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"Esdevench-se que un misage del cardenal "Quoniam tu solus sanctus" tramès misage al cardenal, que per desvariació de lenguatges s'enbargava la preycaçió (...). esdevenc-se que (...) un misage del cardenal de recomtament vench davant l'apostoli, al qual recomptà que grans treballs avia en lo món atrobats entre les gents, per ço cor eren de diverses nacions, havents diverses lenguatges; per la qual diversitat de lenguatges guerrejaven los uns ab los altres, per la qual guerra e lenguatges se desvariaven en creençes e en sectes contra-ls altres. Molt cogità l'apostoli en los -Hi- misages demunt dits, e ajustà tots los cardenals, als quals demanà quin consell puria ésser pres a destruir la diversitat dels lenguatges, ni a qual lenguatge sseria millor que hom feés convenir totes les gentes en general per tal que s'entenessen e s'amasen, e que a servir Déu se convenguesen.

Respòs un cardenal:-Senyer apostoli: a ço que vós demanats, és necessària cosa que (...) per cada província sia una ciutat en la qual sia parlat latí per uns e per altres; cor latí és lo pus general lenguatge, e en latí ha moltes paraules d'altres lenguatges, e en latí són nostres libres. Aprés aquestes coses cové que sien fembres e hòmens asignats a anar en aquella ciutat per aprendre latí e que, retornants en lur terra, lo mostren en lur començament que apendran a parlar; e en axí, per longa continuació, porets aportar a fi con en tot lo món no sia mas un lenguatge, una creença, una fe (...).

Con lo cardenal ach finides ses paraules, lo camarlench dix al cardenal que ço que el havia dit sseria trop greu de adur a fi, e que seria trop de gran messió a precurar aquell negoci."

"A messenger from the "Quondiam tu solus sanctus" cardinal sent a message to the cardinal, communicating that language diversity was hindering preaching (...), and a messenger from the 'narration cardinal' came before the Pope, and explained to him the great difficulties he had encountered among the people, for they were of diverse nations and had different languages; whereby they fought with each other, and, due to war and to language diversity, they went astray in beliefs and sects against each other. The Pope reflected intensely about the two messages just mentioned, gathered all the cardinals, and asked them what decision could be made to destroy language diversity, and to what language would it be best to make all people convene so that they could understand and love each other, and to make them convene to serve God.

Answered one cardinal: -Your Holiness: to achieve what you intend it is necessary that (...) there be a town in each province where Latin is spoken by everyone; for Latin is the most general language, and in Latin there are many words from other languages, and our books are written in Latin. Besides that, it is necessary that women and men be sent to that city to learn Latin so that, when back home, they teach Latin to the children when they start learning to speak; in that way, after a long process, you will achieve that in the whole world there be just one language, one belief, one faith (...)"

(Ramon Llull Libre de Evast e Blanquerna. Book IV, chap. XVIV "Tu solus dominus". Written between 1283 and 1285. Ed. Barcelona: Barcino, 1947)

"També és important de veure que la qüestió de la diversitat és sempre la qüestió de la coexistència -i la coexistència no implica aïllament absolut sinó contacte i imbricació. L'igualitarisme serà visionari si es basa en un aïllament fantàstic -però no ho serà si es preocupa de concebre les regles del joc que assegurin la coexistència."

"It is also important to see that the issue of diversity is always that of coexistence -and that coexistence does not imply absolute isolation but rather contact and imbrication. Egalitarianism will be visionary if it is based on a fantastic isolation -but it will not if it heeds the rules of the game that ensure coexistence."(Aracil, 1986a: 16)
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Outline of the Study
This is a thesis about the effects of a language-in-education policy on language behaviour in a plurilingual community which is in the process of reversing language shift. The community is Catalonia, in Spain, and the languages primarily involved are Catalan, the indigenous language of Catalonia, and Spanish, or Castilian, as it is known there. As a result of its official banning and persecution, Catalan has been excluded from most institutional spheres during the last two centuries, while Castilian has been promoted as the only official language. Contrary to the fate of most European subordinate languages, Catalan has been retained as the general vernacular by the local population with a strong feeling of national or ethnic pride.

During this century, Catalonia has witnessed the massive immigration of Castilian speakers. Due to the official repressive policy against the use of Catalan, this population was not required to linguistically accommodate to the host community. As a result, Castilian is today known by almost all inhabitants in Catalonia, but a significant minority cannot speak Catalan.

In the course of the last 20 years, Spain has been evolving from a highly centralised, heavily nationalist structure to a political system allowing for a certain degree of political self-rule for 'nationalities and regions', as expressed in Spain's current Constitution. Some of these 'regions' have taken this opportunity to promote their languages, basically by means of a language-in-education policy, hoping that schools would play a major role in reversing the process of language shift. Catalonia has spearheaded this move by progressively spreading Catalan as the medium of education at all levels. In less than 20 years Catalan has not only entered the school as a subject but become the main language of instruction in Catalonia, in a probably precedent transformation in contemporary Europe. The language-in-education policy applied in Catalonia has often been related to Canadian French immersion programmes, although fundamental differences between both systems exist, and its school model is known as 'Catalan school' or, more recently, the 'Catalan Conjunction Model' of schooling.

The 'Conjunction Model' has benefitted from substantial educational and pedagogical research, but one of its fundamental goals, that of reversing language shift, has remained surprisingly unexplored. The present study aims to remedy this by assessing to what extent the language-in-education policy has transformed former patterns of language use, and why. To do so, several steps have been taken: first, discussing the notion of language-in-education policy; second, analysing how language behaviour, the object to be transformed, has so far been described; third, reviewing both language-in-education policy and language behaviour in the Catalan-speaking area or Catalan Countries. I then move to this specific study and draw the conclusions with reference to both the Catalan case and the disciplines involved. The structure of this thesis is as follows:

Chapter 1 reviews the functions language-in-education policy has most often been assigned up to the present. It focusses especially on bilingual education and its definition, and points to what are considered biases towards the majority perspective, arguing for other complementary
standpoints, often more relevant to subordinate linguistic communities. A theoretical model for the analysis of bilingual education based on Spolsky and his associates is discussed, finally arriving at the conclusion of J. Fishman, C. Bratt Paulston, and other social scientists, that education is only a dependent variable in the transformation of sociolinguistic reality.

Chapter 2 analyses in what way language use has been so far described in terms of language choice and contact. Three approaches are briefly presented: first, the allocation paradigm, which considers language choice a variable dependent on the arrangement of (other) social variables, and consequently regards speakers as merely reacting to external variables; second, the interpretative and interactional paradigm, with its emphasis on the role of interlocutors in constructing the social context relevant to the interaction; and third, some attempts at combining both perspectives. At the end of this chapter a synthetic model is proposed to describe language choice and code-switching.

Chapter 3 is divided into two sections. Section 3.1 is devoted to the analysis of the sociolinguistic situation of Catalonia from two angles: first, language-in-education policy, with a major emphasis on the most recent periods, stressing its importance in the antagonistic processes of Spanish and Catalan language spread processes. Particular attention is paid to the policy displayed by the Catalan autonomous government during the last two decades and to its effects. The spread of Catalan across Catalonia's educational system is described, revealing how knowledge of Catalan has expanded without a loss of Castilian competence. Catalonia's 1993-94 'Language of instruction crisis' is examined in the light of the Spanish political situation. Section 3.2 focusses on research on language contact and language choice in the Catalan-speaking area, and provides an understanding of the norms of language choice and code-switching prevalent in Catalonia today.

Chapter 4 deals with the methodological options employed in the present research: a case study based on the one-year ethnographic observation of a school, the analysis of questionnaires, interviews and recordings of spontaneous data both during classes and in extra-curricular activities and leisure time. A detailed description of the locality chosen for this research, the particular school, and the subjects who formed the sample follow. Other methodological considerations, such as the transcription conventions adopted, are also discussed in this chapter.

Chapters 5 and 6 are devoted to the data analysis. Both quantitative and qualitative methodologies are employed. In chapter 5, observational, declared and recorded data on language choice and code-switching are combined to provide a clear picture of what norms of language use govern verbal interaction, whereas the distribution of language contact phenomena of lexical and morphosyntactic nature are identified and related to the social factors in chapter 6. A comparison is established between the patterns of language use in the school and those observed in the wider community of Santa Coloma and Catalonia. Finally, an
assessment is made regarding the extent to which the school's policy has resulted in an effective transformation of out-of-school language patterns, and to what extent the results can be judged as successful from the perspective of reversing language shift.

Chapter 7 draws conclusions from this particular experience, on the one hand, for Catalonia's particular language policy and for the whole of the Catalan-speaking area, and, on the other hand, for the fields of language-in-education planning, bilingual education research and language contact research. Special consideration is paid to those subordinate / minority communities striving to stop and reverse the process of language shift, and reflexion regarding language contact in comparable sociolinguistic situations.
1. Theoretical issues in bilingual education research
The aim of this chapter is to introduce some of issues of bilingual education research and of language-in-education planning in general which are relevant to the present study. The chapter will start by reviewing some of the most well-known typologies of bilingual education. It will be argued that in spite of the international dimension of language-in-education planning, most typologies emphasise bilingual education models and programmes developed in English-speaking countries, whereas experiences from other geographical contexts have received lesser attention. Also, while the pedagogical, psycholinguistic and attitudinal implications of bilingual education have been often investigated, little research has dealt with the consequences of language-in-education planning on language use norms. Several considerations will be made regarding these aspects, and it will be concluded that language-in-education planning would greatly benefit by enlarging its scope both in geographic and in theoretical terms.

1.1 Planning language in education

Most countries in the world are multilingual in one way or another. In some cases they include two or more monolingual linguistic groups side by side, while in other cases one or more of these groups are bilingual or even multilingual. Multilingualism may have been originated by migration, military conquest, commercial, cultural or religious links, among many other reasons. Irrespective of why and how multilingualism has come about, the fact is that a large number of social institutions around the world find themselves facing linguistic diversity.

Education is one of the social institutions most deeply connected with linguistic diversity in at least two fundamental senses. On the one hand, education deals basically with knowledge transfer, and transfer requires adequate means of communication, i.e., common linguistic varieties. On an increasing number of occasions, the knowledge to be transferred includes the satisfactory command of one or more linguistic varieties that are not originally possessed by the learners.

On the other hand, the educational process conveys a set of moral and ethic values, world conceptions, loyalties, and other ideological conceptions. At least since the birth of the nation-state, languages play a central place in this socialising process that attempts to transform children into citizens, subjects or believers.

The link between linguistic diversity and education probably goes back as far as education itself (cf. Lewis, 1976). The nature of this link has been extremely varied, and very often a controversial one. Language-in-education planning has been actively practiced in most countries either by explicitly acknowledging its relevance, or by absurdly denying the very existence of linguistic diversity and the need to deal adequately with it. Increasingly popular as it may be, the fact of acknowledging the importance of language-in-education planning does
not necessarily imply an attempt to preserve linguistic diversity: planning may be directed at homogeneity as much as at heterogeneity, if not more. In any case, though, the awareness that multilingualism constitutes a relevant focus of research has led to the thriving of a field that has come to be known as ‘bilingual education studies’.

Since its appearance as a subject of research, the term bilingual education has been the object of much debate regarding its meaning (cf. Mackey, 1970; Fishman, 1976: 24; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1984: 121ff; Baetens Beardsmore and Kohls, 1988: 240; Baker, 1993a: 150 ff). The world-wide extension of both schooling in multilingual settings and multilingual schooling has fuelled the discussion about the limits of what is and what is not comprised under this denomination. To some authors, the term should comprise all school settings where linguistically heterogeneous children receive their education irrespective of the teaching approach. In this case, the complementary term ‘monolingual education’ is reduced to the educational models where linguistically homogeneous children are taught by means of their first language. To other authors, education should incorporate at least a minimal consideration of the fact that children do not share the school language, for the educational model to be considered bilingual:

"An education is still (though only minimally) bilingual when only one of the two languages is included formally in the curriculum, provided that methodology of instruction recognises that the children possess the untaught language and that it influences the way in which they respond to instruction." (Lewis, 1977: 6)

To a majority of authors, bilingual education rests on the conscious, planned use of more than one language as a means of instruction during the educational process (Fishman, 1976: 24; Spolsky, Green and Read, 1976: 237; Siguán and Mackey, 1986: 62; Baetens Beardsmore and Kohls, 1988: 240; Hamers and Blanc, 1989: 189).

Already in the early 70’s, the degree of confusion attained by the indiscriminate use of the label bilingual education was noted by William Mackey (1970: 413). He claimed that bilingual education had become such a polysemic term that new definitions would be of little help for research; instead, he claimed that what was needed was "(...) a simple and complete typology based on the only common denominator - the use of two or more languages." (ibid.: 413)

A comparative approach results in a much deeper understanding of what bilingual education stands for. Nevertheless, typological proposals have to be based on the conscious assessment of the variables relevant to the object studied, and this assessment is far from being homogeneously shared by all authors. Thus, a review of the typologies so far proposed is called for here.
1.2 Some bilingual education typologies

Thousands of bilingual programmes were already underway around the world some twenty years ago (Fishman, 1974: 425), and, judging by the available literature, this global figure has increased substantially. A number of typologies have been formulated in an attempt to organize this variegated world according to different criteria. (see, among others, Fishman & Lovas, 1970; Mackey, 1970; Fishman 1974, 1976, 1992; Skutnabb-Kangas 1984, 1988; Hamers and Blanc, 1989: 189; Hornberger 1991; Baker 1993a). Theoretical approaches have taken inspiration from psychology, educational sciences, linguistics, sociolinguistics and diverse interdisciplinary perspectives. I will now review a number of these typologies in order to get a clearer idea of what is included under the label of bilingual education.

Mackey (1970) attempted to provide a classification of bilingual education based upon objective, quantifiable variables. He selected four criteria for classification, namely the pattern of distribution of languages in (1) the behavior of the bilingual at home, (2) the curriculum in the school, (3) the community of the immediate area within the nation, and (4) the status of the languages themselves. Each one was subsequently analysed according to its possible realizations. The outcome of this effort was different types of bilingual education.

Mackey’s typology undoubtedly represented a major step in the analysis of bilingual education, since it offered an objective tool which allowed for cross-cultural comparisons, taking into consideration both within-school and out-of-school factors. Without denying its utility, this classification has not been widely taken up for a number of reasons, the most fundamental probably being that a clearly argued explanation for Mackey’s choice of these four criteria instead of many others is missing. (cf. Skutnabb-Kangas, 1984: 122; Hamers and Blanc, 1989: 189).

Fishman and Lovas (1970) defined bilingual education as that using two languages (L1 and L2) as a means of instruction. This definition, quoted from Andersson (1968), was intended to clearly differentiate it from programmes with English as a Second Language (ESL) in the U.S.A. These authors introduced a sociolinguistic perspective and suggested a classification of bilingual education which:

"(...) is not based on student and schedule characteristics such as proportion of students speaking a certain language and proportion of time devoted to each language (...). Rather it looks to the kinds of sociolinguistics development implied in the program objectives, and suggests that various kinds of programs assume and lead to particular societal roles for the languages taught.” (Fishman, 1972: 85)

This classification stressed the societal implications of its models, which could not be ignored without risking failure originating in a mismatch between programme and sociolinguistic reality. Four possible models were described and U.S. instances of each given:
1. **Transitional bilingualism**, whose goal would be language shift and consequently would not encourage L1 development.

2. **Monoliterate bilingualism**, which, while encouraging audio-oral bilingualism, would promote literacy only in L2. In the American context, this may lead to ultimate language shift.

3. **Partial bilingualism**, which would promote bilingualism and biliteracy but restrict L1 to certain culture-related subject matters which are mostly ethnic related.

4. **Full bilingualism**, which would seek development of all skills in both languages in all domains for all students.

This last type was criticised by the authors, since the ideal of an equally balanced bilingual speech community did not appear to be realistic, for this type of programme did not have "(...) a clearly articulated goal with respect to societal reality." (Fishman, 1972: 89)

Fishman (1972), classified bilingual education policies according to the use of either L1, L2, or both, in relation to their possible school integration and eventual social integration. Three kinds of policies were possible: two of them based on monolingualism or monodialectalism, type A and type C, and a second one, based on bilingualism or bidialectalism, type B. Monolingual in-school policies could be the result of either promoting a single, unifying great tradition via a single system (type A), or the consequence of the non-existence of such a unifying tradition; this would result in parallel systems of monolingual subsections in the same polity (type C). This classification granted bilingual education with considerable strength in enhancing social integration; it was nevertheless too broad in the sense that it did not actually classify bilingual education strictu sensu but in its broader implications.

In order to evaluate the significance of each variable under study, Fishman (1974) analysed more than 60 bilingual education models. The variables selected for analysis were: (1) Language given primary emphasis (LPE) vs. language given secondary emphasis (LSE); (2) mother tongue vs. other tongue; (3) minor vs. major language; (4) out-of-school formal institutions; (5) goal intensity of LPE and LSE; (6) admission selectivity (high, medium or low); (7) the extent to which either the language of primary or secondary emphasis was dependent on school instruction (rather than on more general societal participation) in order to be learned; (8) the extent to which there was a nationalist or other heightened socio-political sentiment on behalf of either language of instruction. The results of this study confirmed the importance of societal variables in explaining the success or failure recorded in LPE and LSE teaching. They confirmed that exclusive school-dependency predicted low achievements and that psycho-educational variables added medium-to-low explanatory power to societal variables (especially for LSE).
Fishman's (1974) analysis was a genuine attempt to transcend the purely descriptive stage and to explore the possibilities of a predictive model based primarily on sociological variables. It afforded evidence for the primacy of sociological factors in the face of psychological or educational aspects. But this emphasis on sociological emphasis leaves unanswered some basic questions in bilingual education research: can the choice of a programme make a difference in sociolinguistic outcomes? and, in what cases does the option for a given bilingual programme in a given setting make a real difference?

In her analyses of language maintenance and shift in ethnolinguistic contact situation, Paulston has repeatedly stated that bilingual education is just an intervening, not the causal variable of the outcomes (cf. Paulston 1992, 1994 *passim*). She has deemphasised the role of pedagogic, psychologic and related factors, and has classified bilingual education in three basic types:

"(1) Immersion programs where all schooling is in the L2, with the possible exception of a component in the mother tongue skills. (...) (2) Programs taught in the mother tongue with an SL component, (...) (3) Programs in which two languages are used as the medium of instruction." Paulston (1975: 10)

This typology of bilingual education is built on two simple questions concerning methodology: (a) is the language used as a means of instruction the students' first language?, and (b) how many languages are used as means of instruction? The simplicity inherent to this typology hides the fact that the same rubric includes programmes which produce completely opposite results (e.g. transitional bilingual programmes vs. French immersion in Canada, both included under the third type). This classification is also misleading in its terminology. Paradoxically, the Canadian immersion programmes would *not* qualify as "immersion" in Paulston's terms, since even total French immersion includes teaching through English in a number of subject-matters (cf. Swain and Lapkin, 1982; Ouellet, 1990), while all submersion and most transitional programmes (cf. Fishman, 1976, Hornberger, 1991) would be considered 'immersion programmes' according to this classification.

Fishman (1976: 23ff) insisted on Fishman and Lovas' (1970) classification according to the *intensity* of bilingual education and complemented it with another typology based on their *goals*. According to this (Fishman, 1976: 27ff), bilingual educational programmes would be considered as either (a) *compensatory* programmes, i.e., those designed to "overcome the diseases of the poor" by teaching them in their first language; (b) *enrichment* programmes, i.e., those programmes designed to offer additional educational and cultural exposure and addressed to middle or higher classes; and, finally, (c) *group-maintenance programmes*, which attempt to preserve and enhance (minority) groups.

Skutnabb-Kangas' (1984: 121ff) typology of bilingual education stems from her engagement with minorities and the promotion of bilingualism. This classification is based on several variables, mostly sociological, sociolinguistic, and methodological: medium of instruction,
group-membership (whether majority or minority), linguistic homogeneity or heterogeneity in the classroom, programme type, societal goal and linguistic aim. Skutnabb-Kangas (1988) classifies several bilingual education programmes as producing either a high degree of success or a low degree of success. This success is measured as an answer to the question "under which conditions does instruction in L1 or L2, respectively, lead to high levels of bilingualism?". She reviews three variables for each programme: linguistic goal, societal goal and academic goal (see graph 1, appendix 1). As other authors dealing with minority education (e.g. Artigal, 1989a) Skutnabb-Kangas emphasizes the distinction between submersion, or sink-or-swim programmes for minority students, and immersion, which she sees linked with higher social status and homogeneous linguistic classes (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1988: 40).

Hornberger (1991) reviews a number of previous typologies of bilingual education programmes. She points out that there exists a considerable confusion in the literature regarding what could be defined as goals, methods and contexts, and that they are usually jumbled in ad hoc classifications. She incorporates the distinction between models and programme type proposed by Trueba (1979):

"I define models in terms of their goals with respect to language, culture, and society, and program types in terms of characteristics relating to student population, teachers, and program structure (cf. Trueba’s ‘design’; Cohen, 1983). Unlike Trueba, I do not see particular types as subdivisions of particular models; rather, I suggest that any one model may be implemented via a wide range of types." (Hornberger, 1991: 222)

This distinction allows Hornberger to discriminate between three basic models of bilingual education (see table 1.1): (a) transitional, (b) maintenance, and (c) enrichment (cf. Fishman, 1976).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.1: Bilingual education model types.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language shift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural assimilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social incorporation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The author criticizes the terminological and conceptual confusion which rests on considering enrichment bilingual programmes as just a variety of maintenance. Hornberger describes her view on the unique goals and principles of enrichment bilingual education (cf. Fishman, 1979) as:

"(...) language development, cultural pluralism, and social autonomy; (...) The primary identifying characteristic for enrichment bilingual education is that the program structure incorporate a recognition that the minority language is not only a right of its speakers but a potential resource for majority language speakers."

(Hornberger, 1991: 226)
Hornberger’s claim that this model of enrichment bilingual education can be implemented via different programme types and not only via immersion is illustrated with her review of what she terms a *two-way maintenance programme* in the U.S.A.

Fishman (1991: 100) puts forward a distinction of minority education according to purely sociological criteria. This classification does not include programmes affecting majority students, and it specifically addresses the needs of what he calls RLSers, or activists favouring the recuperation of a given language (From *Reversing Language Shift*, RLS + er). No pedagogic, linguistic or other criteria come into play in this typology. The fundamental difference between *schools of type a* and *schools of type b* is economic and organizational: schools of type *a* are organized, funded and attended by members of the minority group, while schools of type *b* get their funds from the educational system in the hands of the majority, and therefore depend to a greater extent on the power balance between minority and majority.

Baker (1993a: chap. 12) synthesizes previous classifications of bilingual education and presents his own typology, which owes much to Skutnabb-Kangas’ models (See table 1.1, appendix 1). He sets a preliminary distinction between *weak* and *strong* forms of bilingual education (*ibid.*: 152 ff), based on the pursued outcomes of language education. Weak bilingual education would not seek full-fledged bilingualism as a result of school action; instead, monolingualism or limited bilingualism would be the desired goal. Strong bilingual education, on the other hand, is portrayed as aiming at full-fledged bilingualism. This distinction is produced according to four criteria: (a) typical type of child involved, (b) language(s) used in the classroom, (c) societal and educational aim of the programme, and (c) aim in language outcome.

This brief overview of some bilingual education typologies has shown that, despite some degree of coincidence, agreement is by no means general among these -and other- authors. Some of them select some variables, while others prefer different factors, and these choices are not always fully explained. In the next sections, I will try to point out a number of inadequacies in these typologies, and I will suggest a number of aspects that they should incorporate.
1.3 Inadequacies of the typologies reviewed

The typologies we have just reviewed, and others we have skipped, such as Siguán and Mackey (1986), share a number of characteristics which can be considered as inadequacies regarding the analysis of bilingual education from a sociolinguistic perspective.

1. There is insufficient concern about the relevance of each variable.
2. Variables are often poorly operationalized.
3. Imbalanced attention is paid to different bilingual education programmes and/or models.

1.3.1 The assessment of variables

The confusion between goals and methods has already been pointed out by Hornberger (1991). But this is not the only terminological and conceptual confusion: while most of the classifications include a number of societal, pedagogical-methodological, psychological and other aspects, they usually fall short in justifying the choice of these very variables, an inadequacy which contributes to make classifications difficult for cross-comparison. There seems to be little concern about assessing the relevance of each variable, and criteria are often selected as self-evident and the choice of one over the other usually receives little discussion.

This is especially true when societal variables are taken into consideration. Typologies range from considering them as the lion's share of the classification (Mackey, 1970) to placing them on an equal footing with pedagogic and linguistic criteria (Baker, 1993a) or even turning social and cultural variables as two among a dozen criteria (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1988). Fishman (1976: 24) established a difference between school-oriented typologies, or those which classify schools according to programme and programme outcomes, and context-oriented typologies, i.e., those which classify according to the social factors which contribute to the establishment of bilingual programmes.

