yo sólo uso el catalán para la clase de catalán.

Dmitri: Normally, here in this neighborhood, I ask in Spanish, but if I go to the center, there they ask questions in Catalan. So I ask in Catalan. I know a bit, and they answer you nicely.

MN: And you guys?

César: In Spanish

Santiago: In Spanish everywhere.

...

MN: Imagine you're in Vic or Girona (heavily Catalan speaking cities)

Ángel: Girona. I was in Girona, and everyone there was like Catalan. Everyone. I don't know. There, I ended up speaking Catalan.

César: Me, like I understand both, they talk to me in Catalan and I answer in just the same in Spanish.

Santiago: Me, I speak Spanish everywhere. I only use Catalan for Catalan class.

An examination of the more positive feelings also illuminates the range of Latinos' views of the language. A few upwardly mobile immigrant students took to Catalan. Gonzalo, an Argentinean, shifted back and forth from Catalan to Spanish in the interview. For him, it was an ethical imperative to learn Catalan.

Gonzalo: Pero yo creo que hay que venir para integrarse, y una parte de esa integración es aprender el idioma.

Gonzalo: I think you have to come to integrate, and part of that integration is to learn the language.

However, these feelings were uncommon, and Gonzalo saw himself as an exception. The only other Latinos who actually seemed favorably disposed to Catalan were a group of three friends—a Colombian, an Ecuadorian, and a Chilean—who even used Catalan in their interview with Adriana Patiño, although it was a second language for all four. Note that when she asked if he was surprised to find the classes in Catalan upon his arrival in Barcelona, the Chilean, Jari, pointed to the theme of difficulty the language presented to new arrivals. For, Jari this problem diminished with time.

Jari: Em va sorprendre molt. Va ser una mica una barrera per poder aprendre i saber més de la classe. Va ser un impediment però una vegada que vaig aprendre no.

Jari: It was a huge surprise. It was a barrier to be able to learn and understand more in class. It was an obstacle, but not once I learned it.

All four immigrants with positive assessments of Catalan pointed to caring teachers as an important factor in their adaptation to their new home, and all were in the same school. By contrast, negative assessments of the language were sometimes associated with dissatisfaction with their reception in school such as being put into Catalan-medium content area classes with no linguistic support. In the end, the tendency to dislike Catalan was indeed widespread among the immigrants, but it was contingent and lacked the utter rejection by the local Parochials.

3.3. Latinos' Feelings about Peninsular Spanish

This relative moderation was somewhat surprising given that expressions of dislike for their new home was common among the immigrants; in fact, loyalty to the home countries was almost universal. Even Gonzalo, much as he supported integration, said he was 100% Argentine. Concretely, many immigrant participants complained of missing friends, spoke nostalgically about their schooling at home, or complained about their reception by locals, although reports of experiences of racism were relatively rare. On this point, it is worth remembering that immigration is almost invariably a difficult experience. For a teenager who often cannot see the need for the move and lacks the maturity to put it into perspective, the experience can be traumatic. One Peruvian who had first gone to Italy before arriving in Barcelona described it stoically as having to go through “el año fatal” (*the horrible year*) two times.

So negative feelings towards Barcelona should be expected, and would be similar wherever the destination had been. Nor is it surprising that most immigrant participants reported either wanting to

go back home or alternatively to somewhere else in Europe or to the US, presumably as greener pastures. Even those who said they were planning to stay also usually reported participating in largely Latino social networks. So, whereas María, a Cuban said she planned to stay in Barcelona her entire life, added, “Yo suelo salir con los latinos.” (*I generally go out with Latinos*). This was not absolute segregation. At times, participants described mixed groups usually in terms of Latino boys taking local girls dancing or forming relationships, and we interviewed one autochthonous Spanish background girl, who expressed a preference for Latino boys and through them came to enjoy Latin music and dance clubs. By dress and hairstyle she appeared to be Latina herself. By contrast we heard of only one Latina going out with a local boy. Also, single-sex networks were sometimes integrated within school, as was the case of Ángel, Dmitri, Santiago, and César. However, we encountered only one really close male friendship group that appeared to go beyond the school walls that spanned the immigrant-autochthonous divide: Rulfo and Randolph with a local boy Esteve.⁴ Also, the Argentine Gonzalo and Sebas, an Uruguayan became involved in local political activities. We saw no equivalent patterns among the girls; for them to cross the divide required Latin music and/or Latino boys.

Participants with no cross-ethnic friends gave various rationales for the homogeneity of their social networks, but prejudice and exclusion were never invoked. For example, when Johan was asked whether he got along with locals, he replied as follows.

Johan: Sí me llevo bien, con españoles. No me llevo mal con nadie. Mis amigos son ecuatorianos, colombianos [silencio] latinos.