Notwithstanding, there seem to be good reasons to believe that schooling is merely an intervening variable in the processes that affect multilingual communities. As Paulston puts it:

"The major point to understand about language as a group behaviour is that language is almost never the causal factor [of language maintenance or shift], never the factor that gives rise to, brings about, and causes things to happen, but rather language mirrors social conditions, mirror man's relationship to man. (...) The corollary to this simple, yet hard to grasp point is that bilingual education (mother tongue education, home language education, i.e. education in the national language plus the ethnic group's own language) is in itself not a causal factor." (Paulston, 1994: 6)

See also the critics to Cummins' language proficiency model in Rivera (ed)(1984), especially Troike (1994), for Cummins' alleged failure to incorporate societal variables, and his own answer: "In short, the causal primacy of sociopolitical factors is not in question." (Cummins 1984b: 72).
The inability to agree on a common ground to evaluate the role played by each variable in bilingual education has been explained by Christina Bratt Paulston as a consequence of the disparate social and historical contexts in which bilingual education takes place and, ultimately, to scientists’ (and laymen’s) contradictory paradigms and particular theories (Paulston, 1977b).

On the one hand, researchers in the *equilibrium paradigm*, mostly in their structuralist-functionalist version, posit a central role for (bilingual) education as an independent variable. According to this view, pedagogic and methodological aspects are considered as factors equally relevant to other variables, in bringing about social transformation.

On the other hand, researchers in the *conflict paradigm* assume that:

"The major point is that the research findings on bilingual education cannot be interpreted unless BE [i.e. Bilingual Education] is interpreted as an intervening variable rather than a causal factor. (...) explanatory factors of BE are to be found in the social relationship of the linguistic groups in contact (...)." (Paulston, 1992: vii)

This view would logically require a classification which considered psychological, pedagogic and methodological aspects of bilingual education on a level different from those of social aspects, since the outcome of the former are expected to be a function of the latter. Surprisingly, the insistence on the fundamental importance of social aspects has not led to this but to the opposite result in researchers that otherwise may be seen as espousing conflictivist positions (e.g., Skutnabb-Kangas, 1988).

The application of typologies without the necessary distinctions between different criteria to new bilingual education models has often produced paradoxical results. For instance, Fishman’s (1976: 24) four kinds of bilingual education cannot be applied to Luxemburg, where a programme which methodologically coincides with American transitional programmes turns out to aim at (and indeed obtain) the results of both a maintenance and an enrichment programme (Lebrun and Baetens Beardsmore, 1993: 106). The very same paradox appears when European schools are considered (Baetens Beardsmore, 1993b: 123). Other examples could be added to prove how submersion methodologies have succeeded in bilingualizing yet they have failed completely in provoking language shift. Andorra, the tiny independent Catalan country in the Pyrenees furnishes us with such an example: until recently, no school in Catalan existed, and no Catalan language course was given at school. Instead, Spanish and French school systems were offered to Andorrans, who therefore opted between two foreign language systems. No language shift was recorded in Andorra, where the only formal and informal language for Andorrans’ ingroup communication was and is Catalan. It was not until 1982, when a locally born second generation of immigrants (Spanish, French, Portuguese, Asians, etc.) arrived at school, that a third school model working in Catalan, the Andorran school, was created so that this population integrated into Andorran society (cf. Govern d’Andorra, 1994).
1.3.2 Poorly operationalized variables

Most typologies do not define accurately either the variables used for classification or their categories. This results in troubles in categorizing bilingual education programmes which were not previously foreseen. These typologies often present their variables as discrete, that is, they oppose two or more concepts. Yet, it is hard to believe that such a clearcut opposition between, for example, minority-majority, assimilation-irredentism is the rule and not the exception. From a methodological point of view, continual variables seem to fit these concepts much better. Social aspects are, by far, the most weakly defined variables in a large number of typologies.

It is often the case that some of the categories used for societal variables are of a compound nature: they are umbrella names, cover terms which include several criteria, both objective and subjective in nature. This mixing up may unnecessarily blur similarities and exacerbate dissimilarities. For instance, acculturation and irredentism (Mackey, 1970) seem to be just two ways to suppress linguistic and cultural group boundaries, while apartheid and detachment / autonomy (Baker, 1993a) seek both a degree of separation between the groups as a way to preserve or encourage the socioeconomic, political, cultural, etc., distance between them. The major difference between either term is who is deciding to reinforce the merging or the separation, and what its direction will be, and therefore whom it benefits (cf. Baetens Beardsmore, 1992); but the final goal, be it merging or separation, and the means to attain it, are shared¹. In order to achieve a clearer typology of language planning in education, some basic factors should be accurately distinguished and analysed independently: these are, at least, social goals - social separation vs. merging -; decision-makers - who decides what programme is to be implemented, either the same group which receives a particular kind of education or another, dominant group-; and moral evaluation of the goals and procedures to attain them.

Several typologies (e.g. Skutnabb-Kangas, 1984, 1988; Hornberger, 1991; Baker, 1993a) use terms to describe societal goals which belong to different levels of analysis: some are of a clear linguistic-cultural nature, such as assimilation and maintenance. Others belong to socioeconomic realities, such as apartheid and detachment / autonomy, and are a priori independent of language and culture. While there is a relationship between both categories, it is not self-evident that this is a relation of isomorphism.

Cummins (1993a) has rightly tried to distinguish Skutnabb-Kangas social goals into (1) educational goals, which include equity (academic achievement in both languages) and enrichment (access to two languages and cultures); (2) sociolinguistic goals, addressed to promote access to particular languages (heritage or of wider communication); (3) sociopolitical goals, which refer to the status and way of participation foreseen for the students in the wider

¹It should be noted that most of these terms are biased in one sense or another: neither apartheid, assimilation, autonomy
society, such as total assimilation, integration or segregation.

Paulston (1975, 1977a, 1977b) has repeatedly pointed out Schermerhorn's (1970: 80 ff.) useful reminder of the distinct nature of cultural and structural features. Indeed, Schermerhorn himself criticizes the simultaneous use of assimilation and pluralism together with secession and militancy as the alternative goals of subordinate groups, since the two pairs are of a different intrinsic nature. Pluralism may furnish us with an excellent example of this confused terminological use. It is seldom defined with regard to bilingual education: Is it an ideological, a political, a cultural or a structural term? (cf. Schermerhorn, 1970: 122 ff) And, if it is a cultural term, what are the explicit structural modifications needed to attain it? Is it a language competence or a language use term? Does it stand for multilingualism for all, or rather for independent community development, including community monolingualism? Despite its vagueness, or better, thanks to it, pluralism appears in many typologies (cf. Skutnabb-Kangas, 1984, 1988; Mikes, 1986: 21; Hornberger, 1991; Baker, 1993a), and it is applied to both bilingual education for both superordinate (immersion) and subordinate (maintenance / heritage language programmes) groups (Baker, 1993a: 153).

Another frequently overlooked distinction is that between language competence and language use (cf. section 1.4). The pursuit of bilingual competence is not necessarily linked with the increase in the use of one of the languages involved in the programme for non-educational purposes. This distinction is connected with the common confusion between individual features and group phenomena detectable in the typologies reviewed. Thus, assimilation is a sociolinguistic term which implies eventual language shift - group phenomenon - and language loss - individual phenomenon - (according to Fase, Jaspaert and Kroon's (eds)(1992) terminology); maintenance may be used as either a language competence, and therefore an individual matter, but it has also a social meaning; whereas, enrichment seems clearly related to personal linguistic abilities (See table 1.2). Language-in-education planning, and bilingual education in particular, should clarify its goals in all these levels.

Table 1.2. Group vs. individual nature of bilingual education targets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Group level</th>
<th>Individual level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language competence</td>
<td>assimilation (?); language shift / maintenance / spread</td>
<td>assimilation (?); language loss, enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language use</td>
<td>assimilation; language shift / maintenance / spread</td>
<td>assimilation (?); language loss, enrichment (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3.3 The unequal treatment of bilingual education programmes around the world

Another frequent inadequacy of typologies is that they pay imbalanced attention is paid to different bilingual education programmes and/or models. Some bilingual education experiences, such as the U.S.A. transitional and submersion programmes and the Canadian French immersion models, have won a great deal of interest, while others have been scarcely researched. This unequal treatment may be responsible for the overemphasis on some aspects of bilingual education and the relative neglect of others, and can be broken down into a number of biases.

I The North-American bias

Although bilingual education has been and is a world-wide phenomenon, it cannot be denied that North-America has played a central, decisive role in establishing it as a field of scholarly interest since the 50's, and much of the current orientation of bilingual education studies is deeply rooted in North-American debates. Bilingual programmes in the U.S.A. and Canadian French immersion programmes have launched most of the research on bilingual education studies and are, so far, the best studied cases (cf. Baetens Beardsmore, 1993a: 1). These have so far overshadowed European and other experiences, more often than not restricted to national borders and languages.

Despite significant attempts to counter this trend, current typologies of bilingual education seem to have focussed their attention mostly on North-American and, to a lesser extent, other English-speaking countries. This fact has probably introduced a bias, since research on bilingual education has to a great extent been focussed on two main points of attention: on the one hand, deprived immigrant minorities' academic achievement and cultural assimilation to the mainstream society, i.e., the U.S.A. debate on transition vs. submersion described in Cummins (1991), Casanova (1991) or Paulston (1991); on the other hand, enrichment programme for a dominant group, basically Canadian French immersion for non-francophones. Examples of this North-American, English-speaking bias are, for instance, Fishman and Lovas (1970) and Fishman (1976); Hamers and Blanc (1989:187 ff) review of bilingual education; or Baker's (1992a: 150-167; see table above) typology, where most of the 10 forms of bilingual education are supported by only U.S.A / Canadian / British examples.

To claim that such a bias exists is not to say that other situations are not present in the literature: Not only cases comparable to those in the U.S.A. (e.g. immigrant minorities in officially monolingual countries such as Turks in Germany and Finns in Sweden), but also other experiences from European, African, Asian or even Pacific linguistics communities do find their way from time to time into the internationally available literature. In fact, the late 80's and the 90's have witnessed a considerable enlargement of the interest on bilingual education in the rest
of the world. See, for instance, García (ed) 1991. Much interest has arisen in Europe, as can be seen, among others, by Jørgensen et al. (eds) (1988); Sikma and Gorter (1990); Jaspers and Kroon (eds) (1991); Ammon, Mattheier and Nelde (eds) (1993); Baetens Beardsmore (ed) (1993); Extra and Verhoeven (eds) (1993); Baetens Beardsmore (1994); Asia and the South Pacific have seen the organization of the Conference on Bilingualism and National Development (Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 13 (1&2); see also Baldauf and Luke, 1990); and Africa has also attracted renewed interest (e.g. Rubagumya (ed.) 1990). But it is still the case that despite good-hearted efforts to take these and other cases into consideration, classifications of bilingual education at hand seem to owe a lot to the North-American debates, while other contributions usually remain theoretically marginal.

II Consequences of the North-American, English-speaking bias

This emphasis on North-American realities bears several consequences. Paulston (1977b: 72-79) has already critically analysed how the different goals and assumptions in bilingual education programmes in the U.S.A. and Canada have consistently led researchers to investigate divergent aspects of reality, to the point that Canadian research on immersion has involuntarily loaded the U.S.A. bilingual programmes opponents' dialectic weapons. Paulston's analysis shows how geographical limitedness may carry heavy tolls. To all appearances, bilingual education research has suffered both at a theoretical and at a practical level from such limitations.

Consequences at the theoretical level are the export of models and terminology to geographical settings where little or no research at all has been done on bilingual education. This export is sometimes unduely done, and substantial differences between models and programmes may remain hidden because of coincidences in terminology. An instance is the spread of the term "immersion" to cover all kinds of second-language programmes around the world... even structured immersion (!) in the U.S.A., which some researchers would consider submersion (Cummins, 1991: 198; see section 3.2 for the Catalan case).

Another major theoretical consequence of this bias is that the emphasis given to certain aspects of bilingual education in Canada or the U.S.A. may overshadow other aspects which are of more salience for communities elsewhere. Thus, the criteria used to design bilingual education typologies may be culturally biased. Bilingual education specialists have occupied themselves mostly with the analysis of language competence in L1 and L2 and social-psychological aspects such as attitudes towards the other group. Central points for their research have been:

"(1) the choice of medium of instruction, whether in the mother tongue or the L2, and consequent achievement of language skills, especially in reading; (2) the achievement of subject matter knowledge in the fields like math, science, etc. in the mother tongue compared to in the L2; and (3) the concern about possible deleterious cognitive effects of following a curriculum in a second language." (Paulston, 1975: 10-11)
There exists at least another fact which is crucial for communities attempting to arrest language shift: effects of bilingual education on actual language use. The scarcity of research on this issue may well be considered as another result of the North-American bias.
1.4 Language use in bilingual education research

Cooper (1989: 61) suggested language planning deals with four types of adoption of innovations: (a) awareness, (b) evaluation, (c) proficiency, (d) usage. Although not all bilingual programmes try to influence their pupils’ linguistic behaviours, a number among them are designed to promote the usage of given languages over others. Surprising as it may seem, actual language use has not attracted a comparable amount of interest on the part of researchers as first and second language competence or results on intergroup attitudes. The aforementioned biases, as well as the predominance of psychological and educational perspectives over sociological approaches, may have played a role in this oblivions. The prevalence of some theories of L2 acquisition which emphasize the importance of input over the role of output can also be pointed at as responsible for such a neglect.

The fact is that language use has remained a somewhat marginal field in bilingual education studies. Reviews of language-in-education planning such as Ingram (1989) do not grant it any place. Research on Canadian immersion planning has practically avoided the issue. As an instance, note the minimal space which it occupies in Swain and Lapkin’s (1982) review of immersion in Ontario, its non-existence in Ouellet’s (1990) synthesis of Canadian French immersion, its humble role in Cummins (1989) future prospects for research, in Harley’s (1991) direction in immersion research, and in Lapkin and Swain with Shapson’s (1990) French immersion agenda for the 90s. Research in the U.S.A. has not developed more interest on the issue, as witnessed by a simple search in the ERIC or Dissertation Abstracts data bases.

At least two aspects of language use in relation with bilingual education seem to be of relevance for full research:

a. Language use in relation with language acquisition and classroom management,
b. The impact of bilingual education on language use in multilingual settings.

Both aspects will be reviewed in the next sections.

1.4.1 Language use and language acquisition

Despite some contradictory findings (see Day, 1985a), the importance of spontaneous interaction in second language acquisition is supported by research all over the world. To give just a couple of examples, let us remember that Ahmaric-speaking subjects claimed to have learned Galla, a language which was totally absent from the school curriculum in Ethiopia (Cooper, 1977), or that a remarkable number of Italian-speaking children turned out to have learned Friulian (Ladino) from their peers and the broad societal context, despite the fact the latter is a minority language in a process of language shift (Dutto, 1990: 155, 163). Wong Fillmore (1985: 18) points out the widespread belief among American educationalists that children pick up English from their peers even more than from their teachers.
Yet research on this subject has not abounded to date. Krashen's (1981, 1982) influential and controversial Input Theory, according to which language acquisition is to be obtained from comprehensible input may be somehow held responsible for the relative lack of study of the relationship between language interaction and language acquisition.

Krashen's Input hypothesis has been challenged by Swain (1985), who has argued that input alone is insufficient to account for the language acquisition gap displayed in different linguistic abilities by French immersion students in Canada. She attributed a vital role to output in a variety of language acquisition aspects:

"The claim, then, is that producing the language may be the trigger that forces the learner to pay attention to the means of expression needed in order to successfully convey his or her own intended meaning." (Swain, 1985: 249)

According to Swain's output hypothesis, output would be a multifaceted tool which (a) facilitates automaticity in L2, (b) forces the learner to move from a general semantic analysis to a precise syntactic processing, (c) permits the learner to test out language hypotheses, and (d) provides feedback from other speakers (Swain, 1993: 159).

In their research on curricular and extracurricular factors influencing language acquisition among European Schools' students, Housen and Baetens Beardsmore (1987) pointed to the relevance of spontaneous interaction in second language acquisition, since:

"The most important factor [to explain L2 competence] was the spontaneous seeking out of opportunities to use a particular language in self-initiated interactions, particularly with peers. This factor outweighed attitudinal and motivational dispositions and was clearly dependent on the nature of the social environment in the school" (Baetens Beardsmore, 1993b: 148)

Thus, immediate pertinence of second language, i.e., the need to operate in the second language once outside the classroom, has been pointed out as the factor enhancing second -and even third and fourth- language competence in the highly successful European Schools (Baetens Beardsmore and Kohls, 1988: 259).

Be it as an 'indirect contribution' to acquisition which encourages the reception of adequately tuned input (Krashen, 1987: 60ff); as a means to enlarge the learner's competence (cf. McLaughlin, 1987: 50); or be it as the multifaceted tool described by Swain, the fact is that active language use has an important role in languages acquisition that makes it deserve more attention from research.

Martin Jones (1991) reviewed the different approaches to the use of more than one language in educational settings, pointing to different phases and goals. Some of the most significant research in the field of language use in bilingual schooling has to be attributed to scholars working from a pedagogical, educationalist perspective in the U.S.A. This research originated
from the particular American educational and sociopolitical situation, where several languages were being used by both children and teachers in unknown ways across the different -mostly transitional- bilingual programmes to English, to the point that:

"In fact, there is wide consensus among practitioners in the United States, that in practice these programs [i.e., bilingual programmes] are best defined administratively in fiscal terms, as programs which receive a certain type of funding, because many in fact, seldom if ever use the primary language of the children they serve." (Ramírez and Merino, 1990: 64)

By the mid-1970s, some researchers were beginning to shift their focus to classroom-based studies. Research focused on the time each pupil spends speaking either language, which proved English to be more widely used in the American bilingual classrooms. "But it soon became apparent that this evidence was of a very limited nature." (Martin Jones, 1991: 87)

Research focussed then on teachers' and pupils' speech acts. "Yet, with hindsight, we can see that this work was constrained by the approach adopted to discourse analysis. As in the early studies that relied on Flanders-type coding schemes, the approach is still a static, taxonomic and quantitative one. The focus is still on individual acts rather than on the sequential flow of classroom discourse." (Martin Jones, 1991: 91)

Finally, research has progressively adopted a more ethnographic nature which analyses code-switching as a way to organize the interaction in the classroom.

The debate in the mid 70's centred on language distribution issues in bilingual schooling, with two main positions: those which proposed a strict separation of both languages and those who argued for their combination. Language allocation and teachers' patterns of language use have been repeatedly classified: Wong Fillmore and Valadez (1986) have talked about alternate-days approach, phased introduction of L2, etc.; Jacobson (1990) has distinguished between separate, concurrent and merged patterns. There exists a widespread belief that languages should be separated on consistent lines (cf. Wong Fillmore, 1985). Nevertheless, the requirement of avoiding code-switching in the classroom has come under fire by some researchers (cf. Jacobson and Faltis (eds), 1990: passim). Jacobson (1990) has also launched the New Concurrent Approach, a sophisticated method to incorporate two languages following structured patterns of code-switching. Teacher's code-switching has thus entered the educational arena as a pedagogical tool and has spread to foreign language teaching (Giauque and Ely, 1990). Unfortunately, the very origin of this research on language use has severely shrunk its possibilities. As far as I know, it seems to have focussed primarily on transitional models for subordinate populations in the process of language shift, mostly in the United States. This limited scope has carried heavy practical and theoretical consequences. It has not only favoured a reductionist understanding of what bilingual education is: "Bilingual methodology as a technical construct concerning how to teach children whose first language is not English (...)." (Jacobson, 1990: 3). Rather, the real problem is that the New Concurrent Approach seems to derive from locally-based statements which are presumed to be universal, such as:
"The artificiality of language separation based on any of these criteria [topic, person, time and place] is obvious as in real life situation neither topic nor person nor time nor place are easily controlled." (Jacobson, 1990: 6. My stress)

As proved by the Catalan case, the fact that language separation is not systematically maintained in some non-English speaking communities in the U.S.A. does not imply that such behaviour does not exist elsewhere.

An alternative approach to language use is that adopted by Dodson's bilingual methodology. This justifies code-switching between target and first languages as a mechanism to improve second language learning, in contrast with most communicative methods that discourage any switch to the students' L1 (cf. Caldwell, 1990).

Most of this research has focussed on teachers' and teachers-children relationships. Research on pupils' language use in bilingual educational environments seems to be much scarcer; Baetens Beardsmore and Anselmi (1991) furnished a valuable example of such a strand of research (see next chapter). Ramírez and Merino (1990: 96) show that interaction involving children in 'English immersion' and transitional Spanish bilingual classes in the U.S.A. were overwhelmingly teacher initiated (more than 75%), and that each language was used in a different way, but the authors do not include a comparison of how much each language is used in respect to the other.

A most significant contribution to the issue of both teachers' and peers' influence on the acquisition of second language derives from Wong Fillmore (1982): according to her analysis, traditional, teacher-centred classroom organization may enhance second language acquisition in conditions where few native speakers of that language are present among the pupils. In these classrooms the teacher becomes the sole source of L2. An organization favouring peer interaction in such classrooms seems to facilitate either the use of L1 or the apparition of a fossilized interlanguage as a classroom dialect.

Tarone and Swain (1995) have tried to explain why French immersion pupils avoid interacting with their peers in their L2, and why this avoidance seems more prominent in the later courses than in the initial ones. They have suggested that immersion classrooms can be conceived as diglossic unstable speech communities where the L2 corresponds to the formal variety and L1 furnishes the vernacular elements. Without denying the fact that interacting in L1 is easier than communicating via their L2, these authors have pointed to the pupils' lack of opportunity to acquire the L2 vernacular varieties as a main reason for their scarce use of this language for peer communication. According to them, adolescence would increase the need for building the subjects' individual personalities, something often achieved by using youth slang.

"The need to perform the social functions is far greater to the children's social identity than the need to stay in the L2 (and look like a dweeb) when they have and share the L1 style they need." (Tarone and Swain,
Thus, the lack of L2 use is attributed to a deficient exposition to its informal varieties. It is suggested that exposition to these varieties would greatly increase their peer use.

1.4.2 Impact of bilingual education on language use

While the first side of the coin, impact of language use on language acquisition, is receiving increasing attention, the other side of the story has remained unexplicably less researched. The impact of bilingual education on language use among peers in the classroom and its out-of-the-classroom consequences remains the Cinderella of bilingual education studies.

Bilingual education not only attempts to teach language: "Bilingual education is usually not merely a pedagogical strategy to improve learning. More often it is connected to other social goals." (Rubin, 1984: 10). These other goals include a wide range of social and cultural aspects, among which language maintenance and identity survival are often central.

"As a formal institution of socialization, education is necessarily also co-responsible for and engaged in sociocultural socialization, i.e. in socialization for ethnic membership and for ethnic consciousness." (Fishman, 1989: 418)

Prominent in this socialization pattern stand, in many cultures-in-contact, language behaviour patterns. These are only partially dependent on language knowledge, and are made up of the patterns of code choice and code-switching. Schools have historically played a significant role as agencies charged with the transformation of so-considered undesirable patterns of language use. Different rationales have been produced to support the efforts addressed at modifying sociolinguistic realities; quite often, they have been tinged with nationalism and made frequent appeals to the need of homogeneity as a pre-requisite for nation-building and successful economic development. The methods employed to achieve such goals have ranged from liberal measures such as placing children from heterogeneous linguistic backgrounds together, seeking to their becoming bilingual and eventually assimilating, as in the case of Indian children in the U.S.A. quoted by Philips (1985: 314), to the prohibition of the repressed languages, as was the case in Guam (Day, 1985b: 174) under U.S.A. administration. These methods have often included punitive techniques, as the French signal (Picoche and Marchello-Nizia, 1989: 32), the Spanish sortija (Siguán, 1992: 31) or the Japanese "dialect penalty plate" (Miyawaki, 1992: 360). It has often been the case that parents themselves have opted for these school practices as a way to promote what they see as desirable language learning and/or social integration, often as a response to non-pluralistic societies, but not exclusively.

But the goals sought by the educational system have not always been those of more or less brutal assimilation. Today, the 'European Schools' are attempting a combination of language
and identity maintenance plus language enrichment and the creation of a shared European identity by means of what has been called social engineering, with full support of parents (Baetens Beardsmore, 1993b: 124). In fact, all language-in-education systems transmit a number of either overt or covert patterns of language use. Language use promotion is clearly a goal for many subordinate linguistic communities, as the Basque Director of Primary Education makes explicit:

"Es el incremento del uso del euskera el objetivo central, más que el incremento del conocimiento de dicha lengua. Y es en función de este objetivo que debe de analizarse la programación de cada modelo, de cada contexto educativo, de cada centro y de cada aula." It is the increase in the usage of Basque, rather than the increase in the knowledge, which constitutes the central goal [of Basque language planning in education]. And it is in relation with that goal that the programme of every model, every educational context, every educational centre, and every classroom, must be analysed. (Hizkunz, 1986: 8).

The awareness that language-in-education planning may have an impact on language use is by no means new. It was clearly stated by Kjolseth (1972) in a remarkable paper which accused most bilingual programmes in the U.S.A. of encouraging covert assimilation of language minorities and denounced some optimistic views of their purportedly pluralistic goals. The paper, while acknowledging the limited role school can play in language destiny, emphasised the importance of language use in design and evaluation of bilingual programmes. Starting from Fishman's assumption that societal bilingualism cannot persist without diglossia (understood as functional distribution) Kjolseth proposed:

"Hence a bilingual program which fosters bilingual use outside the school and norms of stable and balanced diglossia is one which can be said to promote linguistic pluralism, whereas a program which restricts or inhibits bilingual use in other than school domains and erodes diglossic community norms is one which must be characterized as promoting linguistic assimilation." (Kjolseth, 1972: 96)

This analysis led the author to describing bilingual programmes as a continuum ranging from those encouraging community language maintenance, widespread societal bilingualism and language development, to programmes designed to hasten assimilation via transitional bilingual stages. Since this classification was limited to the U.S.A Spanish bilingual programmes, it is subject to a particular constellation of ethnic, social and sociolinguistic features which may not be automatically transplanted to other contexts. Nevertheless, the idea that even a purportedly maintenance programme can serve assimilation is worth being retained (Kjolseth, 1972: 117).

Regarding research about the consequences of bilingual education on community language use, after a systematic review of bilingual programmes in the U.S.A. and after communication with the American educational research administration, Rolf Kjolseth came to the conclusion that in 1972 there was not a single study planned to determine bilingual programme effects upon community diglossia, that is, upon language use outside the classroom. In his own words:

"Such a glaring absence presents a phenomenon which in itself deserves detailed investigation and should attract persons interested in the sociology of science and knowledge." (Kjolseth, 1972: 117)
As a reason, he pointed out that psychologists, educators, and linguists far outnumbered sociolinguists in the education research establishment.

"Also, the laymen, teachers, and administrators promoting bilingual education programs have primarily been members of the ethnic minority elite and nonethnics who are generally uninterested in, or directly opposed to many of the characteristics of the pluralistic model presented here." (Kjolseth, 1972: 117)

Since 1972, little research has been done on the lines suggested by Kjolseth. Some of it has arrived via (micro)ethnographic analyses which were either totally or partially interested in the home-school-language maintenance link (e.g. Attinasi et al. (1982), Hornberger (1988) or Heller (1994) in the next chapter). But language shift and maintenance studies have usually taken either a macrosocial view, which allows for little analysis of bilingual education impact (see, for instance, Fase, Jaspaert and Kroon (eds), 1992), or a purely ethnographic approach with minor sociolinguistic emphasis.

More education-centred projects usually overlook the language use dimension of language-in-education planning. As an instance, not even the laudable EMU-Project, which deals precisely with minority language teaching throughout the European Union and is directed by the Fryske Akademy with the European Commission's financial support, has paid attention to this crucial point. Baker's (1985b: 87) bilingual education evaluation model, which is based on the Welsh experience, includes the following items as those to be considered as bilingual evaluation output: attainment in languages, attitudes, preference for studying either or both languages. Considerations about effective (increased) language use among students or creation of new Welsh-speaking social networks as a result of bilingual education are simply absent or should rather be understood to be included under the vague concepts of social integration and long term effects (e.g. cultural involvement, language of family).

Other bilingual education programmes have not paid much attention to consequences on language use. John de Vries complained not long ago that French immersion in Canada had been studied extensively from the linguistic, psychological and pedagogical points of view, but "(...) little work has been done on the sociological side." (1988: 147), and this seems a common feature of bilingual education studies. Since then, several research projects have been undertaken in Canada in order to examine some language use issues in relation with French immersion programme. According to Harley's review (1993: 3), two major sources of research can be identified:


b. Wesche and her colleagues in Ottawa (Wesche, 1989; Wesche, Morrison, Ready and Pawley, 1990; MacFarlane and Wesche, 1992; Wesche, in press).

These projects and others in Canada share their interest in assessing different aspects of
language competence and language use among French immersion graduate students some years after finishing secondary school. These aspects typically include further study of French language and degree of language retention, but they also look into some questions of language use, such as choice of French as a medium of higher education, use of French with neighbours and friends, use of French mass-media and cultural production and repercussion of French immersion in the work sphere. Results appear still partial, and their interpretation remains open to analysis. French immersion in Canada has undoubtedly increased bilinguality among English-speaking circles, and it seems to have proved of use in finding employment (De Vries, 1988: 165). These results also show that while French language use does not vanish completely from graduate students, it remains at low levels, for two thirds of the Calgary immersion graduates and half of those from Ontario indicated that they did not use the language outside the classroom as much as once a week. (Harley, 1993: 7)

The failure in assessing language use among students means that research on bilingual education seldom addresses specifically the core question of many subordinate groups: how do the different school programmes affect language use? Aracil (1982) rightly pointed out that, since language shift usually involves a gradual substitution of one language for another in every language domain, and since language use is governed by social constraints, it is a task of the school to break the ice and teach not only language but, especially, new norms of language use which reverse the sense of shift. Regardless of how far can this action go, the truth is that the very centre of interest for many language minorities, namely whether a particular method is better to contribute to language maintenance and reversing language shift, attracts little attention.

1.4.3 Language use and typologies of bilingual education

Rubin (1984) described four phases for language planning: (1) fact-finding phase, (2) establishing goals, strategies and outcomes, (3) implementation, and (4) feedback. From this perspective, and considering bilingual education as a language planning endeavour, we could argue that not taking into consideration language use fails to account for the totality of facts relevant to the plan, disregards a major goal of language planning, neglects one of the most determining elements in implementing the totality of goals, and, since language use is doomed to intervene significantly in the final outcomes, considerably distorts the evaluation.

Negligence in considering language use in bilingual education research can significantly hinder progress in this field. Most authors consider the language used in the classroom to be a basic criterium to distinguish between bilingual education methods. Yet, as research on code-switching in bilingual schools (Baetens Beardsmore and Anselmi, 1991; Jørgensen, 1992) has shown, patterns of language use in bilingual schools may be far more complex than official statements. Significant differences in actual language use both in the classroom and in peer interaction may appear between two programmes of purportedly identical language policy, and these may be responsible for different outcomes. Interest in mutual relationships and feedback
between bilingual education and language use should not be restricted to those communities engaged in processes of reversing language shift. There is no theoretical argument to restrict research to language competence where multilingual student populations are involved: information about language use furnishes us with invaluable data about programme effects.
1.5 Re-evaluating bilingual education typologies

The overview of bilingual education typologies has permitted us to distinguish some of the main interests in the analysis of this socio-pedagogical phenomenon. Drawing from the literature, I will now try to summarize and develop these aspects from a sociolinguistic point of view in order to clarify relations between relevant factors. This means that I will not be considering pedagogic issues, since my main interest will be linguistic and societal outcomes of language-in-education planning.

1.5.1 Levels of analysis of bilingual education: Spolsky et alii’s model

Most of the typologies of bilingual education reviewed combine variables which do not belong to the same level of analysis. Spolsky (1974), Spolsky and Cooper (1978) and Spolsky, Green and Read (1976) provided a frame of reference for the analysis of bilingual education which has recently been revisited by Baetens Beardsmore (1992: 276). This models breaks down bilingual education into three components: situational component, operational (or manipulable) component, and outcomes component. Every component is represented by a hexagon where each side stands for a factor: political, economic, sociological, psychological, linguistic and religio-cultural (see graph 1.2, appendix 1). The authors were perfectly aware that factors would not be equally significant (Spolsky, Green and Read, 1976: 235), but they did not evaluate their relative importance, since the state of knowledge was judged insufficient for such an attempt (Spolsky, Green and Read, 1976: 244). The model was theoretically applicable to any community, from the village to the nation. The distinct characteristics of each hexagon were clearly stated:

“The first hexagon, then, represents factors that predate and are independent of a bilingual program, whereas the second one deals with factors involved in the interaction of the school with the outside world upon the introduction of bilingual education. The latter includes the sources of the program's basic needs (funds, personnel, materials), the constraints within which the administrators have to work, the program's contribution to the community, and potential reasons for the program's failure. The third hexagon sets out the effects of a bilingual program. The effects may be on the individual participant or on the community at large. Included here are both the explicit goals of those who have planned the program, and unintended outcomes or products of it.” (ibid. 241)

In my opinion, the authors’ distinction between not just two (cf. Hornberger, 1991) but rather three levels of analysis for bilingual education, namely situational, operational and outcomes levels, seems especially illuminating. The model offers many descriptive possibilities that may be explored and complemented with arguments obtained from our previous discussion.

It is my contention that a sociolinguistic classification of bilingual education should contemplate at least these three levels: (a) under what contextual conditions is a given programme applied, (b) what are the methodological variables which are manipulated, and (c) what are the outcomes of such language-in-education planning. In fact, during the process of evaluation, a further distinction should be established at the third level between projected
outcomes or goals and actual outcomes of results (see graph 1.2).

Graph 1.1. Levels of analysis of language-in-education planning.

Spolsky, Green and Read (1976: 241) suggest outcomes should be analysed at either the individual and the community level. This position would disregard the fact that the children-at-school population as a whole may constitute in many occasions the ideal locus of sociolinguistic change and, therefore, an adequate target population for research.

The weight of all levels of analysis is by no means equivalent: despite its powerful action on the socialization of the new generations, education cannot but modify contextual reality. Consequently, bilingual education can modify social reality to a limited extent: "Schools and schooling can facilitate existing social trends, but they cannot be a successful counter to social and economic factors." (Paulston, 1986: 19). Certain societal goals require a particular kind of schooling in a given setting, while the very same societal goals will call in a different kind of schooling elsewhere. Some goals are probably not feasible in a given context, irrespective of the approach we take, while other contexts may offer wider alternatives.

"unless we try in some way to account for the socio-historical, cultural, and economic-political factors which lead to certain forms of bilingual education, we will never understand the consequences of that education." (Paulston, 1977b: 80)

The Catalan case seems especially illustrative in this respect, for it shows how the same language policy in school may result in contradictory sociolinguistic outcomes due to a variety of sociological, economic and other factors. The very same Spanish submersion school -methodology- led to massive language shift -results- from Catalan to Spanish in the Valencian Country during the XXth century, while it led to widespread bilingualism and functional distribution without language shift in Catalonia, due to the difference in their situational factors. Fishman and Lova's (1970) and Hornberger's (1991) typologies fail to capture the link between methodological and societal variables. This is not to say that they were wrong in positing a relationship between a particular methodological arrangement and a given outcome; it is only to acknowledge that this relationship was true in a given sociocultural context, but may not be so in a different one. In Luxemburg, Catalonia or Andorra, transitional
methodologies have not resulted in language shift. In Catalonia, as in other minority contexts, dual-way maintenance methodologies do not result in all the students learning both languages, but rather in bilingualism on the side of minority speakers. There, as elsewhere, the effect of methodology depends on extra-curricular variables.

A graphic image of the model proposed here would be that of comparing language-in-education planning to a lens: contextual reality can be modified depending on what sort of lens is used, but it is still the original reality (societal context) which is transformed into a given image (outcomes). The lens per se has no power to create independently of contextual reality. Some aspects can be easily modified by the lens, such as measures or colours; other aspects may turn out to be more difficult to transform. We still know too little about the difficulty of transformation of each factor by the school. It is the responsibility of the educational authority to choose the right lens to obtain a desired image from a given reality. A mismatch between the lens and the projected goals will result in an image which is out of focus.

1.5.2 Methodological variables: Programmes versus models

The distinction between three levels of analysis and the definition of a methodological level allows us to recycle Hornberger's (1991) opposition between programmes and models into a new set of terms. I propose that programmes should be defined in purely methodological terms, while models would be defined as the actual result of implementing a particular programme in a given set of contextual variables. Thus, I propose that we should establish a distinction between 'early immersion', 'total immersion', 'submersion', etc., programmes, based on particular arrangements of methodological variables, and particular models, i.e., practical applications of theoretical programmes to particular sociolinguistic settings (e.g. Franco-Ontarian Schools Model, Catalan Conjoint School Model, etc.).

Here we have some of the most important variables when classifying bilingual education programmes; they are seen as continua, not as clear-cut dichotomic typologies, since this enhances our possibilities to understand their highly nuanced nature.

1. **Use or not of the children's first language** seems a variable generally used to classify bilingual education programmes. Paulston (1975) is a good example of a classification based on this criterion, but its terminology seems somewhat misleading and it suggests that 3 distinct programmes exist, while in fact we have a continuum between (a) programmes by means of L1 with an element of second language and (b) programmes by means of L2 with first language teaching. In between, all sorts of programmes by means of two languages.

2. **Stability of the language distribution across the curriculum.** Many authors have based their typologies on the patterns of language allocation at school. These patterns can be:
   a. **Stable**, which keeps the same basic profile during the whole educational process;
   b. **Substitutionary**, which progressively replaces L_a for L_b, be it completely or partially;
c. *Irregular* implies that there lacks both stability and definite direction; instead, different patterns describe the language use across the curriculum\(^2\).

Other authors, like Jacobson (see section 1.4.1) have used related criteria such as code-switching patterns by teachers.

3. **Approach to second language learning**, e.g. grammar-translation, direct method, etc., is another variable which may be applied. In fact, it usually stands for a compound variable, since few programmes use exclusively one language teaching method, but instead they can be classified according to the predominance of each method in a given moment.

An analysis of bilingual education according to these and other methodologically relevant variables would allow us to identify some clusters which are more common than others: these we call *(bilingual) education programmes*. Bilingual education *models* can be described as a function of these (and other methodological) variables, but their outcomes are determined not by operational variables but rather by situational factors.

### 1.5.3 Contextual variables: sociostructural vs. sociocultural factors

#### I Sociocultural and sociostructural variables

Spolsky, Green and Read’ (1976) model includes an enumeration which probably contains most of the relevant aspects which should be taken into account when considering bilingual education. In my opinion, though, this model is somehow misleading in that it does not make clear differences between the *inwards* versus *outwards* school's effects, i.e., effects on those whose lives are directly affected by schools and education -basically children and teachers-, and on those whose lives remain more or less distant from school. There seems to be a qualitative, as much as quantitative difference in school action regarding, let us say, sociocultural aspects such as literacy or second language learning, in comparison with school action on other more external aspects such as the community's economic situation and the language use at the courts. This is not to deny that bilingual schooling can bring about some modifications on the latter, for instance by the formation of a thin layer of middle-class teachers and school administrators; but, on the whole, even such a changement appears to be minute in a modern, postindustrial society. On the other hand, it seems hard to deny that school, as a basic tool of socialization, seems to have a better chance at influencing the cultural aspects of children than their parents' social status.

Once established this distinction (*direct, inwards or inside* action, versus *indirect, outwards, or outside* action), it clearly appears that most of the aspects school can act upon directly are of

---

\(^2\) For instance, late immersion programmes which start in L1, switch to L2 at a given age and eventually adopt both languages as means of instruction.
sociocultural nature, i.e., the "ways of action learned through socialization, based on norms and values that serve as guides or standards for that behavior" (Schermerhorn, 1970: 80). These are defined as opposed to another group of variables termed sociostructural variables, which represent:

"the set of crystallized social relationships which its (society's) members have with each other which places them in groups, large or small, permanent or temporary, formally organized or unorganized, and which relates them to the major institutional activities of the society, such as economic and occupational life, religion, marriage and the family, education, government, and recreation." (Gordon, 1964: 30-31, quoted by Schermerhorn, 1970: 80).

Both sets of variables interact with each other. They usually combine in coherent forms and mutually reinforce each other, but structural realities are in principle independent from sociocultural ones. Each one of these variables can be analysed independently, and, within certain limits which still remain unclear, each sociocultural and structural goal can be pursued on its own.

II Sociocultural goals in education

In relation with language, three main sociocultural goals can be addressed by education: knowledge, attitudes and ideological values, and actual use\(^3\). The first element is by far the best investigated in bilingual education research, and will not be explored further here.

The second sociocultural goal addressed by language-in-education planning is that formed by attitudes, beliefs, and ideology (Baker, 1992; Woolard and Schiefflin, 1994). At least since A. Daudet's *La dernière classe* (Daudet, 1986:581-585), it is almost a common place that formal education constitutes one of the main institutions for ideological reproduction in what concerns language issues, although its actual effectiveness is subject to discussion (cf. Woolard, 1985a). Educational programmes often have to strive to overcome negative attitudes regarding to low-status varieties or immigrant languages, and bilingual education research has often addressed intergroup issues such as ethnic stereotypes, self-esteem problems, and ethnic self-hatred.

Finally, language-in-education planning has an impact on norms of language use that may be assessed. In societal contexts where more than one language is present, it is worth suggesting the opposition between sociolinguistic norms governing the use of a single language, and sociolinguistic norms of code-switching and language choice. The first ones control such things as the appropriate use of personal pronouns, pertinent lexical items or verb inflexion for each register, etc., and constitute part and parcel of any language learning process, despite the fact that awareness of their pertinence is still quite recent. Sociolinguistic norms of language

\(^3\)Skutnabb-Kangas' (1987: 21) model of cultural competence, including (1) a cognitive component, (2) an affective component, (3) a behavioural component, (4) a metacultural awareness component, may serve as a point of reference to this proposal, although hers encompasses a broader range of elements.
choice and switch, on their side, govern the use of either code with respect to the other.

In order to operationalise these concepts, we could simplify them and speak about linguistic goals - referring to competence in either language, attitudes / ideology, and norms of language use - referring to rules governing language use. What follows is a temptative list of the most fundamental sociocultural goals of language-in-education planning and of bilingual education in particular.

a. Linguistic goals can be defined as promoting either monolingualism or (partially or fully developed) bilingualism (cf. Fishman and Lovas, 1970). Bilingualism can be understood in exclusively linguistic terms or as communicative competence.

b. Attitudes and beliefs can be classified in different ways. A simple classification may distinguish between attitudes and ideologies favourable to bilingualism and/or biculturalism, and those against them. Pro-bilingual attitudes may also adopt either integrative or instrumental positions.

c. Norms of language use require different language behaviour according to the particular functional arrangement of each community. Bilingual education has so far dealt mostly with two basic goals regarding language use: heterogeneity and homogeneity (cf. centripetal and centrifugal trends in Schermerhorn, 1970). Homogeneity is attempted when the same and common patterns of language use are favoured across the target population, irrespective of previous group boundaries and differences (e.g. Basque is promoted in ikastolak or Basque-medium schools irrespective of the children's first language). Heterogeneity is sought when different patterns of language use are encouraged as a function of each individual group membership (e.g. European schools try to preserve ingroup use of the national language by organizing different language sections). Homogeneity and heterogeneity should be carefully distinguished from monolingualism and multilingualism: while the former deal with coincidence in norms of language use between members of a social group, the latter concern the range of varieties included in their repertoire. Thus, a given community may seek to establish socially homogeneous norms of language use that imply multilingualism (e.g. functional distribution of two languages), while another may promote heterogeneous behaviours (e.g. preservation of ingroup ethnic language) while simultaneously discouraging multilingualism (e.g. segregated education).

While the link between language and ethnicity has often attracted much attention, it is nevertheless clear that social class differentiation, i.e., heterogeneity, can also be sought (e.g. élite bilingualism). Last, but not least, the population affected may be originally homogeneous (e.g. English speakers in Canadian immersion) or heterogeneous (e.g. Montreal multilingual population served by French schools as described by Heller, 1989, 1994), and both homogeneity and heterogeneity can be either maintained or sought.
A small table may help understanding the classification suggested:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of analysis</th>
<th>Potential goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic competence</td>
<td>Monolingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partial bilingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full bilingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>Pro-monolingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-instrumental bilingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-integrative bilingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterns of language use</td>
<td>Homogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in-school / societal)</td>
<td>Heterogeneity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Linguistic, attitudinal and usage factors interact with one another to a large extent, but this does not entail they cannot have a relatively autonomous development. This relative independence implies that, for instance, (partial) language competence can be fostered while simultaneously language use and group assimilation is pursued (cf. Kjolseth, 1972). This arrangement can be the object of modification by school, but this is not automatically achieved by simply language teaching.

At least two loci of analysis seem pertinent for research of sociocultural goals in education: school level and societal level. A given school -or even a school system- can try to implement either particular sociocultural goals among students. Thus, a school can encourage knowledge and use of a given language for all purposes, or for a restricted set of purposes, among a heterogeneous student population. This school will achieve school-level homogeneity to the extent it succeeds in instilling these common patterns of language use. To the extent that they do not encourage the maintenance of different patterns of language use, most bilingual programmes in U.S.A., for instance, encourage in-school homogeneity (Kjolseth, 1972).

On the other hand, school systems are often used to promote sociocultural goals at the societal level. Minority language education addressed at maintenance and/or reversing language shift aspire at transforming the out-of-school societal reality to an extent which is fundamentally alien to enrichment second language programmes for linguistic majorities. Aspirations regarding the transformation of the wider society constitute a significant difference between bilingual educational models.

Thus, systems promoting in-school homogeneity can encourage societal homogeneity, when they
allow for a single type of school which aims at the same kind of sociocultural pattern. But they can also encourage societal heterogeneity, when different sorts of schools are included under the same system, each pursuing its own homogeneity. For instance, Danish-schools in Germany (Søndergaard, 1993) and German-schools in Denmark (Byram, 1986, 1993) promote both a homogeneous language repertoire and homogeneous patterns of language use among a previously heterogeneous population -in the measure that children of different language backgrounds are included. At the societal level, they seek heterogeneity towards their global context. In turn, educational systems encouraging in-school heterogeneity can fuel societal heterogeneity, but they cannot promote sociocultural homogeneity.

Table 1.4. Sociocultural homogeneity /heterogeneity at school and societal levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School level</th>
<th>Society level</th>
<th>Existing examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneity</td>
<td>Homogeneity</td>
<td>Most submersion and transitional (towards the national language) models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneity</td>
<td>Heterogeneity</td>
<td>Élite bilingualism; European foreign schools (e.g. French, Italian, German schools abroad); language shelters; Maori schools; segregation models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity</td>
<td>Homogeneity</td>
<td>(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity</td>
<td>Heterogeneity</td>
<td>dual-way (?); European Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III A typology of language-in-education planning according to sociocultural goals

Hitherto, bilingual education typologies have usually overlooked the distinction between sociocultural factors, and have mixed them with other social variables under broad terms such as pluralism. In my opinion, new typologies should try to maintain them clearly distinct, since they offer rich possibilities to explain phenomena related to bilingual education (see table 1.2).

I would like to focus attention on a part of this typology formed by two of the variables, namely language competence and language use. This typology avoids sociostructural variables. This is not to mean that they are not significant to language in education planning; on the contrary, they can usually be held responsible for the ultimate choice of a given programme. Sociocultural factors are normally used to favour a given sociostructural balance, but I consider that until sociocultural elements are fully understood, their manipulation in order to achieve sociostructural goals will remain unclear.

Variables are conceived as continua instead of a closed taxonomy. This allows for greater flexibility when analysing each model, since degrees of monolinguism and bilingualism, for instance, may vary along the continuum. In fact, a refined version with standardized measures for both continua would allow for a quantitative analysis of language-in-education models.
Graph 1.2. Classification of educational models according to goals regarding language competence and patterns of language use at societal level.

Such a classification produces a rearrangement of traditional bilingual education typologies:

1. Bilingualism and sociocultural heterogeneity, i.e., schools that promote more than one language and also encourage differences according to social variables (national origin, ethnic affiliation, etc.): European schools (Baetens Beardsmore, 1993b); German schools in Denmark (Byram, 1986, 1993); Maori-medium schools (Benton, 1991); Franco-Ontarian schools (Heller, 1994).

2. Bilingualism and sociocultural homogeneity, i.e., schools that promote more than one language and aspire at reducing social differences between existing social groups: trilingual mainstream education in Luxemburg (Lebrun and Baetens Beardsmore, 1993); Catalonia's educational system; Basque-medium education (Hizkuntz, 1986; Artigal, 1993a; Ojanguren, 1993); all-Welsh schools (Baker, 1985, 1993b); all-Irish schools (Harris, 1991).

3. Monolingualism and sociocultural heterogeneity, i.e., schools that promote one single language for each social group: Namibian apartheid (Phillipson, Skutnabb-Kangas and Africa, 1986); Bavarian segregationist schools for Turks (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1984); Francophone -versus Flemish- educational systems in Brussels (Baetens Beardsmore, 1993).

---

4 This classification does not consider foreign language teaching.
4. Monolingualism and sociocultural homogeneity, i.e., schools that promote only one language and seek to reduce difference between social groups: Mainstream U.S.A. and European submersion and transitional programmes.

Each socio-historical setting allows for different goals: thus, Catalonians command their own educational system and can progressively implement a unified system around their autonomous community, while the Welsh have to rely on partial command of a locally-based network of schools. But there is an explicit will in both cases not to leave 'others' (Castilian-speakers or English-speakers) apart because of their first language, ethnicity, or whatever reason, and, at least in the Basque case, there is an emphasis on incorporating non-ethnics into the Basque speaking community. This is precisely what makes them different from programmes encouraging heterogeneity such as language maintenance programmes for immigrant minorities, which strive to preserve or implement different sociocultural patterns of language use among members of different linguistic, social, ethnic, or other groups.