Johan: Yeah, I get along with Spaniards. I don't have problems with anyone. My friends are Ecuadorians, Colombians, [silence] Latinos.

Yet for the most part, Latino participants had little good to say about the local culture; only some girls reported that they thought that local boys were less sexist than their countrymen.

More common was a complaint like that by Celia, also Ecuadorian, who said, “aquí no hay respeto” (*There's no respect here*). In Spain, there is a tendency to deemphasize what Brown and Levinson (1987) call negative politeness strategies, referring to social mores expressing respect and accommodating others' needs and desires. By contrast, in Ecuador and Colombia, where most of our Latino participants came from, negative face (the desire for respect and circumspection) is stressed. Consequently, requests and potentially unwelcome information may be delivered with far more directness by Spaniards than immigrants, and this can lead to serious misunderstandings. Spaniards can become convinced Latin Americans are unreliable, vague, and/or insincere, and Latin Americans can believe locals have no manners.

This difference is realized linguistically in Spanish in the reduced usage of honorific and profession-related address terms such as *señor/señora* and *profesor/profesora*. Teachers in Spain are usually addressed by their first name by students, and politeness markers such as *por favor* are also much less common in Spain than Latin America. Finally, given that Spanish has a T/V 2nd person pronoun singular system (with polite *usted* and informal *tú* or *vos* depending on dialect), the distribution of these forms differs. *Tú* is far more widespread in Spain than in Latin America.

For example, it is very surprising to Latino immigrants that teachers in Spain are referred to with *tú*:

Johan: Sí, cuando digo usted, la profe me dice, “¡No! Trátame de tú.” Ellos utilizan tú, tú. A una persona mayor tú le puedes decir “oye, tú, ven para acá”...

Nancy: En cambio nosotros, usted.

Johan: Es como una falta de respeto.

Johan: Yeah, when I say usted, the teacher tells me, “No! Use tú with me.” They use tú, tú. To an older person you can say, “listen [tú morphology] here you [tú], get over here!”

⁴ These three were heavily involved in Hip-Hop music, a peer culture that is overtly Cosmopolitan and integrative (Sarkar & Allen 2007).

Nancy: *On the other hand with us, it's usted.*

Johan: *It's like a lack of respect.*

Gonzalo and Sebas were the only ones to report having adopted the Peninsular second person singular address patterns, and perhaps it is no coincidence that they were the ones who had to change most radically in their pronoun usage. After all, in Uruguay and Argentina *vos*, is used in place of *tú*. These participants reported that they maintained *vos* with family but in public adopted *tú*, and it appeared by doing so they adopted Peninsular usage norms. It is also the case, however, that the politeness norms in those countries differed the least from those of Spain more generally.

Resistance to dialectal accommodation was crucially not limited to pragmatics. In interviews, we noticed the maintenance of many, though not all, usages exclusive to home countries. Unsurprisingly, the /s/-/θ/ distinction—which as it involves undoing a phonological merger and using an unfamiliar sound would be hard to learn—was absent. Use of the *vosotros* forms—the Peninsular 2nd person plural—was infrequent. In fact, there were reports of linguistic policing with Latinos heard using Peninsular Spanish forms being called names like *español* or *españolito* (see Trenchs and Newman 2009).

Finally as these insults show, the Latinos tended to consider all the natives of their new home to be Spaniards, a designation that would not be expected to please any ardent Catalanist. However, they also indicate the focus of their objections is Spain, not Catalonia, and it is not surprising therefore, that the identity threat is perceived as coming from Peninsular Spanish not Catalan. The use of Catalan was not received with insults as far as we could tell.

4. Summary and Conclusion

The proportion of participants expressing negative feelings about Catalan was greater among the Latin Americans than the locals, reflecting the findings of the survey in Hugueta and Janés (2008) and the matched guise in Newman, Trenchs-Parera, and Ng (2008). However, the motives seem very different for the two groups. For the Latinos, Catalan was an unpleasant surprise and obstacle to their adaptation, but it seems that it was one that diminished with time and proficiency. Actually, with school support and caring teachers, it was possible for a positive association to the language to emerge. The local Parochials, by contrast, were competent in Catalan, but expressed objections associated with identity. They did not ultimately consider themselves to be Catalans or not primarily so, and the use of Catalan represented this undesired identity to them and so was kept to a minimum.