**IV Methodological vs. situational variables: programmes and models**

Bilingual education is generally defined in methodological terms as the programme which uses more than one language as the language of instruction. Bilingualisation constitutes a sociocultural goal for bilingual education. In some settings, bilingualisation can be achieved by using two languages at the same level as means of instruction, since the situational allow for it. This is what favours the learning of French at Brussels European School and in Luxemburg in comparison with Canadian French immersion programmes (Housen and Baetens Beardsmore, 1987; Lebrun and Baetens Beardsmore, 1993).

But in other circumstances such a use is simply not enough to make children learn the second language. In a number of contexts, it is not the use of two languages as the means of instruction which guarantees the highest levels of bilingual proficiency, but rather the (quasi-)exclusive use of one of them. In the Catalan Countries, for instance, where societal norms prescribe productive bilingualism for all native Catalan-speakers and convergence towards Castilian when addressing a Castilian speaker, Castilian speakers often do not feel compelled to go further than receptive bilingualism in classrooms where two languages are 'freely' used (see chapter 3). It is only by using Catalan as the predominant means of instruction that these societal rules are bent and Castilian speaking children feel it pertinent to achieve productive abilities in Catalan, at least in the most heavily Castilianized areas. As it has been recently stated:

"Socio-cultural factors are stronger than linguistic factors in bilingual development, and in cases where bilingualism forms part of educational development it is these socio-cultural factors that require manipulation within the constraints of the situational context of the school." (Baetens Beardsmore, 1993d: 119)

This consideration takes us back to Fishman's statement that what is involved in bilingual education "(...) is a matter of balance, of sensitivity, of judgement." (Fishman, 1976: 103)

Yet it is not only balance regarding subject matters and language allocation within a given programme which counts most, but balance between programme arrangements and contextual reality. And this points in the same direction as Cummins' (1993a: 65) considerations in the sense that minority languages may need much stronger support to escape language shift.
1.6 Bilingual education: synthesis

The review of several bilingual education typologies has shown how this phenomenon is usually analysed in terms which consider eventual language competence and academic achievement as the central points of classification and evaluation, while the effects on patterns of language use are seldom taken into consideration. A certain amount of confusion regarding the importance of each factor which bears an influence over bilingual education has also been detected. Drawing from the existing literature, I have suggested a number of ideas for the analysis of bilingual education:

Language-in-education planning can be fruitfully analysed if three levels are taken into consideration: contextual or situational, operational or methodological, and outcomes or results. The independent variable in bilingual education is context. Methodological variables account for modifications of context, but they are nothing more than a dependent variable. The more goals are separated from situational context, the more radical methodology should probably be.

The combination of methodological variable produces programmes. Though programmes point to broad goals, they do not determine the ultimate result of language-in-education planning, since these depend primarily on context. The implementation of programmes in given contexts constitute a model. Programmes cannot be evaluated; it is their concrete implementation as actual models, which are evaluable. Evaluation is achieved by comparing attempted goals to actual outcomes; this comparison has to fuel consideration on how well a given programme fits a context. Evaluation has to take into account not only language competence and academic achievement, but the whole constellation of sociocultural and sociostructural facts.

Language-in-education planning not only attempts to achieve goals at the level of language proficiency; it also seeks to achieve other sociocultural goals -such as language maintenance or language shift- and structural goals -such as social integration or social segregation. I have proposed an alternative classification of the sociocultural factors relevant to language in education planning, and have emphasised the relevance of taking language use into consideration when studying bilingual education. Finally, I have proposed a new typology of language-in-education planning fundamentally based on the models' sociocultural goals.
2. The analysis of linguistic behaviour: language choice and language contact
The present research seeks to evaluate the impact of adopting a particular language as the main medium of instruction on the norms of language use and on the linguistic varieties employed by the subjects who attend the school under study. This evaluation requires a previous clarification of how the phenomena of language contact and the norms of language choice and code-switching can be described.

Section 1 introduces the field of language contact and language choice and specifies the areas which will be analysed in the present chapter. In section 2, some aspects of language contact are considered, such as the conceptual distinction between interference, transference and transcodic markers, including the debate on the nonce-borrowing hypothesis. Social and conversational aspects of language contact are discussed in section 2.3. Since norms of language choice and code-switching constitute the central goal of the present research, the different theoretical models which have attempted to explain them are reviewed in detail, and a synthetic model proposed. Once clarified the main social perspective on language contact, some of the most significant studies on code-switching studies in the educational arena are briefly reviewed in section 2.4, as a complement to those discussed in section 1.4. Finally, section 2.5 synthesises the main themes discussed in the chapters devoted to language-in-education planning (chapter 1), and language contact and code-switching studies (chapter 2).

### 2.1 Perspectives on language contact phenomena

In a world where multilingualism is the norm, one should not ask why language contact issues deserve scientific attention but rather why monolingualism is still not being seen as a particular case of multilingualism. Growing geographical mobility and global communication are promoting language contact, and increasing efforts are being devoted to its comprehension.

The study of language contact does not originate with Weinreich's (1953) *Languages in Contact*. Rather, as his own bibliography suggests, he was drawing on a rich tradition which furnished relevant examples and with significant theoretical foundations. Nevertheless, Weinreich's contribution was crucial in that it promoted interest in language contact issues by illuminating its relevance as a new scientific discipline. His work is of fundamental relevance as it was one of the first to regard extralinguistic, societal factors as critical for the analysis of linguistic behaviour.

Since Weinreich (1953), the amount of research on language contact phenomena has grown exponentially, as has the amplitude of interests and perspectives. New disciplines have been developed which focus on language contact and multilingualism, including sociolinguistics, linguistic anthropology and ethnolinguistics, psycholinguistics, neurolinguistics, and 'bilingual studies' as a comprehensive designation for them all. Linguistics, both theoretical and applied, is also progressively abandoning its former reluctance to deal with linguistic variety and incorporating bilingualism and multilingualism into its scope. The price for such
interdisciplinarity - one which most researchers are probably willing to pay - is that of a certain lack of coordination, to the point that the field has no common name: language contact, code-switching, bilingualism, bilingual studies, language interaction, interlinguistics, and Kontaktlinguistics, have all been proposed.

Attempting even a brief, synthetic view of all the developments in the above disciplines is beyond the scope of this thesis. Instead, I will deal with some recurrent issues in the study of language contact phenomena of direct relevance to the present research. These issues can be placed on a continuum ranging from the more linguistic, structural issues, to the more sociolinguistic. At the descriptive end, I will be dealing with the description and conceptualisation of the major language contact phenomena. At the discourse and social end, I will review the links between language choice and code-switching and social interaction, production of discourse, and macrosociological processes such as language shift and language maintenance. No reference will be made to psycholinguistic approaches, for they fall beyond the scope of this study.
2.2 Structural perspectives on language contact phenomena

2.2.1 From interference to transcodic markers

The study of language contact phenomena has registered a striking multiplicity of labels to refer to often partially overlapping phenomena which have created terminological confusion. This terminological confusion is not only due to the various approaches to the field, but also to the fact that there is no generally accepted theoretical framework.

In Weinreich's original conception, the study of language contact phenomena was to be based on the notion of interference, understood in terms of the bilingual moving away from monolingual norms:

"Those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, i.e. as a result of language contact, will be referred to as INTERFERENCE phenomena." (Weinreich, 1953: 1)

Weinreich's structuralist position led him to conceive languages in terms of langue versus parole, i.e., clearly defined systems which were enacted by speakers. He reserved the term interference for those cases which caused a rearrangement of the system (Weinreich, 1953: 1), and thus, attributed it a more permanent status, and emphasised that interference concerned primarily "the more highly structured domains of language, such as the bulk of the phonemic system, a large part of the morphology and syntax, and some areas of the vocabulary (kinship, color, weather, etc.)" (Weinreich, 1953: 1). He initially opposed interference to borrowing or "the transfer of an element an such" (Weinreich, 1953: 1), although he left the door open to considering borrowing as interference, should the incorporation of an element produce "rearrangements in the patterns." (Weinreich, 1953: 1). As for switching, his view was distinctly non-empirical: his description of how an 'ideal bilingual' behaves (or rather should behave) betrays his structuralist conceptions of what language use could and could not be: languages were to be switched as a funcion of topic, interlocutor or other reasons, "(...) but not in an unchanged speech situation, and certainly not within a single sentence" (Weinreich, 1953: 73).

Another prominent figure in the study of language contact, Einar Haugen, defined a continuum of diffusions and established three different stages: code-switching, or the alternate use of two languages without assimilation, interference, when the two systems overlap, and integration, when the unit has completely assimilated into the recipient language and language contact can be said to exist only from an etymological perspective (Haugen, 1956: 40).

Weinreich's interference soon lost its original restricted meaning and became an 'omnibus term' (Baetens Beardsmore, 1986: 45) to refer to any sort of language contact phenomena. This was probably favoured by the initial absence of interest in code-switching (cf. Myers-Scotton,
Its very conception as a deviation from monolingual norms nevertheless included the seeds for its own loss of credit, for it promoted pejorative connotations. Thus, other names were launched to replace it. Clyne (1967) proposed the term transfer, which has been massively followed in second language acquisition and second language teaching research. This term has more positive connotations, and has been described in two ways: positive transfer, i.e., the transmission from L1 to L2 of skills or knowledge which are congruous in both languages; negative transfer, on the contrary, corresponds to the difficulties created by the transmission to L2 of abilities or structures from L1 which are not shared by both languages.

In the mid-eighties, Lüdi (1986, 1987) proposed the term marques transcodiques, translated into English as transcodic marks, transcodic markers or translinguistic markers, and defined as:

"(...) marques, dans le discours, qui renvoient d'une manière ou d'une autre à la rencontre de deux ou plusieurs systèmes linguistiques (calques, emprunts, transferts lexicaux, alternances codiques, etc.)." (Lüdi, 1987: 2)

Lüdi underlined two elements: first, the transcodic marker notion was to be regarded as an etic, not an emic concept, i.e., transcodic markers are phenomena which speakers themselves do not necessarily perceive (Lüdi, 1987: 5).

"Elles présupposent l'existence de systèmes langagiers distincts et la faculté du linguiste (dans le rôle de locuteur- auditeur plurilingue témoin) de se prononcer, face à un énoncé, sur l'appartenance d'un élément ou d'une construction à une langue autre que celle considérée comme langue de base." (Lüdi, 1987: 4)

On the other hand, with this more neutral term Lüdi emphasised his determination to fight the conception of transcodic markers as bearing witness of linguistic insufficiencies. Enough evidence was already at hand to argue that transcodic markers were group markers and elements which speakers could manipulate in order to achieve their communicative goals. In this, he was joining other authors (e.g. Baetens Beardsmore 1986: 45) who claimed that interference had to be analysed not only in the static framework of a linguistic system but also in the dynamic paradigm of communicative competence.

Although it has not been universally accepted, transcodic marker enjoys some favour in sociolinguistics, for it has the advantage of being maximally neutral and broad enough to include any language contact phenomenon, and it has been incorporated into a number of models (Auer, 1990; Nussbaum, 1990, Boix, 1993). A strong competitor of transcodic markers is that of code-switching5, which a number of linguistically oriented researchers (such as Poplack or Myers-Scotton) seem to favour as a cover term. Other terms proposed for interference are crosslinguistic influence (Sharwood-Smith and Kellerman, 1986: 1, quoted by Romaine, 1995: 52). In this study, I will use the term transcodic markers in the sense proposed by Lüdi, and I will reserve code-switching for more specific functions. In so doing, it should be

5 Also spelt 'code switching' or 'codeswitching' depending on the author.
borne in mind that transcoding markers not only refer to the actual presence of imported elements into the recipient language. As Baetens Beardsmore (1986: 46) points out, bilingualism often involves a number of phenomena of avoidance, i.e., "(...) those things that are done by monoglots but not done by bilinguals using the same language (...)". These instances of negative interference are crucially relevant in the case of convergence between varieties.

2.2.2 Levels of analysis: lexical language contact phenomena

There exists a long tradition of describing language contact phenomena as a function of the linguistic level concerned. Weinreich (1953) based his study on three linguistic levels, namely phonic, grammatical and lexical interference. The phonic level allowed for underdifferentiation, over-differentiation, reinterpretation and substitution of phonemes. The grammatical level allowed for interference in all sorts of relations, such as order, modulations, agreement and dependence; it could affect morphemes and/or categories, extending or reducing their uses; it could also lead to the abandonment of obligatory distinctions. Finally, lexical interference could involve either form, content or both, and permitted lexical interference 'as such', total or partial transfer of words or their meanings, phonic adjustment of cognates, specialized retention of an 'indigenous' word after borrowing of an equivalent, etc.

Later research would expand the framework provided by Weinreich's seminal work in various ways. Development in (theoretical) linguistics resulted in the addition of new theoretical constructs and levels of linguistic analysis (e.g. prosody and pragmatics), while the empirical scope was broadened by including a wider range of language pairs (especially African and Asian). Many classifications of language contact phenomena have been produced after Weinreich (1953) including, Haugen (1956), Baetens Beardsmore (1986), Romaine (1989, 1995) and Poplack (1990). In the Catalan-speaking area, Payrató's (1985a: 75ff) proposal of enlarging Weinreich's model of phonic interference with two supplementary possibilities (import or pure transfer, and loss), and extending it to the other linguistic levels has gained some ascendancy. As a whole, though, no descriptive model has achieved general consensus, and classifications of language contact phenomena are still often based on ad hoc partial rearrangements of the most fundamental concepts.

Language contact at the lexical level has attracted much attention from specialists in the field. There are numerous ways of classifying the results of language contact at this lexical: based on their (lack of) integration into the recipient language, their variability, their frequency, etc. (cf. Weinreich, 1953/1968; Haugen, 1950; Baetens Beardsmore, 1986; Romaine, 1995).

A basic distinction is that established between substitution and importation of lexical items (cf. Haugen, 1950). The first one, known as semantic calque (or semantic transfer, loanshift, etc.) includes the (primarily semantic) transformations experienced by lexical units of one language
under the influx of items from a different language. Examples of calques from my corpus are
the use of Cat. provar 'to try' meaning 'to taste' instead of Cat. tastar under the influence of
Cast. probar, or the use Cast. por eso 'due to that' meaning 'though' instead of Cast. 'sin
embargo', under the influence of Cat. 'per això'.

The second basic process of language contact at the lexical level is that of borrowing /
switching (importation). It implies the incorporation of lexemes (i.e., including a phonic
segment, not only semantic information) from the donor language into the recipient one. This
incorporation may imply different degrees of adaptation to the phonetic and phonologic,
morphological and syntactic patterns of the recipient language, ranging from total preservation
of the whole set of original linguistic features (e.g. Cast. celo, cadete, vale used untouched in
Catalan) to absolute integration (e.g. Cat. enterar-se, descuido which are totally integrated into
Catalan in spite of their Castilian origin).

Limits between loanwords and calques appear difficult to establish in a number of cases,
especially when the recipient language possesses a (quasi)homophone of the imported word
which is semantically unrelated to the calqued / imported unit (cf. Haugen, 1950). For instance,
Cast. cura 'priest' is imported into Cat. as cura; it can hardly be regarded as related to Cat. cura
'care'. Cast. con que 'provided that' (Cat. mentre) is imported as [koŋ / kɔŋ + ko / ke / ka] into
Catalan, where it coincides phonetically with Cat. com que 'since', 'so' (Cast. como). The
converse phenomenon is also recorded: Cat. com que 'since' (Cast. como) is imported into Cast
as [koŋ ke], with the subsequent coincidence.

The process of borrowing -and its result, often referred to as loanword- has been researched
from a number of perspectives. Several criteria have often been proposed for distinguishing
between loanwords and switches; the most common point that loanwords should be
widespread and lack 'genuine' synonyms in the recipient language, they should be available to
monolingual speakers and not exclusively to bilinguals, and be phonologically,
morphologically and syntactically integrated. The difficult distinction between what constitutes
a single-word code-switch and what stands as a one off loanword or nonce borrowing still
remains a field of dispute, and influences all other considerations on borrowing (see next
section).

Contrary to earlier assumptions, it has been proven that borrowing does not necessarily
respond to a genuine need of vocabulary to refer to foreign innovations. Myers Scotton and
Okeju (1973) argued it was false that borrowing never involved core vocabulary: numbers,
dates or function words were also imported from one language to another. In this respect,
Catalan furnishes striking examples: not only prepositions such as hasta ('until', Cat. fins), but
even determiners este ('this', in Southern dialects) and the neuter article lo (Cat. el) have been
described as borrowings from Castilian. Poplack, Sankoff and Miller (1988: 61) found that
only a "negligible" percentage of English borrowings in the Ottawa-Hull corpus could be
attributed to referential necessity, and argued that other social factors such as the environmental presence of the other language correlated better with borrowing. All studies emphasised the importance of the socio-cultural milieu in determining borrowing against the weight assigned by structuralist linguists to intrinsic linguistic causes.

Not all grammatical categories are borrowed with the same frequency: content words are borrowed more often than function words, and nouns, verbs and adjectives seem to be borrowed more often than other units, but disagreement persists regarding the exact hierarchy of borrowability (e.g. Poplack, Sankoff and Miller, 1988; Van Hout and Muysken, 1994; Romaine, 1995: 65). Several hierarchies of borrowability have been produced to describe the preferences for certain categories against others.

The issue of loanword integration has produced considerable discussion. Lüdi (1987) proposed several dimensions which should be simultaneously considered in the analysis of lexical assimilation. Each dimension is seen as a continuum between two poles: one of the poles is formed by lexical code-switch or transfers, while the other is constituted of those words whose foreign origin is only known to etymologists. Dimensions oppose juxtaposition versus integration, variation versus stability, and isolated usage versus diffusion.

Figure 2.1. Assimilation of allophonic lexical units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>integration</th>
<th>stability</th>
<th>diffusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>juxtaposition</td>
<td>variation</td>
<td>isolated usage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

lexical code-switch / transfer

Ph.: phonemic; P.: prosodic; M.: morphologic; S.: semantic.


According to Lüdi, lexical items do not necessarily stand at comparable points of assimilation for all dimensions, i.e., phonological assimilation may lag behind morphological and syntactic assimilation, and the form may still be variable while widely diffused at the same time.

Regarding phonological integration, Poplack, Sankoff and Miller (1988: 61) found that:

"The results provide striking confirmation of the observation (...) that phonological integration proceeds as a function of the social integration of the loanword" (Poplack, Sankoff and Miller, 1988: 72).
Therefore, the longer a loanword has been present in a community, the more phonologically adapted it would be. Bilingual proficiency is also significant in the degree of integration:

"Thus, proficient English speakers use less French phonology than monolinguals, but all speakers integrate old and widespread loanwords more than they do nonce borrowings" (Poplack, Sankoff and Miller, 1988: 75).

While phonology may correlate with long-term integration, it has turned out not to be reliable for distinguishing between a one-word switches and borrowing; especially at the stage of nonce borrowing, the phonology can be identical to that of a switched word (cf. Poplack, Sankoff and Miller, 1988; Myers-Scotton, 1993b).

Morphological integration of loanwords tends to be language-specific (Poplack, Sankoff and Miller, 1988: 75). With syntactic integration, its treatment depends heavily on what perspective is adopted regarding the issue of nonce borrowing. In any case, integration is a matter of degree, not an absolute issue (Baetens Beardsmore, 1986: 51).

### 2.2.3 Structural approaches to code-switching

It is ironical that the area of code-switching, which Weinreich considered marginal to the study of language contact, has recently become the focus of attention During the past decade, the specialists interest has focussed on code-switching, while other transcodic markers have remained in a secondary position.

Gumperz (1982) defined code-switching as "(...) the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems." (Gumperz, 1982: 59). The problems entailed by such a definition are not simple: what is a *passage of speech*? How long should it be to be regarded as a code-switch (to be distinguished from interference / transfer)? What are the qualitative differences between these phenomena, if any?

These and other issues have been faced by what constitutes the grammatical or structural study of code-switching. Code-switching has been distinguished at three different discourse levels: between speech turns; at sentence boundaries, and between different constituents within a sentence or intrasentential code-switching. (e.g. Li Wei, 1994: 152) Grammatical approaches have progressively emphasised research on code-switching taking place inside a single sentence, or *intrasentential code-switching* (Poplack, 1980), as opposed to that taking place between different sentences or *intersentential code-switching*. In a recent paper, Muysken (1994) pointed out the main loci of debate of grammatical research on code-switching:

(a) The distinction between *alternation*, or replacement of one language for another one at a given point, and *insertion*, or inclusion of elements from one language in speech in a different language,
(b) The distinction between switches involving otherwise grammatical constituents and switches involving constituents which are incomplete or telegraphic,

(c) The distinction between smooth and flagged switching, i.e., switching where no linguistic or paralinguistic element is used to underline the fact that a switch is taking place versus switching where hesitation, paralinguistic devices or even comments are made witnessing the speaker's awareness of the switch.

(d) The distinction between clause-central and clause-peripheral code-switching,

(e) The degree of adaptation of the switched elements.

A main point in grammatical research on code-switching has been that it is regular or principled. There are certain switches that are not produced, and linguistic research has tried to identify the grammatical constraints determining the (im)possibility of the switch. A number of models based on linguistic constraints have been proposed with unequal success. Some have been based on a linear conception of code-switching which conceives it as a real time, surface phenomenon, and prefers identifying sites for the switches to occur; this position gave birth to the equivalence constraint and the free morpheme constraints (cf. Poplack and Sankoff, 1987). Other models, within the framework of Government and Binding theory, see code-switching as an operation which takes place much earlier than the surface structure, such as the Matrix Model (Myers-Scotton, 1993b) and Muysken and DiSciullo's government constraint (cf. Muysken, 1994). Two important issues are related to these alternative conceptions: the nonce borrowing or one-word code-switching issue and the base language or matrix language issue.

The nonce borrowing or one-word code-switching issue concerns the status of a number of single lexical items from one language occurring in utterances produced in a different language. Although these items have an extremely low frequency of occurrence, they appear morphosyntactically adapted to the receiver language. Thus, it is not clear whether should be related to old, well-established borrowings, or rather considered one-word switches.

For researchers working in the more linear model of code-switching, the Free Morpheme Constraint predicted that "Codes may be switched after any constituent in discourse provided that constituent is not a bound morpheme" (Poplack, 1980: 585). To solve the contradiction existing between empirical data and the theoretical restrictions, it was proposed that instances breaking this constraint were not real switches but rather loanwords which had been produced only sporadically and which were termed nonce borrowings (cf. Sankoff and Poplack, 1987; Poplack, 1990).

The nonce borrowing hypothesis came under heavy fire from other researchers (e.g. Eliasson,
which referred to it as a way out of the insoluble contradiction created by empirical data to the Equivalent Constraint, and denounced the alleged circular reasoning that would support it. Proponents of the nonce borrowing concept have argued that nonce loanwords do not behave as code-switches, but rather as loanwords, in grammatical terms (Sankoff, Poplack and Vanniarajan, 1991) while their critics have persisted in the apparent *ad hoc* argumentation of the construct and provided counterevidence (Myers-Scotton, 1992).

The debate is still open, and to a large extent depends on what general model one uses to account for the data analysed. The background of this debate is the conception of the relationship between code-switching and borrowing. For those proposing the nonce borrowing notion, these are two related but fundamentally distinct processes which should not be confused, for they respond to two different mechanisms. In contrast, critics of the concept maintain that both phenomena follow a common path, and are to be regarded as a continuum. This view does not necessarily imply that both phenomena should not be distinguished on other basis: for Myers-Scotton (1993b), the difference between borrowing and switching resides in that loanwords have become part of the recipient language lexicon, whereas switches still imply the activation of the donor language; formal characteristics are nevertheless not enough to distinguish between them.

The base language issue is in some way the converse of the nonce borrowing issue. Theoretical models which claim that morphological units are plugged into syntactic structures once these have been built do not find it difficult to justify that a lexical unit from language B inserted in an otherwise morphosyntactically language A frame constitutes a code-switch; their problem is then how to justify what the base or matrix language is, especially in cases of heavy mixing.

The two different positions have consequences for the definition of code-switching: more linear conceptions focus attention on the fact that there is a given point where speakers 'jump' from one language to another. Thus, Poplack defines code-switching as:

"Code-switching is the juxtaposition of sentences or sentence fragments, each of which is internally consistent with the morphological and syntactic (and, optionally, phonological) rules of the language of its provenance." (Poplack, 1990: 37)

Conversely, for the opposed positions code-switching is better regarded as an operation of (a) constructing a frame, i.e., a morphosyntactic structure provided by the base or matrix language, and (b) filling it with the right items (Myers-Scotton, 1992: 19, 1993b).