The fact that immigrants' objections were based on concrete challenges and frustration suggests that despair over the reports of dislike and relatively little usage of Catalan by Latin American immigrants is unwarranted. Such negative feelings seem more tractable than they would be if they were based on identity, but they make clear that the early experiences of new arrivals are of the utmost importance in setting up positive attitudes. Unfortunately, the affirming experiences reported by some participants were not widespread and seemed dependent on the professionalism, dispositions, and skills of individual teachers and school administrators. Furthermore, it seemed likely from reports by students who had studied elsewhere, that these supportive practices were overrepresented in the schools we did the research in. Some participants talked about being placed into regular classes taught in Catalan on a sink or swim basis. In some cases, the Catalan "Reception Class" seemed largely concerned with the written language particularly the issue of correctness. Academic language support and usage of the language in everyday life were not part of the curriculum unless an enlightened teacher made it so. So students in these classes were not necessarily obliged or even encouraged to speak the language. Of course, students' complaints about school need to be treated with due skepticism, but some of the teachers we spoke to also felt concerned about the adequacy of the curriculum. It seems clear that educational policy needs to be much better articulated in terms of immigrant children's linguistic needs to achieve the results hoped for from the policy of Catalan-medium education (see also Trenchs-Parera 2010). Preparation for teachers needs to be redoubled to provide them with the skills required to serve this population.

There are also implications from these results for the enterprise of investigating attitudes through matched guise and other experimental research. It is clear from this study that quantitative findings of regarding so-called Solidarity are not as transparent as might be assumed. The favoring of speakers of judges' in-group language appears to be a product of the ideology we identify as "Parochialism" and therefore is not inevitable. Also, expressing dislike for a language or a variety of a language may result from different factors, and identity may not even be the primary motivation.

Similarly, positive scores can be misleading as well. Latinos in the matched guise portion preferred Peninsular Spanish over Catalan voices. However, in interviews Peninsular Spanish was perceived as problematic. An explanation to this paradox could be that the matched guise study presented judges with Spaniards speaking their native Peninsular variety. However, the Latinos were concerned with the speech of other Latinos in their linguistic policing. Thus, the Latinos might positively rate a Spaniard speaking Peninsular Spanish but criticize another Latino for using the same dialectal forms. Be that as it may, researchers working with scales measuring language attitudes need to be cautious in arriving at interpretations of their findings. To do so solely on the basis of ratings without a qualitative component risks arriving at spurious conclusions.

References

- Brown, Penelope and Stephen Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Campbell-Kibler, Kathryn. 2006. *Listener Perceptions of Sociolinguistic Variables: The Case of (Ing)* Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University. http://www.ling.ohio-state.edu/~kbck/KCK_diss.pdf
- Fern, Edward. 2001. *Advanced focus group research*. London: Sage.
- Huguet, Àngel & Janés, Jordi. 2008. Mother tongue as a determining variable in language attitudes. The case of immigrant Latin American students in Spain. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 8, no. 4: 247-260
- Lambert, Wallace. 1967. A social psychology of bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues* 23: 91-109.
- Newman, Michael, Mireia Trenchs-Parera, and Shukhan Ng. 2008. *Normalizing bilingualism: The effects of Catalan linguistic normalization policy one generation after*. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12(3): 306-333
- Rampton, Ben. 1995. *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London/NY: Longman.
- Sarkar, Mela and Dawn Allen. 2007. Hybrid identities in Quebec hip-hop: Language, territory and ethnicity in the mix. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education* 6, no. 2: 117-30.
- Trenchs-Parera, Mireia. 2010. *Incidencia de las estrategias educativas en las actitudes e ideologías lingüísticas de los adolescentes inmigrantes en la educación secundaria pública de Cataluña*. Report to AGAUR, Generalitat de Catalunya. (Ref.: 2008AIRE-00018)
- Trenchs-Parera, Mireia & Newman, Michael. 2009. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* (30)6: 509-524
- Woolard, Kathryn A. 1984. A formal measure of language attitudes in Barcelona: A note from work in progress. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 47: 63-71.
- Woolard, Kathryn A. 1989. *Double Talk: Bilingualism and the Politics of Ethnicity in Catalonia*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Woolard, Kathryn A. and Tae-Joong Gahng. 1990. Changing language policies and attitudes in autonomous Catalonia. *Language in Society* 19: 311-330.
- Woolard, Kathryn A. 2009. Linguistic Consciousness among Adolescents in Catalonia: A Case Study from the Barcelona Urban Area in Longitudinal Perspective. *Zeitschrift für Katalanistik* 22, 125-149.

Selected Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics

edited by Jim Michnowicz
and Robin Dodsworth

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2011

Copyright information

Selected Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics
© 2011 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-443-0 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Newman, Michael. 2011. Different Ways to Hate a Language in Catalonia: Interpreting Low Solidarity Scores in Language Attitude Studies. In *Selected Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics*, ed. Jim Michnowicz and Robin Dodsworth, 40-49. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #2504.