Both lines of research have promoted much investigation addressed at verifying the degree of accuracy of the predictions made by each model. The evolution of this line of research is synthesised by Muysken:

"In a first stage there were a number of separate observations; then from the early eighties onwards, people
tried to come up with universalist postulates. As the data became more varied, after 1986, there were a number of attempts at parametrized or relativized global models, with attention paid to typological differentiation. At present, we find only tentative multi-factorial models on the base of comparative research. The reason for this retreat or evolution is that the factors that intervene are highly complex. That we must be less optimistic than before has positive aspects as well, since the need for caution is due to the more detailed knowledge that we have of code-switching patterns.” (Muysken, 1994: 12)

2.2.4 Structural approaches to language contact: summary

In the previous sections I have reviewed the most relevant aspects of grammatical approaches to language contact phenomena. I have briefly outlined the historical development of the field, discussed several controversial aspects of borrowings, and considered the distinction between code-switching and borrowing. Greatest emphasis has been placed on lexical aspects which are most relevant to my research.

I have proposed the adoption of the term transcodic markers to refer to the phenomena produced by language contact, and reserved code-switching for a particular sort of transcodic markers, that of the alternation between two or more languages. The disputes between the ‘nonce-borrowing’ hypothesis have been presented, so that their tenets can be tested against the Catalan/Castilian language pair. The actual limits between code-switching and borrowing in Catalan and Castilian will be explored in chapter 6.

In the next sections I will revise several approaches adopted to account for the link between language use and extralinguistic variables, and the proposals of how code-switching acquires meaning in its use, suggesting a number of modifications and a model for description and analysis.
2.3 Social approaches to language contact

2.3.1 Explaining language choice in multilingual communities

The problem of explaining actual behaviour by means of theoretical models is shared by all the social sciences. One of the fundamental issues underlying most social science research is that of clarifying the exact nature of the link between individuals' behaviour and supra-individual variables. Two major approaches have often been distinguished: on the one hand, there is a perspective which has traditionally attributed decisive importance to societal, supra-individual factors in the determination of individual behaviour, known as an objectivist or social physics perspective. A second perspective imputes to the individuals' will the ultimate responsibility for particular behaviour; this is known as the subjectivist perspective or social phenomenology (cf. Bourdieu with Wacquant, 1992: 16).

The analysis of language choice and switch in bi- and multilingual settings remains a crucial endeavour in sociolinguistic research. Early attempts by linguists and sociologists at describing language use in general quantitative terms failed to account for the evident heterogeneity across communities, individuals and occasions. Theoretically refined tools were needed to explain why language X was used in situation x, and why language Y was used in situation y. Contrary to the widely assumed belief that language use is unsystematic, sociolinguistics has held as axiomatic that "A speaker's choice between varieties is also structured. It is systematically linked to social relationships, events or situations." (Gal, 1987: 287)

Therefore, one of the fundamental issues in socially oriented linguistic disciplines is why a given linguistic variety is used in a particular array of situations, while another variety is preferred in other circumstances. (cf. Fishman's (1965) widely quoted title, 'Who speaks what language to whom and when').

Not surprisingly, the two poles of social sciences mentioned have been recreated in the effort of understanding linguistic behaviour. The first line of sociolinguistic research attributes preeminence to the study of the correlation between social structure, linguistic repertoire and language use and change. This line has emphasised the historical and socio-political factors which provoke transformations in linguistic behaviour. On the other hand, a second line of research has stressed the view of code-switching as a sociolinguistically structured strategy used to convey meaning by means of the association between codes and expectations, attitudes, etc.

Section 2.3 will be devoted to reviewing some of the most significant theoretical proposals in the attempt to link language use with social factors, and especially their implications for language choice and code-switching. It should be clear, nevertheless, that no all-embracing, totally coherent theory has still been produced which accounts for all instances of language
2.3.2 Objectivist perspectives on sociolinguistic research; the "allocation paradigm"

The major point in objectivist approaches to linguistic analysis is that language behaviour is ultimately determined by social factors, speakers merely responding to relevant situational factors. Earlier attempts at establishing connexions between social factors and language behaviour could be included in the category of the objectivist perspectives. Weinreich might be seen as a (pre)objectivist, in that he suggests a deterministic relationship between language contact phenomena and sociolinguistic (i.e., societal) factors. According to him:

"To predict forms of interference from the sociolinguistic description of a bilingual community and a structural description of its languages is the ultimate goal of interference studies." (Weinreich, 1953: 86)

Weinreich did not produce a theoretical model to integrate social factors and language contact phenomena; instead, he provided a list of geographic, cultural, economic, demolinguistic, and other factors which he thought might influence the outcome of language contact under the name of "socio-cultural setting of language contact".

Ferguson's (1959) notion of *diglossia* undoubtedly constitutes a landmark in the objectivist perspective on language use. With the notion of diglossia, Ferguson attempted to describe a pattern of code choice which was apparently shared by a number of societies around the world, where a relatively stable functional distribution between high and low purposes seemed to work between two very divergent varieties of a single language (Ferguson, 1959: 336). His goals were to successively obtain "clear case, taxonomy, principles, theory" (Ferguson, 1991: 215).

Diglossia in Ferguson's model is a language- and culture-centred concept in that it is not defined in social structural terms, but primordially on a cultural and linguistic basis. In its original conception it was not associated to any societal structure, and could be brought about by diverse historical processes (e.g. Greek vs. Haitian diglossia). It nevertheless contained a basic trait which would be further developed: varieties were used according to different functions or purposes.

"One of the most important features of diglossia is the specialization of function for H and L. In one set of situations only H is appropriate and in another only L, with the two sets overlapping only very slightly." (Ferguson, 1959: 328)

Formality or informality variables were therefore seen as determining language choice in a rather absolute term in diglossic societies.

Diglossia was to become a successful term, but in the process of spreading, it would lose its
distinctive characteristics. J. A. Fishman (1967) redefined *diglossia* so that it became synonymous with the stable functional specialisation of two linguistic varieties of any sort (two dialects as well as two languages), with one variety being used for high functions and another for low functions. Fishman's view of diglossia required a strict societal compartmentalization for diglossia to persist. The concept sustaining social compartmentalization was that of *language domain*.

The *language domain* notion seems to have been proposed by Schmidt-Rohr (1932: 183; quoted by Weinreich 1953: 87), but it was Fishman who defined and gave it wider currency (Fishman 1964, 1965, 1970, 1972; see Mioni, 1987 for a reappraisal).

"Domain of language behaviour (or of language choice) is a theoretical construct that designates a cluster of interaction situations, grouped around the same field of experience, and tied together by a shared range of goals and obligations: e.g. family, neighbourhood, religion, work, etc." (Mioni, 1987: 170)

Domain is proposed as a meso-social construct to account for patterns of *language choice* which cannot be fully explained by macro-social concepts such as language community. The domain construct incorporates some situational elements judged relevant to language choice, mostly participants and their roles, locale, topic and goal of interaction. Domains are culture-specific, and have to be inductively defined from the informants' perceptions and opinions.

Their goal is that of synthesizing major clusters: clusters of interactions occurring in clusters of settings, and all of them involving clusters of interlocutors. In other words, domains are supposed to account for the majoritary or customary language under a given set of conditions.

The domain construct has often been applied to intragroup interactions of bilingual communities.

"In such instances, it is quite easy, indeed, to reduce linguistic choices to the simple alternative between language X or Y, while correlations between minute linguistic variations and parameters tied to persons (age, sex, socioeconomic class, etc.) or to situations (styles, contextually bound variation, etc.) are left to linguists and to students of face-to-face interaction." (Mioni, 1987: 176)

In short, domain analysis relies on correlational analyses between sociological variables to define interaction types where a given language is predominant for a given social group; societal variables are seen as determining the choice of either one or the other language.

The domain construct has been a favourite in perspectives closer to the sociology of language, in language maintenance and language shift studies, as well as in language planning. It synthesises major societal regularities and allows for macro-level generalizations. The term *language choice* has traditionally been linked to the view that a given language predominates in a given situational type, and domain analysis has made this a preferred term. The domain construct, in combination with the assumption derived from the diglossia model that

---

6Interestingly enough, Weinreich already objected to the existence of a domain such as "family". His own experience with communities undergoing language shift inside the family provided him with counter-examples to such a concept.
sociocultural compartimentalization can be maintained for long periods, has led Fishman to propose one of the most remarkable models of language planning, that of 'Reversing Language Shift' (Fishman, 1991).

Domain studies tend to use sociological tools of analysis such as questionnaires and in-depth interviews. One of their major advantages is the possibility of working with samples which are sociologically representative of the target populations, a possibility which enhances their external validity. In exchange, the major disadvantage is the reliance on reported data, with the attendant problems of validity.

Nevertheless, due to its macro/meso-sociological orientation, the domain model leaves a number of phenomena unexplained. The 'minute linguistic variations' mentioned by Mioni may not be minute at all. Myers-Scotton (1993a) relates how, under the influence of what she calls the allocation paradigm, i.e., the combination of the domain model and the binary-choice model (which predicts that language choice has to categorically select either variety -or trait- A or variety -or trait- B; see Rubin, 1968: 526; Ervin-Tripp, 1972: 219), she herself refused to acknowledge that on many occasions it was neither language A or B that was being used in a given domain, but both languages simultaneously. The domain model undoubtedly provides a general overview, although of a rather static nature, of a language-in-culture set and when these 'minute' differences are judged as of lesser importance, with a description of what the customary language use in each sociocultural set. Nevertheless, unstable communities seem less amenable to domain analysis (e.g. Gardner-Chloros, 1991). As a rather static model, the domain model is at odds when explaining language switches, mixes and transformations in progress from one domain configuration to another one. This may constitute one of its major disadvantages: even when they are quantitatively minor, switches to the non-predicted language should not be left unexplained; in fact, it is precisely via those 'minute' breaks that culture-specific domain buildings crumble when a language shift process affects a sociocultural structure.7

Another objectivist approach to language use is that espoused by variationism, represented in the field of language contact by Poplack, Sankoff and associates (Poplack, 1990). A variationist approach seeks to discover patterns of usage, which pertain to the relative frequency of occurrence and co-occurrence of structures, rather than simply to the existence of grammaticality of such structures. Variationist studies select samples of speakers on the basis of sociological criteria so that they can be regarded as representatives of their speech communities. The researchers attempt to gain access to the vernacular, regarded as the most systematic linguistic variety, via a multiplicity of methods such as sociolinguistic interview or participant observation.

*Typically, each speaker will alternate among all the choices, but will manifest an overall pattern of

7 The notion of 'discourse domain', proposed by Selinker and Douglas (1985) in the framework of the Interlanguage Theory and based on a more ethnographic and conversationalist approach, has not been taking up in code-switching research and will not be discussed here.
A basic tool for variationism is that of correlational analysis. It usually involves large numbers of sociologically representative speakers that are grouped according to their sociological characteristics (i.e., age, social class, gender, place of residence). These variables are regarded as the independent variables, and their influence on the dependent variable, language use, is scrutinized by means of sophisticated statistical methods (Chambers, 1995).

Representative of the variationist approach to language contact and code-switching is the study of the Ottawa-Hull corpus, a bilingual (French-English) corpus of sociolinguistic interviews (cf. Poplack 1988, 1990; Poplack, Sankoff and Miller, 1988). The systematic assessment of the significance of each variable allowed the researchers to come to significant conclusions regarding, among other things, the influence the minority and majority status exerted on the patterns of code-switching and the introduction of loanwords from the superordinate language, English, into the subordinate, French. The weight of competence, sociolinguistic environment, social class, etc., could be empirically tested in relation with language contact phenomena.

Both the diglossia and the domain models (and, to a lesser extent, variationism) share a functionalist perspective of the language-society relationship. They rarely inquire into the social origin of functional distribution, are based on the assumption that functional distribution of varieties may persist for long periods provided that the right conditions are maintained, and tend to emphasise the consensual nature of the different patterns of language allocation. In their most prototypical formulations such as in Ferguson's (1959) diglossia model, these formulations do not even consider the possibility that linguistic varieties are not equally distributed across the community (cf. Williams, 1992). As a whole, these approaches have been termed the 'complementary distribution model' (Li Wei, 1994: 12).

In opposition to this functionalist perspective, Catalan sociolinguists in the 60s, 70s and early 80s developed a more critical approach to language choice and language contact issues, with a more or less distant connexion with Marxist postulates, which has rightly been termed the 'conflict model' (Li Wei, 1994; see 3.2 for a wider comment). This approach refutes the allegedly spontaneous and inevitable process of (Catalan) language shift, denouncing its fictitious link with the modernization process, and underlines the crucial role played by the institutional power -in their case, the Spanish and French states- and its respective ruling classes in the progressive displacement of unofficial varieties by the official ones. These Catalan sociolinguists fiercely contradict the static nature of diglossia à la Fishman, considered by them as a step in the path to language shift, and denounce that linguistic knowledge is by no means evenly distributed across society, but rather as a function of sociopolitical control.

The Catalan conflictivist proposals lost most of its impetus with the definite establishment of democracy in Spain as a whole since the mid 80s (for a recent reappraisal of the history of Catalan sociolinguistics, see Vila i Moreno, 1995a). Nevertheless, approaches emphasising the
conflictive nature of sociolinguistic relationships have proliferated elsewhere, such as with scholars concerned about Celtic languages on the British Islands (e.g. McKinnon, 1984) or European minorities in general (e.g. Nelde, 1995).

As a whole, the objectivist approaches to language choice and language contact described above allow for a fairly detailed characterization of overall patterns and, when they incorporate concepts from other more qualitative approaches (such as Poplack's 1988 analysis of code-switching functions), these methods may prove highly productive. One of their most significant drawbacks, however, is the role the individual speaker plays in the management of language use. Due to their fundamentally quantitative approach, they find it difficult to provide explanations for individual tokens of transcodic markers; more important, they do not account for the mechanisms which assign shared meanings to societal patterns of code-switching. This is precisely the task which interactional and interpretative sociolinguists have undertaken.

2.3.3 Subjectivist perspectives: interactional and interpretative sociolinguistics and socio-psychological approaches

I Code-switching as a creative, skillful strategy

Blom and Gumperz' (1972) study on the alternation between Norwegian dialects makes the point of departure of interest in the new topic of code-switching. This article presented an ethnographic, qualitative analysis of how Bokmål (one of the two standards of Norwegian) and the local dialect were used by different groups of the population not only as a result of the determination of the social context in a diglossic situation but also to express other social meanings.

This article marks the evolution from the interest on code choice, i.e., the customary language in a given domain, to a more detailed analysis of code-switching. Up to that point, linguists and social scientists had simply ignored the phenomenon or had attributed it to performance errors or lack of competence. Code-switching was regarded as just another token of interference. Myers-Scotton (1993a) attributes this view to the currency of what she calls the allocation paradigm, the predominant way of understanding the relationships between language behaviour and extralinguistic factors reviewed in section 2.3.2.

Blom and Gumperz proposed the opposition between, on the one hand, situational switching, or a switch to another language brought about by a change in the situational elements, and, on the other, metaphorical code-switching, to refer to a particular 'flavour' born out of the association of a language with a set of situations.

Myers-Scotton points to several reasons that contributed to popularize Blom and Gumperz's article, the most important being that it had the virtue of showing code-switching "not only as a legitimate subject of study but as a phenomenon amenable to analysis. More important, they present CS as a type of skilled performance." (Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 47). With them, code-
switching started to be regarded as a regular phenomenon produced by the speakers' ability to combine different codes, not the product of less proficient speakers unable to keep separate their languages.

The article by Blom and Gumperz was soon followed by a growing number of specialists who progressively discovered the existence of code-switching all over the world (for a brief historical account, see Myers-Scotton, 1993a). They all shared an emphasis on interpreting interactions where more than one language was used, and progressively adopted analytical tools from ethnography and anthropology, ethnomethodology, conversational analysis, and discourse analysis.

Gumperz (1982) represents the author's review of some of the most significant questions of code-switching. This monograph replaced the term metaphorical code-switching with that of conversational code-switching, and emphasised the distinction between situational and conversational code-switching. It stressed the fact that code-switching is not the result of a lack of mastery of L2, but rather a creative strategy to transmit meanings shared by groups of bilingual speakers. Gumperz proposed some structural constraints for code-switching and, more importantly, provided a list of functions of code-switching as identified in several bilingual settings.

Blom and Gumperz (1972) and Gumperz (1982) introduced a new perspective in sociolinguistics in general and in code-switching studies in particular. During his ethnographic research in India, Norway, Austria, and elsewhere, Gumperz had detected significant discordances in the expected links between sociologically defined groups and linguistic categories.

"Attempts to reconcile my ethnographic findings with then current structural functionalist social theory soon revealed that Parsonian explanations of sociolinguistic regularities as directly governed by community level, internalized normative constraints or grammar-like rules which a) operate below the level of consciousness and b) specify appropriate ways of speaking with respect to extralinguistically defined contexts, are in many ways fundamentally flawed." (Gumperz, 1992: 39)

Soon he argued that speakers were not automatically obeying normative sociolinguistic constraints on appropriateness; rather, they were making use of their communicative abilities and strategically deploying variable choices in such a way as to be rhetorically effective in achieving particular discourse ends. In a word, speakers decided upon their behaviour. This approach differed from strict correlational analysis, which could not account for the highly structured uses of code-switching and fell short of explaining this special kind of social activity.

"If instead of attempting to discover direct and stable linguistic reflections of social categories in clause level phonology, morphology or syntax we begin by looking more closely at the clustering of co-occurring variables in situated everyday discourse, in terms of what sorts of linguistic signs are involved and how they are distributed, we soon discover regularities that are demonstrably socially conditioned." (Gumperz, 1992: 40)
This is a far-reaching position, for it implies a complete reformulation of how social factors intervene in the interactional activity:

"The issue of relating linguistic to social phenomena can thus be reformulated as follows: 'How can one find a way of showing how discursive practices relate to or enter into everyday social action?' In other words, we are no longer looking for correlations between structural categories in two conceptually distinct domains of analysis but concentrating on how linguistic and social knowledge affect human action." (Gumperz, 1992: 41)

II  Functions of code-switching: the creation of meaning

Gumperz has developed a sociolinguistic perspective which rests upon the idea that code-switching is not language specific but rather situation specific, and that it is useful to speak about variability in terms of communicative strategies in order to achieve interactional goals (Gumperz, 1992: 41). To the extent that it is communicative action, social action has to be described in terms of encounters or events. Language and linguistic practices play a significant role in the definition of events, which are thus not defined exclusively in extralinguistic terms, as extraneous sociological categories alien to participants, but rather created during the interaction. Hence the significance of the notion of context in Gumperz's views. A major necessity during interactional processes is that of defining the frame for correct interpretation.

"My basic assumption is that all understanding is framed understanding, that it ultimately rests on contingent inferences made with respect to presuppositions concerning the nature of the situation, what is to be accomplished and how to be accomplished. The term activity can be seen as a cover term to suggest what these presuppositions are." (Gumperz, 1992: 42)

But how is the correct context suggested so that the desired goals may be achieved? Gumperz believes that several sorts of communicative devices are employed by participants in order to define the appropriate frame of interpretation and contextualization. Conversational interpretation is cued by empirically detectable signs, which he calls contextualization cues, i.e., "(...) all the form-related means by which participants contextualize language." (Auer, 1992: 24). Contextualization cues are crucial for successful communication.

"(...) the recognition of what these signs are, how they relate to grammatical signs, how they draw on socio-cultural knowledge and how they affect understanding, is essential for creating and sustaining conversational involvement and therefore to communication as such." (Gumperz, 1992: 42)

In their broader sense, contextualization cues include any verbal and a great number of non-verbal devices: explicit definitions by the participants of what an event is, deictics, loudness, tempo, gaze, and, very importantly, the selection and switching of linguistic varieties. In practice, research on contextualization has focused on the study of non-referential cues (Auer, 1992: 24), and code-switching has become a privileged field of investigation.

The emphasis on code-switching as a creative, skillful strategy in the hands of the speakers as a
tool to renegotiate their role relationships and identities constituted a revolutionary perspective in view of the predominant domain-like analysis, and was soon to be imitated all around the world. Gumperz (1982) had provided a list of functions code-switching had been detected to serve; these were (a) quotation, (b) addressee specification, (c) interjection, (d) reiteration, (e) message qualification. Researchers provided further evidence of code-switching as a productive discourse device, and soon developed growing lists of functions code-switching served in different communities (cf. the synthesis in Auer, 1991: 326ff).

In 1991, Auer criticised (from a conversational analytical perspective) the proliferation of classifications, on the ground of four points:

(a) Conversational categories used for the analysis were often ill-defined. "What is lacking is the proper grounding of the categories employed in a theory of interaction." (Auer, 1991: 327-328).

(b) Typologies of code-switching often confused conversational structures, linguistic forms and functions of code alternation.

(c) Lists of conversational loci could not be more than a clue to the understanding of code-switching conversational use, for this was a creative tool and lists were doomed to remain open and would therefore not lead to any theory.

(d) Conversational loci for code-switching do not always have the same meaning, and they may have multiple meanings; interactional structure and context are needed to understand them.

Auer (1991) argued in favour of a perspective that takes into consideration the sequential nature of conversation, stressing that each utterance has to be understood in the light of preceding utterances in order to arrive at a correct interpretation.

"any theory of conversational code alternation is bound to fail if it does not take into account that the meaning of code alternation depends in essential ways on its sequential environment. This sequential embedding is given, in the first place, by the conversational turn immediately preceding it, to which it may respond in various ways. Each conversational turn provides a frame of interpretation for the following one and each following utterance will be interpreted in this frame." (Auer, 1991: 321).

Auer has proposed a number of conversational patterns to be usually associated with given interpretations of code-switching as a contextualization cue. For instance, his pattern Ia, consisting of a sequence ...A1 A2 A1 A2 // B1 B2 B1 B2... where letters are languages and numbers correspond to speakers, would correspond to Gumperz's proto-typical conversational code-switching, while Auer's pattern IIb ...A1 B2 A1 B2 A1 // A2 A1 A2 A1... would be defined as language negotiation with the eventual victory of speaker 1 (Auer, 1991: 335).
In opposition to the previous lists of functions, Auer distinguishes four patterns of conversational structures described in terms of speech turns: (a) discourse-related code-switching, which involves a change in setting, participants, etc; (b) preference-related code-switching, related to (each) participant dominance, political preference, etc., for a linguistic option; (c) a pattern in which both languages are successively used so that ambiguity or double identity is claimed; this is not to be confused with the use of a mixed linguistic variety; (d) transfer, or the insertion of a fragment in another language with previsible end.

III Some criticisms on the interactionist approach

While the emphasis on the creative aspects of code-switching opened new avenues to research, it has focussed on microsocial analysis and has done little to build a theoretical model capable of connecting conversational code-switching to macrosocietal variables. Most researchers have contented themselves with listing the functions of code-switching which have often been too locally-based to be exported to other analyses.

“While Gumperz-style analytic procedures illuminatingly reveal intra-speaker variation in utilising various discourse strategies for different communicative purposes, they do not address inter-speaker variation patterns in any principled way (...). Seldom do we find systematic information on, for example, differences and similarities in the communicative behaviour of speakers of differing age, sex and social group. This is a real methodological problem, rather than merely a question of analytic interest or emphasis.” (Milroy, Li and Moffat, 1991: 289)

Myers-Scotton has recently pointed out that this research model, which she calls interpretative/interactional is vaguely defined.

“This model, however, is never really explicated. Rather, it exists in a number of crucial premisses: (1) small-group interactions are the proper research site and naturally occurring data are the object of study; (2) the social meanings of language use are a function of situated contexts; and (3) the use of linguistic choices as a strategy adds intentional meaning to an utterance.” (Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 56)

This model does not operate on the basis of testable hypotheses; on the contrary, it stresses the importance of understanding the data “in its own terms”, and underlines the fact that interaction cannot be understood out of context. The most crucial critique of the model is its neglect for the macro-social coincidences detected by domain analysis. Provided that conversation is a locally-negotiated issue, and provided that the participants’ identity is basically (re-)created out of the negotiation, how to explain the large coincidence often detected across social groups? How to account for the persistence of the same discourse strategies by different subjects when confronted with the very same situational phenomena?

Finally, the possibility exists that the emphasis on the sequential nature of code-switching in opposition to the previous ‘functional’ approach may be unduely extrapolating data from a particular sort of language contact situation. This point will be further elaborated in section 2.3.4.5.
IV. Other subjectivist approaches

Some other theoretical models have attempted to explain language use placing the individuals' decision at the very centre of the theoretical model.

A radical constructivist position more related to a discourse analysis perspective than to strict conversational analysis is that adopted by a number of authors that emphasise the speakers' conscious manipulation of each language's social meaning. These authors (such as Rampton, 1991, Pujolar, 1995) share conversationalists' weltanschung in that the subject is placed in the middle of the social identities creation process. They nevertheless differ from the previous in their distinct etic concern about the (potentially empowering) consequences of research for the informants; their lesser emphasis on methodological issues as opposed to conversational analysis; and the stress put on the aspects of sociopolitical opposition to hierarchies and institutional power expressed via code-switching. As a whole, criticisms applied to other subjectivist perspectives are equally applicable to this line of research (see also sections 2.4.3.2 and 2.4.3.3 for criticisms to Pujolar, 1995).

Another subjectivist theory is that proposed in the acts of identity theory, which proposes that "the individual creates for himself the patterns of his linguistic behaviour so as to resemble those of the group or groups with which from time to time he wishes to be identified, or so as to be unlike those from whom he wishes to be distinguished." (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller, 1985: 181).

Finally, the social psychological model developed by the Bristol school and known as the speech accommodation theory or SAT (Street and Giles, 1982; Giles, Mulac, Bradjac, and Johnson, 1986) claims that speakers accommodate to their interlocutors as a function of the relation they wish to establish with them. Thus, a speaker may decide to converge with their interlocutor, i.e., adjust his or her variety to that of the interlocutor, or may rather prefer to diverge, stressing differences with him or her.

Although the last two theories have often been invoked as auxiliary means by code-switching researchers, neither of them has been extensively applied to the analysis of code-switching and will not be further discussed here. The acts of identity theory has been mostly applied to creole and polylectal situations. The SAT theory, on the other hand, has received more attention as a tool to evaluate attitudinal aspects of language contact and code-switching. As was the case for the interpretive-interactional paradigm, the major disadvantage of these theories seems to be how to reconcile their claim that a linguistic decision is ultimately an individual matter with the explanation of regularity in macro-social trends.
2.3.4 Some tentative syntheses

The limitations of both quantitative and interpretative paradigms for the comprehension of the social dimensions of language use in multilingual communities have been pointed out by several researchers (Milroy, Li, Moffat, 1991; Myers-Scotton, 1993a; Li Wei, 1994). The shift away from deterministic views of code-switching is evident not only in microsocial perspectives, but even in mesosocial research (cf. Heller (ed), 1988; Network on Code-Switching and Language Contact 1990, 1991a, b, c, d). Nevertheless, the need for a thorough understanding of the societal background for any interpretative task requires a solidly established model which ultimately connects minute code-switching activities with macrosocial processes and political and economic trends. Gal was pointing to such a need when she argued that "This suggests that the study of how codes are deployed in conversation is not only a sociolinguistic problem." (Gal, 1988: 247), only to add:

"To explain variation in codeswitching, an integration of conversational, ethnographic and social historical evidence is required. It is true that, as the papers in this volume amply demonstrate, codeswitching is a conversational strategy used to establish, cross or destroy group boundaries; to create, evoke or change interpersonal relations with their accompanying rights and obligations. But the conversations themselves take place within and between groups whose interactions are shaped not only by Barthian (1969) considerations of ethnic boundaries and competition over resources." (ibid.: 247)

This problem has sometimes been solved by resorting to domain analysis as a 'background': "Thus at the heart of codeswitching is the separation of languages in different domains (..)." (Heller, 1988: 6) despite its limitations. In other cases, a combination of macro and micro approaches have been proposed as offering alternative paths for description (e.g. Gardner-Chloros, 1991). Finally, attempts have been made in order to overcome the inadequacies of both the objectivist and the subjectivist perspectives described above by means of renewed theoretical constructs. At least three of them have been explicitly applied to the issue of language choice and switching and will be commented here: Bourdieu's Linguistic Market Theory, Social Network Theory, and Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model.

1 Bourdieu's linguistic market model

Bourdieu's sociological model has often been applied to the analysis of language choice and code-switching (Bourdieu, 1982; for a recent synthesis of his views, see Bourdieu with Wacquant, 1992; see applications in Nussbaum, 1990; Heller, 1990, 1992a, 1992b, 1994; Boix, 1993; Jones, Martin, Ozóg, 1993; Canagarajah, 1995b).

Two central ideas from Bourdieu's model should be retained:

1. His interest in developing a theoretical model which explicitly links physicalist and subjectivist (cf. section 3.3.1) views of social phenomena.
2. The pre-eminence of social structures over individual, subjective practice, and the acknowledgement of the individual's role in social action.

Bourdieu sees the opposition between the physicalist and the subjectivist approaches as complementary, and considers it necessary to combine both, should social sciences understand social reality. His own position is that of granting epistemological value to both approaches by defining two sorts of objectivity. On the one hand, he speaks of the objectivité de premier ordre or first order objectivity, created by the distribution across the social space of material resources and means to acquire socially rare goods and values. This is the "social physics" proposed by the earlier sociologists, comparable to a social topology or "analysis situs" (Bourdieu, 1988: 101). Its main risk is that of reifying its concepts to the point that they become abstract entities able to act as historical agents.

"Incapable de saisir la pratique autrement que négativement, comme simple exécution du modèle construit par l'analyste, l'objectivisme finit par projeter dans le cerveau des agents une vision (scolastique) de leur pratique que, paradoxalement, il ne pouvait atteindre que parce qu'il avait au préalable méthodiquement écarté l'expérience qu'en ont les agents." (Wacquant, 1992: 17)

On the other hand, there is the objectivité de deuxième ordre or "second order objectivity", in the form of mental and corporal schemata which function as the symbolic matrix for practical activities and behaviour. These schemata are the goal of study of subjectivist approaches, for whom social reality is seen as being continuously and contingently created by social actors through their practices. Nevertheless, this position on its own cannot account for the coincidence and persistence of social strategies.

In Bourdieu's view, the social sciences are bound to understand both objectivities. He attributes epistemological pre-eminence to societal structure, and sees the categories of perception as eventually determined by the former. It is the subjects' repeated exposure to a given set of societal structures which gives birth to a set of attitudes, beliefs and ways of behaving, the structures by means of which the social world is apprehended: the habitus. The habitus is a system of schemata for both the interpretation of the social world and the production of practice (Bourdieu with Wacquant, 1992: 91ff).

A second concept of relevance to be retained from Bourdieu's analysis is that of capitals. The social space -Bourdieu's preferred term to that of 'society'- is divided into different fields of human activity which do not assess every form of goods or knowledge as equal; rather, they assign to them different values. These are the capitals with which individuals enter the market. Capitals can be economic, cultural, social, and symbolic. Dominant groups assign a higher value to their own goods and characteristics, and (try to) impose their evaluations upon the whole society (Bourdieu with Wacquant, 1992: 94).

Bourdieu himself has devoted much reflexion to the way linguistic varieties, as forms of differently valued capitals, are used in social competition (Bourdieu, 1982). He has emphasised
that Saussure's and Chomsky's view of language as a treasure shared by the whole linguistic community:

"escamote la question des conditions économiques et sociales de l'acquisition de la compétence légitime et de la constitution du marché où s'établit et s'impose cette définition du légitime et de l'ilégitime." (Bourdieu, 1982: 25)

On the contrary, superordinated social groups use the state to spread not only their own language but also their own evaluations of language, i.e., their assessment of linguistic (as part of cultural) capital. A *socially pertinent* system of oppositions between linguistic features and varieties is therefore created and spread by the nation-state: differences in the social system are imported into the linguistic system(s) in a symbolic order. According to Bourdieu's view, the answer to this pressure is the effort by subordinate groups to acquire the supra-ordinate varieties. In their turn, the socially supraordinate have to remain linguistically different:

"tout permet de supposer qu'elles ((the distinctive practices)) s'enracinent dans un sens pratique de la rareté des marques distinctives (linguistiques ou autres) et de son évolution dans le temps: les mots qui se divulguent perdent leur pouvoir discriminateur." (Bourdieu, 1982: 56)

Strategies of assimilation and dissimilation become thus the origin of linguistic variation: these strategies not only reproduce structural social differences in a linguistic form, but also perpetuate them under different forms.

Bourdieu's model has been criticised as being incapable of accounting for the resistance to the dominant groups pressure, such as subordinate linguistic varieties maintenance or peer-group pressure to accommodate to subordinate cultural practices. Woolard (1985a) has argued that Bourdieu's -and other 'reproductionists'- fail to account for the creative power of subordinate groups in their cultural and linguistic practices, which goes well beyond the mere subsistence at the fringes of the economical market. According to her view, the emphasis on the power of socialization endowed to school and family is misplaced.

"Rather, I suggest that even in the Western bourgeois state, cultural hegemony is not established primarily through the schools and other formal institutions, even though the bourgeoisie has captured these and is more directly involved in them than in the exceptional state. The process by which such hegemony is actually consolidated may be simply obscured, particularly to the backward gaze, by the coincidence of political, civil, and economic dominance." (Woolard, 1985a: 79)

In a case in point, Woolard attributes the failure of the Spanish government's efforts to achieve Catalan language shift to the fact that Catalans have historically remained in control of economic power despite their ousting of political power; this leads her to suggest that, in the recent search for explanations of social reproduction, formal institutions have been overestimated, and that the researchers' attention should be "(...) forced back to the effects of primary economic relations on arrangements for everyday living, and on the informal structures of experience in daily life." (Woolard, 1985a: 742)
Heller (1988, 1989, 1990, 1992a, 1992b, 1994) has applied this theoretical framework to the analysis of French and English speakers' relationships in Canada. Starting from the point that linguistic resources are unequally distributed across the community, she has argued that, in order to understand the role and significance of codeswitching, it is essential:

"(...) to understand not only its distribution in the community, but, more importantly, how this distribution is tied to the way groups control both the distribution of access to valued resources and the way in which that value is assigned. Further, the study of code-switching (and its absence) can shed light on the way in which groups struggle over resources, and on the ways in which individual members of the community contribute to that struggle by creatively and strategically exploiting their linguistic resources in key interactions." (Heller, 1990: 71)

Linguistic practices not only reflect macrosocial factors but also contribute to their creation and perpetuation (e.g. Heller, 1989: 361). Code-switching may be either conventional or anti-conventional. Conventional language practices represent relatively stable relationships of power, while their violations can be seen as forms of resistance. Conventions are created, maintained or changed through social interaction. The absence of code-switching can be as significant as its presence (Heller, 1992b: 123).

Heller has analysed instances where code-switching became relevant as an index of intergroup relationships (Heller, 1990, 1992b). She has also described the social groups who will not engage in code-switching (Heller, 1990: 62-63; see also 1992b and section 2.6 for the analysis of code-switching at school): (1) People who are too far from the linguistic boundary to possess the resources (and the motivations) upon which code-switching is based; (2a) People mobilized in favour of a language or against it. Their political strategy entails a reinforcement, not a levelling, of the linguistic boundary; (2b) People whose privileged access to and control over resources are being threatened, and who react by either resistance to mobilization through flight from boundary disputes or through attempts at reinforcement of existing boundaries.

On the other hand, other groups are more prone to linguistic alternation as a strategy to level group boundaries, create ambiguity, and take advantage of the two worlds symbolized by each language. Code-switchers are willing to cross or level the language boundary (Heller, 1990: 65-66). In Canada, these are: (3) Some anglophones attempt to gain access to the resources controlled by francophones (and distributed through the use of French) by registering their children in immersion schools and by learning French themselves. They are mostly middle class, the ones who have held the jobs in which French has now become important. They also have the material resources and the cultural knowledge necessary to enable them to acquire French, this new form of symbolic capital which has changed its value in the marketplace and its place therein. (4) Other groups, especially those among whom code-switching is more frequent, are young English employees, young francophones trying to access older English-speakers, members of ethnically mixed couples, etc.
In Woolard's vein, Heller points to two basic criticisms to Bourdieu's model: (a) it explains the maintenance of a given balance, but hardly resistance and change, and (b) it limits our ability to locate the creative ability of individuals in social interaction to define and redefine social relations through communication. (Heller, 1992b: 125)

In the Catalan area, at least Nussbaum (1990), Boix (1993) and Pujolar (1995) have borrowed Bourdieu's views. Nussbaum (1990, 1991, 1992) makes a restricted use of Bourdieu's concepts. She considers the base language of a given interaction as being produced by linguistic market forces. In comparison, Boix (1993) espouses Bourdieu's model as a whole as the main sociological view on code switching, and applies it to the description of the Catalan case. Mirroring the sociological conflictivist paradigm and the main concern on language maintenance and shift predominant in Catalan sociolinguistics, Boix has also made the point that code-switches are very rare in conversations among members of ethnolinguistic groups which enjoy a good economic situation and find themselves in a process of ethnic and political mobilization in which language loyalty is important. On the contrary, code-switching is widely accepted in ethnolinguistic groups which are economically and socially peripheral and which undergo a process of language shift (Boix, 1993: 29).

The market model provides the researcher with a flexible set of interrelated concepts (capital, habitus, fields, etc.) which effectively connect individual behaviour to social constraints. As a whole, and in a conflict paradigm which sees individuals and groups competing for scarce resources, this theoretical model explains why most individuals acquiesce in normative behaviour and, simultaneously, provides an explanation for deviant, non-normative behaviour. Nevertheless, it is precisely in the flexibility of this model where some of its insufficiencies may rest. To my knowledge, the habitus model has so far not been operationalized and remains difficult to be empirically tested, for explicit hypotheses are difficult to be drawn from it in its current state.

II  Myers-Scotton's 'Markedness Model'

One of the most complete theoretical proposals with regard to the link between extralinguistic factors and language behaviour is Carol Myers-Scotton's (1993a) Markedness model. In its latest version (cf. previous versions in Myers-Scotton 1987, 1991) it is explicitly presented as an attempt at overcoming the limitations of both physicalist and interpretative approaches to language behaviour. Myers-Scotton acknowledges the importance of what she sees as the two previous research paradigms\(^8\): The "allocation paradigm" and the "interpretative/interactionist" model. She particularly underlines the relevance of John Gumperz in the promotion of research on code-switching.

\(^8\) She vacillates between defining them as a 'model' or a 'paradigm'.
Myers-Scotton considers essential that a theoretical model should (a) provide for an adequate explanation for all language behaviour, and (b) go beyond purely descriptive terms to explanation and even prediction, if possible. The allocation paradigm is inadequate for the description of language use in that it can only account for the use of one single language variety in each domain, and therefore does not provide any explanation for the use of the other varieties or for code-switching. On the other hand, the interpretative/interactional paradigm fails to provide researchers with some theoretical construct which goes beyond open-ended lists of functions for code-switching. She doubts that Gumperz believes in the possibility of generalizing across interactions in order to build explanatory theories (Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 59). A model which does not provide with general explanations ends up as an untestable model and risks to be based on ad hoc explanations.

As regards the actual links between extralinguistic factors and language behaviour, Myers-Scotton refuses the interpretative/interactionist position that meaning is basically locally managed:

"The issue, which has relevance far beyond the work of Gumperz, is this: are social meanings so much a product of individual interactions that they are largely locally negotiated? I would claim that answering this question with a 'yes' results from undue emphasis on the surface diversities existing among interactions everywhere." (Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 60)

Utterances do not obtain their meaning ex nihilo at every interaction; rather, their meaning heavily depends on social arrangements which are external to the speakers.

Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model incorporates the interpretative view that the speaker is the ultimate manager of conversation; he or she is no automaton predetermined by external circumstances, but has the power to choose whether to accommodate to the expected language behaviour or whether he or she prefers to break the expectations and adopt another language behaviour. This theory proposes that speakers have, as part of their communicative competence, a cognitive capacity to establish a difference between the expected (unmarked) linguistic varieties and the unexpected (or marked) linguistic varieties. This capacity, called markedness metric, is locally enacted according to each speech community rules.

"This markedness has a normative basis within the community, and speakers also know the consequences of making marked or unexpected choices. Because the unmarked choice is 'safer' (i.e. it conveys no surprises because it indexes an expected interpersonal relationship), speakers generally make this choice. But not always. Speakers assess the potential costs and rewards of all alternative choices, and make their decisions, typically unconsciously." (Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 75)

Linguistic choices are indexical, understood in Peirce's terms, of attitudes, beliefs, expectations a member of a given community shares with the others for a given interaction type. The use of each variety in a community's repertoire points to a somewhat different RO [Rights and Obligations] set within the interaction. An RO set is an abstract construct, derived from situational factors, standing for the attitudes and expectation of participants towards one
another. Switching to a different variety indexes a different persona for the speaker and a
different relationship with the addressee.

This connexion between a given RO set and a language variety grows out of the regular
association between both. The most frequently used language is the unmarked language in that
context of interaction. Breaking the expectations amounts to asking for a different RO set to be
enacted, and it is an option the speaker can take.

The Markedness Model is based on a principle, the **negotiation principle**, followed by three
maxims comparable to those proposed by Grice (1975). The negotiation principle states:

"Choose the form of your conversation contribution such that it indexes the set of rights and obligations
which you wish to be in force between speaker and addressee for the current exchange." (Myers-Scotton,
1993a: 113)

The three maxims which follow the negotiation principle are: (a) **The unmarked-choice
maxim**: "Make your code choice the unmarked index of the unmarked RO set in talk
exchanges when you wish to establish or affirm that RO set." (Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 114); (b)
**The marked-choice maxim**: "Make a marked code choice which is not the unmarked index of
the unmarked RO set in an interaction when you wish to establish a new RO set as unmarked
for the current exchange." (ibid.: 131); and (c) **The exploratory maxim**: "When an unmarked
choice is not clear, use code-switching to make alternate exploratory choices as candidates for
an unmarked choice and thereby as an index of an RO set which you favour." (ibid.: 142)

The unmarked-choice maxim is complemented by two auxiliary maxims: (a.1) **The deference
maxim**: "Switch to a code which expresses deference to others when special respect is called
for by circumstances." (ibid.: 147); and (a.2) **the virtuosity maxim**: "Switch to whatever code
is necessary in order to carry on the conversation/ accommodate the participation of all
speakers presents." (ibid.: 148)

The application of these maxims may result in one of the following four patterns of code-
switching:

- **a. Sequential unmarked code-switching** is the most widespread possible result of applying
the unmarked-choice maxim: "When one or more of the situational factors change within the
course of a conversation, the unmarked RO set may change. (.) Whenever the unmarked RO
set is altered by such factors, the speaker will switch codes if he or she wishes to index the new
unmarked RO set." (ibid.: 114). From a structural point of view, sequential unmarked code-
switching seems to be basically intersentential.

- **b. Code-switching itself as the unmarked choice (unmarked code-switching)**, based on the
frequent switching between languages, is a less frequent possibility of code-switching: "each
switch in unmarked CS does not necessarily have a special indexicality; rather, it is the overall
pattern which carries the communicative intention." (ibid.: 117). From a structural point of view, unmarked code-switching may include alternating sentences as sequential unmarked code-switching, but may more typically include a good deal of intrasentential switching, which is especially characteristic of unmarked code-switching. One-word and intra-word switching is also characteristic of this code-switching pattern (ibid.: 125).

c. **Code-switching as a marked choice** is produced when the speaker follows the marked-choice maxim, suggesting: "Put aside any presumptions you have based on societal norms for these circumstances. I want your view of me, or of our relationship, to be otherwise." (ibid.: 131). The final goal of a marked choice is to negotiate a change in the expected social distance holding between participants, either increasing or decreasing it, by gaining ascendance or authority by switching to a language associated with power, excluding/non-ethnics from an interaction by switching to an ethnic/linguistic, aesthetic effects, etc. Marked code-switching is often structurally flagged, i.e., it is accompanied by a number of elements which detach it from its surroundings. This is not surprising since, in her model, marked choices are meant to call attention to themselves. Flagging occurs at several different levels, basically at the content level and at the phonological levels (ibid.: 141)

d. **Code-switching as an exploratory choice (exploratory code-switching)** is the result of applying the exploratory maxim. It is not frequent because non-conventionalized situations are usually few. They are usually the result of different norms overlapping or due to the fluidity provoked by changes in language policy such as those in which a part of the community contests the former norms.

The Markedness Model makes an effort to systematically predict in what conditions code-switching will take place and what sort of speakers will engage in such practice: "(...) when faced with choosing paths, the majority of speakers will follow the known path and make unmarked choices (...)" (ibid.: 154). It also makes different predictions about the contexts which favour each code-switching type.

While the Markedness Model is indubitably a remarkable attempt to explain the social motivations for code-switching, it has received numerous critiques from a number of authors (e.g. Baetens Beardsmore and Anselmi, 1991; Meeuwis and Blommaert, 1994; Muysken and De Rooij, 1995). Some of the main points of criticism are the following:

The Markedness Model statement that all code-switching is to be understood in terms of negotiation of identity is too powerful, and excludes other conversational and stylistic functions of code-switching. Code-switching as a marked choice should be more carefully defined in its attempt at subsuming all the 'rhetorical' or 'aesthetic' functions already described in the literature, for at the moment it seems vaguely defined. In this sense, the Rights and Obligations (RO) set in its current formulation suffers from lack of definition. In order to make
it operational, it should be carefully described; otherwise, it may end up becoming the joker to explain all sorts of switches.

The Markedness Model is weakly linked to societal processes; in Meeuwis and Blommaert's (1994) terms, society is simply absent from this model. A Parsonian structuralist functionalist view is implicitly adopted where the subjects decide how to act on the grounds of their individual interests. This model, thus, includes micro-level negotiation and speakers' rational choice, but the model does not suggest that social groups, as individuals, compete for resources, and it seems to assume that all speakers belong to the same speech community (cf. Muysken and De Rooij, 1995: 1045). In the model, norms are shared and linguistic varieties appear as generally available to everyone, when this is hardly the case. Association between RO sets and linguistic varieties is not simply a matter of frequency: it is a matter of history, power and dominance as well (Gal, 1988), and this should be explicitly recognized in the model. This limitation had already been pointed out by Blommaert (1992) in the model's previous versions, and is now stressed by Meeuwis and Blommaert (1994), who blamed the model's mentalist, subjectivist bias for it.

The Markedness Model yields a fixed, rather static image of sociolinguistic reality (cf. Muysken and De Rooij, 1995: 1045). This shortcoming is significant in several aspects. The model does not clearly discuss how code-switching patterns arise, and how they transform from one into another; for instance, when and how does code-switching as a marked option becomes itself the unmarked option, and why? In its present form, the Markedness Model pays scarce attention to the link between code-switching and language shift and, when it does, it is only to refuse their systematic association (Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 1). However, research elsewhere has proved that at least some populations known for their ample resource to code-switching do experience massive shift as well (e.g. Hispanics in the USA, see Fishman, 1991: 187), and other researchers have documented code-switching as an intermediate stage in thorough language shift (Gal, 1979; Gardner-Chloros, 1991; Li Wei, 1994). Some of Myers-Scotton's examples, such as ex. 23 (1993a: 149) and her own comments in the sense that some social groups do not need the African ethnic languages anymore (1993a: 34) suggest that, at least in a number of cases, code-switching does constitute a path for abandoning subordinate linguistic varieties and to spread nativised (ex-)colonial languages (cf. Myers-Scotton, 1991). In this sense, the Markedness Model suffers from the same staticness as domain analysis and interpretative/interactive analysis. If bilingualism and multilingualism are unstable by definition, a clearer distinction should be attempted between those cases in which code-switching constitutes a language-shift by-product (code-switching itself as an unmarked choice?) and those in which it indexes other cases of group contact.

Finally, it seems as if the discovery that code-switching is not necessarily related to insufficient mastery of L2 had created a sort of taboo against recognizing that such a link actually exists (cf. Baetens Beardsmore and Anselmi, 1991: 413). The Markedness Model contains few
references to the level of proficiency needed to engage in code-switching practices. Level of control of L2 should probably be introduced in the model, be it only to explain why some groups engage in certain patterns of code-switching while others do not - cf. Castilian-speakers in Catalonia, who are receptively but not productively bilingual in Catalan, with Catalan-speakers, who are productively bilingual.

III Combining acculturation and audience design theories

Research by Baetens Beardsmore and Anselmi (1991) in a multilingual, unstable language community represented by the European schools has substantiated some of the limitations inherent in the Markedness model. In this school, children from all over the European Union are taught by means of several languages and become proficient in a minimum of two or three of them. Social engineering tries to maintain their respective L1 while enhancing cross-linguistic interaction and the development of a common European identity.

"It is by no means evident that a European School represents a clearly definable speech community in which the languages in presence reflect established roles and social values. It is true that in the formal curriculum the eight languages of instruction carry clear social functions, as do the three "vehicular" languages which are offered for selection as compulsory L2s for all (French, English and German). But once the constraints of the formal curriculum are relaxed, as in breaks, free periods, etc., the various languages used only rarely carry a precise social meaning." (Baetens Beardsmore and Anselmi, 1991: 409)

According to the article, three main norms may be described as operating in these schools, namely (a) formal interaction (i.e., class activities) functions in the language of instruction, (b) ingroup communication functions primarily in the ingroup language, (c) the out-of-school majority language is the safe choice in case of doubt.

In between the scope of application of these norms lies an area of linguistic indetermination. The relevance of these schools is that their composition and the social engineering practiced seem to preclude further stabilization of social meanings for each language, and therefore highlight the individuals' roles in language choice. This circumstance permits the authors to assess Schumann's (1979, 1986) 'Acculturation Model' and Bell's (1984) 'Audience Design Model' in the framework of an unstable multilingual community, which are found useful to explain the motivation behind certain switches.

Baetens Beardsmore and Anselmi (1991: 422) raise the significant issue of whether the Markedness Model is too powerful in that it presupposes a social meaning for all marked choices.

"Hence, the theory states, social consequences, not norms, motivate choices. It is not self-evident, however, from the data collected in our multilingual context, that it is the social consequences that motivate the choices, since we have evidence to show that even the very loose social norms applicable in the school can control code-switching." (my emphasis) (Baetens Beardsmore and Anselmi, 1991: 422)
They present some examples to support their claims. In the following instance (their ex. 16) all participants were Italians and code-switching to French occurs:

A: Ma allora, dove hai messo la borsa?
B: Ma é là sur le palier.
C: Senti quello come parla bene l'italiano.

(A: Well then, where's your bag?
B: It's over there on the landing.
C: Just listen to how well he speaks Italian!)


According to the authors, there is nothing in this fragment of interaction that leads to believe that such a switch is a claim to apply a different RO set than the one previously in use. This and other examples are provided to support the idea that under certain conditions it is the person-to-person relationship which determines language use patterns, while interference from social constraints is minimal (quoting Tabouret-Keller, 1983: 142)

Finally, Baetens Beardsmore and Anselmi (1991) warn against the premature adoption of supposedly universal theories regarding code-switching:

"It seems clear that some of the major theories are not universally applicable in their present form since they are too powerful, though they are useful in representing modal tendencies which may well cover a majority of cases." (Baetens Beardsmore and Anselmi, 1991: 430)

IV Social network theory

The limitations of objectivist approaches have driven social sciences to develop other theoretical constructs which include more of individual attributes. One trend is that of structuralist sociology, which criticizes the traditional sociological view in that the latter believes, axiomatically, that enduring patterns in the relationships among the elementary parts of social systems constrain individual behaviour, a view which separates sociology from fields such as psychology or economics, which ultimately rest on individualistic assumptions.

"Their (sociologists') analyses treat persons as automata, moving like compass needles, in response to internalized norms. Their explanations hinge on discovering that persons with similar attributes (e.g., gender, urban residence) behave similarly in response to shared norms. Such analyses, which are based upon an inferred vocabulary of motives, can detect social structures only indirectly." (Wellman and Berkowitz, 1988: 2).

Structuralist sociologists propose an alternative approach, starting from the study of relationships between subjects, their locations in the social structure, and stressing the need of understanding the particular social structure rather than an abstract one.

"Rather than beginning with an a priori classification of the observable world into a discrete set of categories, they begin with a set of relations, from which they derive maps and typologies of social structures. Thus they draw inferences from wholes to parts, from structures and relations to categories, and from behaviors to attitudes." (Wellman and Berkowitz, 1988: 3)
These sociologists have developed the social network model as a central point in their analysis, suggesting that network analysis is "neither a method nor a metaphor", but a fundamental intellectual tool for the study of some social structures. People's relationships can be represented as networks, i.e., as sets of nodes (or social system members) and sets of ties depicting their interconnections. (Wellman and Berkowitz, 1988: 4). It is in these networks that social action should be understood. Personal relationships can be viewed as a scattering of points where each individual represents a point that is united by lines, or relationships, to other points. This scatter diagram has different forms depending on the type of relationships established between subjects.

In its classic formulation, social network theory distinguishes between two major criteria: interactional and structural (cf. Boissevain, 1987). *Multiplexity* and *density* are two of the most fundamental criteria for network analysis. Networks with high multiplexity and high density, i.e., networks where members are linked to one another by more than one capacity and in which most members are directly linked with the rest of the network, are called close-knit networks (or tightly-knit networks); in contrast, open (or loosely-knit) networks are those in which uniplex relationships and low density predominate. Close-knit networks are assumed to exert higher pressure towards group-conformity. Networks brought about by individuals' voluntary association are termed *coalitions*. They are *cliques*, *gangs*, *action-sets* and *factions*, each with its own characteristic reasons to be created, its own internal structure and goals (Boissevain, 1974)

Lesley Milroy has championed the adoption of social-network analysis as a sociolinguistic tool (for an up-to-date review, see Hatzidaki, 1994: 22-41). Milroy's (1987a) application of the social network construct to her social dialectological research in Belfast provided valuable insights of how horizontal pressures in close-knit networks could override the prestige influence of the standard language. Of more relevance for our review here, in her analysis of language maintenance among Greek immigrants in Brussels, Hatzidaki (1994) found that use of the ethnic language was clearly receding, but significant differences could be identified in its use between different networks, while attitudinal aspects towards language or proficiency in Greek were found not to be relevant. In Treffers-Daller (1992), on the contrary, social network was not found to be of significance in the prediction of code-switching patterns in Brussels.

Taking social networks as a significant point in his approach, Li Wei's (1994) analysis of Tyneside (Northern England) Chinese community constitutes one of the most complete attempts to elaborate a model combining macro-societal and micro-interpretative approaches to multilingualism and language choice.

At the theoretical level, Li Wei's model draws from a number of sources: (a) *social network theory*, in positing that personal contacts and relationships are relevant to the understanding of
social behaviour; (b) *Bell's (1984) audience design*, in that it claims that interlocutors are the primary source of stylistic variation, and regards stylistic variation as a function of social variation; (c) a number of social approaches to code-choice: mainly Gal, Myers-Scotton and Heller's considerations that code-switching has to be interpreted according to a normative framework provided by supraindividual language norms; (d) *conversation analysis* and Auer's approach to code-switching as a contextualization cue, in that it considers language alternation as a mechanism to manage conversation, and in that it rejects analysing code-switching in terms of functions, and in its stress that code-switching has to be sequentially analysed.

At the methodological level, Li Wei's analysis relies on ethnographic techniques for data collection, basically participant observation and in-depth semi-structured interviews; but he stands out among qualitative researchers in his detailed explanation of the observation *process*, and his account of the *observer's* characteristics judged relevant to the investigation. His data analysis is primarily inductive, and owes much to social network methodology and principles: he does not analyse the linguistic correlates of social groups established *a priori* according to independent social variables (e.g. sex, age, first language); instead, he starts by elucidating the different language choice patterns present in the community, classifies the subjects in groups according to their language choice patterns, and only then turns to correlational analysis to check whether significant differences exist between these groups.

Li Wei (1994) corrects a number of excesses which have proliferated in previous literature on bilingualism. On the one hand, he underlines the limits of the speaker's freedom to creatively use his linguistic varieties.

"Thus, in order to understand the social meaning of code-switching, we need to relate specific interactional strategies to the more general patterns of language choice and language ability at the inter-speaker (or community) level (...)" (Li Wei, 1994: 166)

On the other hand, he rightly stresses that bilingualism does not necessarily imply code-switching.

"It is a mistake to assume that code-switching occurs in all bilingual communities on all occasions. In language shift situations at least, code-switching occurs only between certain speakers in certain contexts. (...) Thus, in the Tyneside Chinese community code-switching is speaker and context-specific. It is not a community-wide phenomena. In fact, code-switching makes up no more than 50 minutes of the total 23 hours of tape-recorded data -a very small proportion of the corpus." (Li Wei, 1994: 151)

It is precisely from its exceptionality that code-switching obtains its meaning.

"Since the general preference is therefore for monolingualism, code-switching in conversation is always purposeful, if sometimes unconscious. In other words, speakers generally know what the preferred languages is for an ongoing interaction, and they choose a different language in order to draw the attention of addressees to some specific discourse structure, so that that part of the conversation could be interpreted differently from the rest of the interaction." (Li Wei, 1994: 151)

Li Wei's (1994) analysis confirms the significance of network analysis to understand
sociolinguistic regularities that go beyond the variables normally used in quantitative studies. Language choice patterns are inductively discovered, and they are not necessarily community-wide. Instead, contradictory patterns of language choice and code-switching may coexist. Different generations and different social networks result in different patterns, to the extent that he proposes a classification of speakers in bilingual communities according to their linguistic abilities and their social networks:

Type 1. *The monolingual community language speaker*, with practically no knowledge in the host language and little -if any- contact with the host society.

Type 2. *The functionally monolingual community language speaker*, with little knowledge of the host language and a few contacts of little significance with that society.

Type 3. *The functionally bilingual speaker*, which makes some regular use of the host language in a number of contexts, maintains different monolingual sets in his/her social network, and rarely engages in conversational switching.

Type 4. *The 'mixed' bilingual speaker*, enmeshed in social networks where everybody switches; he/she uses a characteristic switched mode, although remains able to separate both codes.

Type 5. *The functionally bilingual 'host' language speaker*, whose mother language is the ethnic language but uses the host language in most contexts outside the community, and even inside from time to time.

Type 6. *The functionally monolingual 'host' language speaker*, which has a reduced competence in the community language (even just receptive), has little links with community members, and uses the host language in practically all contexts.

Other speaker types are also suggested, such as Schooling's (1990) *forced bilingual speaker*, raised outside the community with the host language as his/her L1 and eventually forced to reincorporate to the community and to learn its language.

The diversity of language choice patterns complicates the meaning of 'we code' and 'they code'; it stops being a simple issue of community vs. host society language:

"We may therefore suggest in a general way that only Chinese is used by grandparents and to grandparents; while English is used by children and to children; and both Chinese and English may be used by parents and to parents. As Gal (1979) argues, it is through this kind of association between choices of language(s) and particular types of interlocutors that languages acquire their social symbolism." (Li Wei, 1994: 144)

Classificatory attempts on the basis of code-switching functions are discarded by Li Wei
(1994), and Auer's sequencial view of code-switching is espoused. Code-switching is understood as a "discourse strategy whereby bilingual speakers accommodate and collaborate with each other." (Li Wei, 1994: 171). Switching serves as a powerful, although optional, contextualization cue, in several ways: (a) contextualising turn-taking; (b) contextualising preference organisation; (c) contextualising repairs; (d) contextualising pre-sequences and insertion sequences.

Li Wei's (1994) proposal stands out as one of the most elaborated language choice and code-switching models, and it will probably occupy a remarkable place in future research. This model provides the researcher with the possibility to obtain a coherent picture of a variegated situation (e.g., with its speaker types). This undoubtedly constitutes a step ahead in that it structures both socially and conversationally what used to be accounted for in terms of idiosyncratic individual responses to local stimuli. Nevertheless, a number of shortcomings seem apparent in his proposals.

The model in its present state remains basically correlational, more than explanatory and predictive, i.e., it probably constitutes a better tool for intragroup analysis than for intergroup comparisons. One of the reasons for it may be that, in spite of its emphasis on establishing a link between macro-societal and micro-interactional levels, it still falls short of incorporating some crucial notions such as power and authority. While these concepts may appear superfluous in the case of immigrant minorities due to the huge gap between them and the host community, they probably play a more significant role in the indigenous subordinate groups' language maintenance and shift.

This failure in identifying causal relationships to account for the process direction results in a difficulty of clarifying how choice patterns appear and transform from one another. Therefore, the model does not produce much understanding of the shift rhythms. For instance, it remains unclear under what conditions the 'mixed speaker' (and, a fortiori, his/her 'switching network') develops his/her switching strategies, whether different networks may be formed characterised by different switching patterns, and how they eventually disappear -if they do so.

Li Wei's claim that all code-switching can be analysed in sequential terms appears overpredictive. At least in some cases, social relationships clearly exclude local conversational exploitation of language alternation. Li Wei's (1994: 157ff) comments regarding the often cited 'addresse-specification' function served by code-switching are a convenient example. According to Li Wei, addresse-specification has to be analysed as a cue contextualising turn-taking, and, indeed, a number of his speakers seem to use the contrast established between Chinese and English to signal turn yielding. An example of such a behaviour is provided by a speaker who, in the middle of their conversation in English, switches to Chinese to prompt an answer which has not been provoked by his previous utterance and following pause:
(1) (Two male speakers in their mid-twenties.)
A: ... He should be home now (.) I think
(1.5)
A: maybe ye (.) perhaps I (.). koeige namba geido a
(What's his number?)
B: yibaatsaam (.) yichat (.) yichatchatluk
(283) (27) (2776)
Source: Li Wei, 1994: 158

It sounds reasonable that the contrast between both languages may be understood as requesting the interlocutor's collaboration. This example shows how code-switching may function as a conversational device contributing to the local management of conversation, beyond its potential social meaning.

Nevertheless, extrapolating this example to other situations may be misleading, at least in the case of Catalonia, where addressee-specification remains clearly linked to the interlocutors' social identities. As chapter 5 will try to prove both quantitatively and qualitatively, language in the Catalan context serves primarily for addressee selection on the basis of the social association of each speaker with a linguistic group. To my knowledge, no instance of switching as the one provided above has been documented in the Catalan Countries: Castilian is not used by Catalan speakers to give the floor to Catalan speakers, neither is Catalan used among Castilian speakers for this purpose. Thus, this particular type of switch remains alien to sequential analysis, while retaining all its meaning as addressee-specifiers.

This discrepancy between Catalan-Castilian and Chinese-English uses of code-switching might be partially explained by considering that addressee-specification in the first context constitutes a mandatory choice (i.e., a situational switch), while in Tyneside it constitutes a conversational device based on (unexpected) contrast. This interpretation causes other problems, for none of the conversational uses of code-switching proposed by Li Wei seem to be present in the Catalan-Castilian data discussed in the present study, while some of the most often quoted conversational functions are, namely code-switching as a discourse device for expressing a second voice (quotations) and code-switching for language-related games⁹ (see section 5.2). It is significant at this point to remind that the second voice function remains closely linked with person identification, which is not by chance the main function served by the addressee-specification function just discussed. Thus, at least in the context here analysed, code-switching seems to retain enough social associations as to make most conversational, non-socially determined uses unavailable in practice. This seems to have serious consequences for language alternation interpretation, since the role of sequenciality diminishes and the shared, social knowledge gains preeminence, irrespective of conversational structure.

An example of the social association preserved by each language in Catalonia may be of help here. The example is provided by a particular scene from a Catalan soap opera (Secrets de

⁹Of course, competence-related switching is also recorded.
família, broadcast in April 1995 on TV3). Two young male doctors were the main characters in the scene. Both were sitting in a bar, one facing the other, drinking beer. The reason for their drinking was that, being themselves good friends, they were both in love with the same woman, and she could not make up her mind about whom to choose. She had to decide whether to break up with her previous boy friend, Ángel, one of the doctors, who had recently arrived from a humanitarian mission in Rwanda, and pursue her newly started love affair with Enrique, the second doctor, or whether to leave Enrique and resume her long-standing relationship with Ángel. The scene which is of relevance here started with both of them relatively drunk, ordering more beers and treating each other while complaining about their fate. They had obviously changed their mood, which at the beginning of the episode was rather gloomy and angry, to one of old friends and camaraderie. And the one thing which made evident the change was that Enrique, who so far in the series had consistently spoken only Castilian and produced only the odd word in Catalan, was now speaking exclusively Catalan to Ángel and even to the waiter, while Ángel, who had not uttered a single word in Castilian in the whole series, was now addressing Enrique in this language. A sequential analysis would not discover why the audience was so relieved to see that those two nice guys had become good pals again, for there was no sequential code-switch to refer to. The beginning of the episode, broadcast a while earlier, had surely passed unnoticed from a linguistic point of view to every viewer, for expectations had been accomplished, with Ángel speaking Catalan and Enrique replying in Castilian as they had always done before. The relevant passage was a marked choice not with respect to a particular sequential structure, but with respect to the clear linguistic expectations established for every participant. The interpretation had to do not with a particular sequence but rather with the exchanged linguistic choices.

Thus, a theoretical distinction may be pertinent between those contexts such as the Catalan one where each language social associations remain predominant, and those such as Auer's Italian immigrants and Li Wei's Chinese mixed bilingual speakers, where social associations seem to be so reduced that they have given way to conversational uses.

2.3.5 Social and discourse perspectives on code-switching: a classification

1 Justification

Earlier approaches to switching phenomena were satisfied with a single term to refer to the adoption of one of the available varieties for a given domain, and this term used to be language choice or language selection. In both cases, the term implied a rather categorical option for a customary language. The quantitatively less significant intrusions of the other varieties represented by one or more switches were worth little research. As a consequence of this usage, choice and selection were associated with a sense of permanence in adopting a variety, a connotation which has been carried over to later classifications, irrespective of their particular approaches (e.g. Grosjean, 1990: 108; Hyltenstan, 1990: 221; Gardner-Chloros, 1991; Boix,
The emphasis on the creative and discourse functions of code-switching by interpretative approaches had as a consequence that classifications of code-switching phenomena proliferated, for it became necessary to delimit each function with respect to the others. The initial opposition between situational code-switching and metaphorical code-switching (Blom and Gumperz, 1972), later referred to as situational versus conversational code-switching (Gumperz, 1982), has frequently been reinterpreted, complemented or even replaced by new classifications. These classifications of code-switching phenomena have often made simultaneous use of several levels of analysis in an attempt to combine social, conversational and structural properties. Thus, situational criteria (e.g. change of participant constellation) have been applied next to discourse ones (e.g. reported speech, side-comments) and to structural ones (e.g. length of utterance) (cf. Auer, 1991: 326). Most of these classifications have turned out to be either too locally based or unconnected to other levels of analysis. These classifications have come to add to the already confused area of language contact based on structural considerations. The need to consider interference phenomena in code-switching models, next to, but not mixed with code-switching, has often increased the confusion.

I argue that an approach that maintains each level clearly distinct from the others will not only help simplify the current terminological proliferation but also result in a clearer understanding of language contact phenomena and a better coordination between different levels of analysis. In this section, a tentative classification of language contact phenomena will be produced in order to synthesise the previous reflections. The proposal, which does not claim exhaustivity, is based on the discussion of available theoretical models and owes much to Bourdieu's (1992) linguistic market metaphor and Woolard's (1985a) considerations about it, and to Myers-Scotton's (1993a) Markedness Model. The proposal distinguishes between three levels of analysis: social, discourse and structural levels; special emphasis is made on the social and discourse approach, while less attention is devoted to strictly conversational and structural approaches, due to the very nature of the data reviewed. An effort is made not to unnecessarily multiply terminology and, therefore, only one term, choice transgression can be said to be entirely new to the field.

II Social level

Two notions seem central to this level of analysis: on the one hand, that of code/language choice and, on the other, that of norms of language use.

I will use the term code choice to refer to the consistent adoption of a means of communication which is internally (by using the same linguistic resources) and externally (over time) consistent. Choices can be monolingual (i.e., language A, language B) or bi-/plurilingual (when code-switching itself becomes the unmarked choice). Choices are defined in quantitative
terms, and used for both macro and micro analysis: language choice for international institutions (e.g. the European Union) and the choice during a particular speech event (e.g. between two friends). The different language choices deployed by an individual or a group form their language choice patterns.

**Norm of language use** refers to the theoretical construct that synthesises the set of code choices and licit transgressions of those choices (see below) assigned as a function of situational (in wider ethnographic terms) constraints in each speech community. In monolingual societies, norms of language use regulate the use of functional and dialectal varieties; in multilingual settings, norms also prescribe different choices as a function of participants, degree of formality, purpose of the interaction, etc. The principles underlying norms vary from one community to another. When norms establish significant differences between subgroups of the community, different language choice patterns may be assigned to each subgroup; in Catalonia, norms have traditionally prescribed different language choice patterns as a function of both speaker and addressee's first language, while in diglossic communities choice may be based on degree of formality.

Norms are socially imposed, i.e., they are not locally decided at every conversation *ex novo*. Norms translate the power balances existing in the community into linguistic practice, and mirror society's composition, tensions and evolution. Thus, norms cannot be exclusively regarded as the result of the dominant groups imposition, but rather translate the different social balances existing in each field at any given moment. In socially stable situations, norms of language use are, by definition, of general application, and in principle enjoy stability. The longer the situation remains stable, the longer norms of language use may be expected to remain, although absolute stability may be out of question even for the smallest and most homogeneous communities. Norms of language use -as social norms in general- become self-perpetuating. Norms are based on frequency of association, and their continuous application feeds them back, while continuous challenge erodes their legitimacy.

In heterogeneous societies -and all societies are heterogenous to a lesser or greater degree- dominant norms need not be automatically espoused by the whole community. Normative discrepancy is obviously higher when two or more independent linguistic communities fuse into a new, single community, as in the case of language shift. Non-dominant groups (and individuals) *may* adapt to dominant norms: thus, Catalan, Occitan, Breton and the other subordinate languages have been almost completely extirpated from France as a result of the successful nation-state building. Nevertheless, groups (and individuals) *may* challenge the dominant norms by failing to apply them; they can also try to modify the existing normative set, or even attempt to impose alternative norms. These situations may lead to normative conflicts where a particular set of choices or even the whole normative system is put in question by intergroup tension. The situation described for Quebec by Heller (1982, 1988) exemplifies this normative conflict.
We can therefore posit that a norm of language use can be (partially) modified or even totally transformed into a new one as a consequence of a process of social change. Between the original and the final normative sets lies a period of normative rearrangement, during which the original norm is challenged by new trends. Linguistic behaviour becomes, then, the object of (explicit or implicit) controversy, and greater variation is expected in language choice. Normative transformations do not usually affect the community as whole, but rather those population segments that are more intimately in contact with the changing social factors promoting the normative rearrangement. Thus, different social sectors may be successively affected by normative rearrangement as social changes advance.

Immigrant communities seem to be particularly fertile grounds for normative conflicts. At the end of the day, (im)migration deals basically with carving one's niche in the host community by adapting one's own normative set to that of the receiving society. Norm concurrence and instability in choices are therefore expected as transitional stages elapsing between the arrival in the new country and the attainment of a new normative set. American and European immigrant communities seem to point out that the eventual normative sets predominantly coincide with total language shift within three to four generations, although a few cases seem to have escaped this fate (cf. Fishman, 1991). Again, though, it is (lack of) power, not migration per se, what determines normative conflict: European minority settlers in colonies were never fundamentally embarrassed in their linguistic practices by migration.

Both the periods of normative stability and normative rearrangement obviously constitute idealized constructs, for neither stability nor instability are absolute; both labels designate periods of major or lesser social consensus about normative behaviour. In situations of sociolinguistic stability, normative sets assure the smooth, predictable application of norms to most social circumstances. Nevertheless, even during the most stable periods circumstances appear where norms of language use run into trouble, due to their competition with alternative norms, or simply due to the very impredictability of the situation. Foreign language classes, encounters in foreign countries or with foreign language speakers provoke such circumstances of normative insecurity. As in the case of periods of normative rearrangement, these are situations of normative insecurity and rearrangement.

In periods and/or situations of normative instability, bargaining between norms leads to negotiation of a commonly agreed means of communication. 'Agreement' should not necessarily be understood as harmonious consensus; it may include variable degrees of imposition from one or more speakers on the others, ranging from the gentle negotiation of a common code among multilingual speakers sharing several codes with different abilities in each one, to conflictual encounters between opposed language activists. Negotiation does not always reach agreement, and, therefore, language choice patterns may remain contradictory, in terms of the norms they index, throughout a whole interaction, and even more; nevertheless,
persistent disagreement seems to be the exception rather than the rule. Thus, negotiation is better not regarded as a choice in itself, since it is a transitional stage during which the selection of a consistent pattern is delayed by means of a vacillation between two choices, marked by attempts to explore the use of one choice over the other. In any case, systematic challenge of a norm in the form of repetititve demands for renegotiation may eventually result in normative transformation. Success in transforming the norms, though, depends on social, extralinguistic factors.

III Discourse and interactional analysis level

The possibility of renegotiating norms of language use leads us to the discourse and conversational level. Central to the discourse analysis of transcodic markers seem to be the notions of markedness, norm / choice transgression, and sequentiality vs. social associations.

The norms of language use of each community define what the particular unmarked choices are, that is, the linguistic means used by default in a particular sociolinguistic situation. But, as other social norms, default options may be challenged and effectively violated by using linguistic features which are marked from the normative point of view. This is what I will call choice transgression. Interpretative sociolinguistics has furnished massive evidence that transgressions of the unmarked choices are resented as marked linguistic practices and assigned social and/or discourse-conversational meanings which vary according to the society and the phenomenon involved.

Choice transgressions may range from the use of a single marked linguistic item to a consistent inadequate choice, such as the adoption of a dialectal accent where not expected, the inclusion of evident borrowings in inadequate speech events, the excessive puristic reluctance against everyday morphological features or the consistent adoption of a linguistic variety unexpected according to the situation. The latter phenomenon constitutes an actual marked choice. In all cases, though, marked behaviours are interpreted by speakers in the framework provided by the normative set, not independently.

"a marked choice [i.e., the switch away from the unmarked choice] is an innovation how and where it is used. But it is not an innovation in the system. Again, as with all choices, marked choices must be part of the system in order to be interpreted." (Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 141)

Some of the choice transgressions seem to be fairly integrated into the normative system, while others are felt as threatening the norm. Thus, in ingroup Catalan communication, telling jokes in Castilian seems a widely accepted linguistic practice, while pursuing in Castilian once the joke is finished remains a highly marked behaviour. The first could be considered a licit transgression according to Catalan norms of language use, while the second one could be regarded as an illicit transgression. Illicit transgressions are understood as a call for the
application of an alternative norm, while licit transgressions consist of those choice transgressions which are not understood as threatening the current norm by the community. It is unclear how illicit transgressions become licit, and how transgressions (i.e. marked options) become unmarked. Nevertheless, a continuum may be posited between them, so that increase in the use of illicit transgressions may eventually turn them licit and even unmarked. It remains to be seen what are the mechanisms that separate each phenomenon.

Auer (1984: 12; 1990, 1991) has suggested that instances of code-switching (code alternation, in his own terms) could be understood in terms of being discourse-related and participant-related. Code-switching is said to be discourse-related when it provides cues for the organization of the ongoing interaction; it serves as a contextualization cue for the start of new topics, new activities, expression of (dis)agreement, etc. Code-switching is considered participant-related when it informs about attributes of the people involved in the conversation, such as their preferred language of interaction, their linguistic competence, etc. The opposition between both is not categorical: some instances may be simultaneously strongly discourse-related while simultaneously conveying much information about participants. Both concepts will be retained in our data analysis.

While sequentiality undoubtedly plays a significant role in conversational code-switching, it cannot be understood on its own but in a dynamic relation with language broader social associations. Both terms seem to be in complementary relationship. There seem to exist contexts where the social associations evoked by each code override the possibility of using code-switching at the same level as other language contextualization cues; in other contexts, on the contrary, social associations seem to recede and the contrast provoked by language alternation may increase its productivity regarding the local management of conversation. In fact, it has been suggested (e.g. McClure and McClure, 1988: 47) that situational code-switching (i.e., switching depending on social associations) is historically (and genetically) prior to conversational switching.

Conversational exploitation of code-switching requires a high degree of bilingual ability; therefore, it is to be habitually regarded as a discourse-related phenomenon. It is not totally clear what contexts are more favourable for non-social, predominantly conversational exploitation of code-switching, although it can be surmised that periods and social sectors experiencing normative rearrangement, or normatively uncertain situations in which social identities linked to each language are equally valued, encourage this conversational uses. It is not by chance that the most significant examples presented for a sequential approach to code-switching come from (highly bilingual sectors of) immigrant communities in process of language shift such as Auer’s Italian immigrant, German-educated children, or Li Wei’s British-born Chinese (other cases in this line would very probably be McConvell’s (1988) Gurindji-Kriol speakers in Australia, or the Italian dialect-speakers described in both Alfonzetti (1992), Sobrero (1992), Poplack’s (1988) Puertoricans, among many others). It remains to be
seen whether Myers-Scotton’s (1993a) East-Africans should be included in this group.

In comparison with these contexts encouraging conversational, non-social code-switching, more stable bilingual communities such Catalans, Romanian Saxons, (McClure and McClure, 1988), or Vollmer’s (1991) American Hutterites, where languages are more heavily loaded with social meanings, do not extensively exploit the conversational potentialities of code-switching.

Nevertheless, internal heterogeneity should not be overseen. Some examples from Catalonia itself, such as the following one, produced by a pharmacist in Barcelona, seem to point to the existence of conversational code-switching with little social connexions in some still undetermined social sectors.

Pharmacist to a client (Catalan in bold, Castilian in standard, dubious in italics, for transcribing conventions see chapter 4).

Fsí tiene molta febre
F(,) te doy uns (,) altres (,) que van muy bien para la fiebre/ que no costen gaire/

F if he’s got a really high temperature
F(,) shall I give you some other (,) that are very good for temperature/ that do not cost much/

(18/II/95)

Examples as those provided by Pujolar (1995) point in the same direction. Again, the most favourable social sectors for such practices in each socioeconomic and sociocultural context remain to be determined.

IV Structural level

The analysis of social and discourse levels have made it clear that code-switching is better defined in strictly structural terms as the juxtaposition of speech fragments belonging to different languages, i.e., as just another transcodic marker such as semantic calque, borrowing, or syntactic convergence. Code-switching adopts different social and discourse values depending on the normative set where it is used. Thus, the same phenomenon in structural terms (e.g. switching from language A to language B to address a new participant) may be regarded as a compulsory choice when the norms dictate such a switch, and as a norm transgression when the norms prohibit it.
2.4 Language contact and code-switching in educational settings

In section 1.4, I reviewed the studies on language use from a predominantly educational perspective. Code-switching specialists and language contact researchers have also been interested in education from a variety of other approaches. In the first place, compulsory education offers a suitable place for macrosociologic approaches, for at least in Western European countries universal schooling guarantees that all segments of societies are represented. As a consequence, social scientists of all colours have found it extremely convenient to use schools as cheap ways to obtain sociologically representative samples. We have already seen how Baetens Beardsmore and Anselmi (1991) draw on evidence obtained from a school setting for exclusive sociolinguistic purposes. Schools have attracted the interest of anthropologists and sociologists as one of the allegedly most significant agencies of social reproduction. Some of the research lines are exemplified below.

Hornberger (1988) exemplifies the study on language shift and language maintenance by means of the domain model. Her object of study was a Quechua-speaking community in the Peruvian Puno where a bilingual education project had been launched next to other Castilian monolingual projects. Hornberger explored the language distribution and concluded that the domain model did not adequately account for the language choice and code-switching patterns in the community, for a number of contexts allowed the use of both languages. The ambiguous nature of bilingual education was here underlined by her research: the use of Quechua in the school was not in itself a guarantee of language maintenance; on the contrary, transitional bilingual education could improve Castilian language learning and foster assimilation.

Monica Heller has extensively researched the issue of multilingualism and code-switching at school (cf. Heller 1988, 1989, 1990, 1992a, 1992b, 1994). Her work has focused on norms of language use (including monolingual use and code-switching and language choice) as strategies used by schools and pupils to achieve their respective goals and organizing their relations. Her research has focused on Ontario minority francophone schools, i.e. schools designed to serve the French-speaking minority (not to be confused with immersion schools, catering for non-Francophone pupils). These institutions are in principle set up to protect the Francophone minority from the assimilation to English, as one of the few institutions where French can be freely used. Moreover, French is the major symbol of the minority’s status as a distinct ethnolinguistic group. Demolinguistic and sociopolitical circumstances have provoked an increase in the number of non-Francophones enrolled in these schools, to the point that at least in the cases studied by Heller pupils constitute a heterogeneous multilingual population with a minority of French native speakers, and French is no longer the customary language for

10The distinction between more educationally oriented versus more linguistically-oriented investigation is obviously difficult to establish and, at a certain point, probably arbitrary and only useful as far as it permits understanding of different lines of research.
informal interaction between pupils, as it has been replaced by English and immigrant languages such as Somali, Haitian Creole, etc. The schools thus find themselves in deep contradiction when forced to impose French as the language of internal communication to non-Francophone pupils.

Heller's analyses have stressed the interconnexion between macro and micro levels, a link which linguistic practices make evident. On the one hand, French has become a valued cultural capital (in Bourdieu's terms) which is desired by the French- and English-speaking middle-class. Use of French is thus explicitly encouraged by the schools, leading even to punishment against those caught speaking other languages in some cases (Heller, 1992a: 79). French is therefore converted into the institutional language. On the other hand, English pervades the pupils' lives to the point that it becomes their peer language in many cases. Heller analyses how the pupils take advantage of their multilingual repertoire strategically in order to convey various meanings: from genuine attempts to overcome a limited French proficiency by means of code-switching to the building of peer solidarity or even the rebellion against the school.

Heller's studies call into question the actual role of French-minority schools in the present formulation. Not only are they primarily charged with the maintenance of middle-class status for the middle-class by dispensing the required linguistic capital (Standard [Canadian] French) and sanctioning it in opposition to vernacular forms; she also questions whether these schools are able to create a marketplace which may become an alternative for the English one, whether they represent:

"(...) the edge of the absorption of the francophone world by a world in which, while bilingualism is valued as a means of easing the pain of transition, ultimately it will be English which retains its hegemonic position." (Heller, 1989: 390)

The relationship between sociocultural factors such as language maintenance, language shift and language spread, on the one hand, and the school function, on the other, have attracted the attention of sociolinguists in several settings.

Language use in connexion with school was one of the privileged foci of attention of the Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños (cf. Attinasi et al. 1982; Poplack, 1983). Both monolingual and transitional, bilingual programmes were implemented in the New York Barrio, and its effect on language use among children considered together with those caused by home and peer influence. Language maintenance and shift were investigated together with patterns of switching and interference.

Language revival was the goal of the initiative to create an urban Gaeltacht (Gaelic-speaking area) in Belfast, Northern Ireland, studied by Maguire (1990). One of the central points of this initiative was setting up a Gaelic medium school not only for those few children whose families had adopted Gaelic as the home language, but also for those of neighbouring families.
who opted to have them instructed in that language.

Several issues are of relevance here. Maguire describes how the initiatives to raise children in Gaelic, based on isolated families previous to the establishment of a whole Gaelic-speaking community, had recorded several failures, in part due to the peer pressure to accommodate to English which these children had experienced at school. In relation with the urban Gaeltacht, Maguire researched the extent to which the school modified the children's language practices by using several techniques (observation, interviews, questionnaires, etc.). Results confirmed the point that school alone is not enough:

"Parents' comments indicate a tendency for the child to use Irish when other visitors and relatives are not present. Some children use a little Irish quite naturally with the Bunscoil [school] peer when they are playing alone. This type of behaviour would normally refer to a limited use of Irish. Indeed, a different tendency is encountered in the school playground: there, constant supervision is required to halt the children's tendency to turn to English. The presence of adult Irish speakers can check that inclination.” (Maguire, 1990: 123)

Even more: "Parents who tried forcing the child to speak Irish usually failed." (Maguire, 1990: 128). Finally, Maguire also described the linguistic variety used by the children in structuralist terms.

More anthropologic in nature was the study of another initiative connected with a minority language maintenance and shift, namely the case of the Diwan schools movement in favour of Breton in Brittany. McDonald (1989) explored these educational centres among other cultural initiatives, and depicted the conflictual situation experienced by French-speaking children in a school using a language in a terminal stage of language shift. Both French and Breton intermingled in the construction of the children's personal and social identities: some rejected Breton, others embraced it thoroughly, while others mixed both languages according to different patterns. Some children would reproach the teachers' insistence on their speaking Breton, and would be delighted to 'catch' a teacher who had pretended not to understand French using that language.

More concerned with language spread than with language shift is the research by Gupta (1992) of how English has been continuously growing as the language of spontaneous interaction in Singapore. Singapore has witnessed a retreat of Malay, Indian languages and Chinese languages in general in favour of Mandarin and especially English. Figures of language shift towards these two varieties show an impressive move away from original multilingualism towards the official languages.

"How have English and Mandarin recruited speakers and made such headway into the home? The answer is in the schools of Singapore, but not so much in the language lessons as in the interactions between the pupils (...).” (Gupta, 1992: 555)

The reason for this statement is the imperious need of a common means of intercommunication
in Singapore English medium schools during this century among a linguistically variegated pupil population, combined with the fact that English was not only the language of instruction but a language spoken by a part of the children themselves, which the author describes as a "critical mass".

"English emerged as a native language in Singapore as a result of the English-medium schools having children from diverse language backgrounds while there was a critical level of English speakers, which ensured that some child-to-child communication had to be in English." (Gupta, 1992: 555)

Beyond their official status, the official languages -especially English- are promoted by parents and educators alike, making language spread not only a school issue but rather a societal issue. It appears from Gupta's description that the use of official languages seems to be highly consistent even in nurseries, not only among caregivers but even among children.
2.5 Language-in-education planning and language contact
theoretical approaches: a summary

Chapters 1 and 2 have attempted to describe what is seen as the two basic axes of present research: on the one hand, the different views on how language-in-education planning affects sociolinguistic reality; on the other, how sociolinguistic reality in itself is analysed and conceived. At this point I will attempt a synthetic view of both.

We have seen that decisions affecting language teaching and language of instruction go back to the beginning of the history of education. Conscious or unconscious language-in-education planning has always been part and parcel of any educational system.

In this review, I have argued that, contrary to expectations, the actual impact of language-in-education planning, and more specifically, the link between bilingual education and spontaneous language use has been little investigated so far, and this lack of interest has been attributed to the fact that the debate about language-in-education planning has suffered from several biases. It has been suggested that these biases have been produced by the predominance of an English-speaking and/or majority perspective on bilingual education, which has favoured those aspects of research of major interest to their own sociolinguistic situations, such as second language learning, impact of academic achievement and attitudinal research. I have argued that other perspectives, which include the link between language use and language-in-education planning, represent promising alternative approaches, not necessarily as a substitute but as complementary to the previous ones, and that they may be more relevant to subordinate groups. I have contended that due to the currently predominant biases regarding these links, our understanding of the connexions between society and education are, at least as far as sociolinguistic issues are concerned, distressingly weak. In my theoretical review, I have stressed the fact that although no total agreement with regard to this issue exists, extra-curricular, social factors are credited as the most fundamental variables in determining sociolinguistic evolution.

In chapter 2, I have reviewed the current theoretical models for language choice and language contact, with a major focus on those proposals which attempt to link patterns of language choice and code-switching with social factors. I have first distinguished between the different language contact phenomena, and given an outline of the discussions which are currently taking place as far as their description and understanding are concerned.

Further, I have tried to identify the different paradigms which are currently applied in language contact and language choice research. Two principal views have been identified: on the one hand, the objectivist approach, which regards language use as responsive to the characteristic arrangement of sociocultural variables for each speech community. This view is predominantly deterministic in that it gives little or no space to the speakers' own decision. On the other hand,
the subjectivist approach has been described as one which stresses the actors' power of decision in the management of interaction, and which therefore sees code-switching as responsive to strategies and not as determined by situational constraints. Finally, intermediate ways have been suggested to combine both macro-sociological and somewhat deterministic approaches with greater room for the individuals' decision capacity. The advantages and presumed shortcomings of each approach have been highlighted, and in some cases alternatives have been proposed.

Both poles of research, that of language-in-education planning, and that of language contact and code-switching research, seem to point to the predominance of extra-school variables in determining language use. Research explicitly concerned with the consequences of monolingual and bilingual education on patterns of language use also points to the same. It is now time to turn to the particular case that stimulated the present research, the Catalan situation and its language-in-education planning, to see to what extent this theoretical framework agrees with the empirical data.
3. Language and education in the Catalan Countries
The aim of this section is to supply the reader with the social, political, and historical background information necessary to understand the language-in-education processes and the language contact trends in the Catalan area during the early 90's. The chapter is divided into three complementary sections.

Section 1 deals with some terminological choices. Like in many other multilingual situations, names such as 'Catalan', 'Castilian', 'Spanish' and others carry heavy political connotations that may not be apparent to the non-Catalan reader. Since no neutral options exist, I have tried to clarify these connotations and clarify my own position regarding the terms used in this study. The section also introduces some basic facts of Catalan history.

In section 2, an effort is made to synthesise the history of language-in-education in the Catalan Countries, with special attention to Catalonia itself. The section discusses at length the repeated employment of the educational institution as a language planning agency to provoke language shift from Catalan to Castilian, and the efforts currently being made by the Catalan autonomous administration to promote Catalan language spread by means of the schools. Special emphasis is placed on giving a detailed account of the Catalan language spread in education during the last years and the contradictory political reactions it has generated.

Section 3 aims to describe the prevalent norms of language choice and code-switching, and the language contact situation in the Catalan Countries. The section reviews the main studies on these issues and synthesises their major conclusions, in an attempt to provide the reader with enough background information to understand the complex tensions currently present in this language community.
3.1 Catalan and castilian in the Catalan Countries: terminological and historical issues

3.1.1 A terminological issue

Catalan is spoken as a native language along the East coast of the Iberian Peninsula (see map 3.1 at the end of this section) in an area which covers 64,437.1 km$^2$ and which stretches from the city of Salses, in the Department of Pyrénées Orientales (Southern France) to Guardamar, in the Province of Alacant (Alicante, Spain), with a total population of 11,015,288 and a density of 170.9 inhabitants per km$^2$ in 1991 (Fundació Jaume Bofill, 1992: 4). Catalan holds an intermediate position in Europe’s language landscape and its situation seems subject to a relatively rapid transformation. It is official in most of its territory, enjoys a healthy cultural life and its use is not restricted to family or private domains, but rather encompasses a wide array of linguistic domains, from university and business to TV and political life. From a sheer demolinguistic point of view, it has more speakers than several other official languages in the continent, such as Danish or Bulgarian. On the other hand, as a language officially ignored until very recently, it is not known by all the population of its territory, and it is still subject to language shift among some parts of them.

Despite massive language shift in the extreme areas during the second half of this century, the Catalan language border has remained basically stable for the last 5-7 centuries. This area is currently divided among three independent states: Spain, France and tiny Andorra. There is still a Catalan linguistic island in l'Alguer (Alghero) in Sardinia, Italy. The territories where Catalan is natively spoken in Spain do not form a single administrative unit. Rather, they are divided into three autonomous communities (quasi-federal states): Catalonia, the Valencian Community, and the Balearic Islands. Each has its own regional parliament, its own Statute of Autonomy or private constitution, and, very often, different -when not opposed- political parties in power. Catalan is also the native language in an eastern stretch of land in Aragon known as Franja de Ponent.

No independent polity has ever encompassed all these territories as a single unified entity, though all of them formed the majority of the Crown of Aragon during the Middle Ages and until the eighteenth century. A fierce sense of local and regional autonomy has zealously prevented one community from gaining effective supremacy over the others, and this local pride has often been encouraged by Spanish nationalism to weaken a potentially dangerous threat to Spain's unity.

As a result of these historical circumstances, no single name has gained full acceptance as a common denominator for all the territories where Catalan is the native language. In fact, not even the name of the language is unanimously accepted, since it is frequently referred to by means of a local term such as Valencian, Majorcan, tortosí (from the city called Tortosa), etc. Despite the negligible difference between dialects, to some political groups, especially in Valencia, these terms refer to independent languages rather than to simple geolectal varieties.
While the issue of language unity is for the most settled, with a single, common standard being used, which allows for some regional variation, the name remains somewhat problematic in Valencia, where the usual term is Valencian (cf. Siguan, 1992: 131 ff). Such name-related debates seem to be widespread among subordinate language communities (cf. Flemish, Occitans, Galicians, Raeto-Romansch, etc.).

As far as the toponym is concerned, things are much less clear. No single name has gained full currency to refer to the whole territory. Some alternative solutions have been proposed: Catalan(-speaking) area, Catalonia, Greater Catalonia, Catalan Countries, Catalan-speaking countries (Fuster, 1962b). The existence of a single name is not a minor question, since it indexes the belief that, despite administrative divisions, some kind of unity exists among these territories, and the use of one or the other -or none at all- is often taken as an ideological declaration. But the need for a term embracing the whole territory persists if one is to avoid cumbersome descriptive periphrasis.

Another term of dispute is the adjective 'national' and 'regional'. In the Catalan political and historical tradition, Catalans constitute a separate nation which has not developed into an independent nation state because of a range of historical factors. In this view, Spain represents a political entity called state. This tradition refers to Catalan institutions as national, and to Spanish as estatal. The Spanish tradition fiercely refuses such a view and claims Catalans are nothing but regional aspects of the Spanish nation. This contradictory usage, which affects several other pairs such as Spain versus Spanish State and the avoidance of the adjective Spanish, has been analysed as a symbolic struggle opposing different political views (Cabré and Anglada, 1984). The 1978 Spanish Constitution represents an intermediate agreement: it introduces the term nationality to refer to historical communities. Nevertheless, both traditions remain fully active in everyday life.

A further precision is needed regarding the name of the other major language spoken in the Catalan Countries, Spanish. This language originated during the Middle Ages in the kingdom of Castile, and was therefore known as castellano (Castilian). Some centuries later, the unifying forces favouring a centralized Spain promoted the name español (Spanish) for the language. The dispute between both options is therefore a long one, each with its own supporters. In Spain, 'Castilian' is the preferred term in several communities where it is not the original language, while 'Spanish' seems to be more popular where it is the indigenous language. But ideological arguments cross-cut geographic borders: Spanish nationalists usually support 'Spanish', establishing a link between what they consider to be the nation and the national language. Ironically, this identification is welcomed and used by Catalan independentists, who consider Spanish to be the language of Spain... a neighbour country. In

---

11 As a vivid example to illustrate, two public-owned radio stations competed during some time over the use of the adjective national: one was Spain's National Radio in Catalonia, while the other was Catalunya Ràdio, Catalonia's National Radio. As another instance, all parliamentary parties in Catalonia but the Popular Party (conservative) have their independent national committees, despite the fact that most of them are not independentist and have stable relationships with Spanish equivalents.
between, non-independentist Catalans and Spaniards who are aware of this conflict coincide in using *Castilian*. Both trends have made use of different arguments. On the one side, it has already been said that calling Spanish one of the languages of Spain implies that the other languages are not Spanish languages, favouring in this way separatism. On the other side, it has also been pointed out that the denomination Castilian is a regional term which should be reserved to refer to the dialects currently spoken in Castile. The fact that this language is spoken in other countries besides Spain adds confusion to the issue, for both Castilian and Spanish—and even other terms such as *castilla*, literally *Castile-* are common to refer to the language (cf. Alonso, 1968).

There is no doubt that the preferred term in Catalonia is Castilian. In fact, the major ethnolinguistic line divides Catalan society between those who have Catalan as their first language and those who have Castilian—whatever dialect—as theirs (cf. Woolard, 1989: 34-60). Traditionally, the former have been known as Catalans, the latter as Castilians. More recently, in an effort to integration, and considering that all those living in Catalonia are Catalan independently of their first language, an attempt has been made with relative success to substitute both terms with *catalanoparlant* (*Catalan-speaking / -speaker*) and *castellanoparlant* (*Castilian-speaking / -speaker*), but ethnicity in Catalonia remains an extremely complex issue for symbols not to take ambivalent meanings (Woolard, 1989, 1992).

It is clear that any terminological choice is heavily loaded with symbolic value, and no neutral terms are readily available. In this thesis, I will refer to the territory where Catalan is natively spoken as the *Catalan area* or the *Catalan Countries*<sup>12</sup>, a territorial entity formed by the regions or *countries* already enumerated (Catalonia, Valencian Country, Balearic Islands, etc.). The Catalan institutions will be termed *autonomous*—and thereafter, autonomous government, language policy, political life—, while Spanish institutions will be referred to as *central*—central government, political debates, etc.—. Finally, when referring to the language and according to common use in Catalonia, I will use predominantly *Castilian*. Nevertheless, whenever *Spanish* is used in reference to the language, it has to be understood as an synonym for *Castilian*.

---

<sup>12</sup> Proposed during the 60's by Valencian intellectuals, basically after Fuster (1962a, 1962b), this term tries to combine unity—a single adjective—and local autonomy—different countries—and it has been historically adopted by a large range of authors.
Map.3.1: The Catalan Countries
3.1.2 Language and education up to the twentieth century in the Catalan Countries

I The Catalan Countries' linguistic situation up to the twentieth century

While there exists little doubt that a majority of the Catalan population has been basically monolingual in Catalan during most of its history, the successive situations of language contact undergone by Catalan (with, at least, Latin, Basque, Mozarabic, Occitan, Aragonese, Sardinian, Arabic, Romani, Castilian, French, English and Italian) constitute a constant in the history of the Catalan Countries which cannot be avoided by historians of literature and culture. Due to the lack of written sources and to paucity of research, we know little about the replacement of Basque and Mozarabic by Catalan in the Middle Ages (cf. Nadal i Prats, 1982). Contact between Catalan and Arabic in Valencia between the fourteenth and seventeenth centuries has been more fortunate\textsuperscript{13}, for it has been researched by a number of authors (cf. Burns, 1979 and Saó, 1994).

Catalan came to be used as a written language for literary, scientific, and philosophical purposes as early as the thirteenth century with Ramon Llull (Raimundus Lullius). His choice of Catalan and Arabic instead of Latin has needed explanation, as has the rise of Catalan as a written and formal language during the fourteenth-fifteenth centuries, when it came to be used for all sort of purposes.

It is commonly agreed that Spanish started its first inroads into the Catalan Countries in the sixteenth century as a result of the socio-economic decay of the Catalan Countries during the fifteenth century. The marriage of Isabel of Castile and Ferdinand of Aragon laid the origins of the establishment of a royal "confederation" between their two kingdoms. The political union preserved full autonomy for each kingdom, with independent governments, laws, taxes, armies, privileges, etc., but the conquest of the Muslim kingdom of Granada, the discovery of America and the annexation of Navarra (all c. 1492), confirmed the preeminence of Castilian power. The economic situation remained one of imbalance in favour of Castile in terms of wealth, population, and political power, and this imbalance was later increased with Castilian-directed conquest and colonization of America and the Golden Age of Castilian literature and cultural splendour. This context enhanced the prestige of the Castilian language, henceforth linked to royal power, and the spread of its knowledge among the highly restricted, cultivated circles (e.g. Peña, 1995).

In 1659, by virtue of the Treaty of the Pyrenees, some Catalan northern counties known as Northern Catalonia (Rosselló or Roussillon being the largest) were ceded to France, where a language policy aiming to promote shift from Catalan to French was soon implemented. The

\textsuperscript{13}Language secessionists in Valencia claim that the variety currently spoken in their region is not a Catalan dialect originally imported by Christian colonizers, but rather the result of Mozarabic, i.e. the Romance language formerly spoken by the descendants of the original population living in Valencia and the Balearic Islands. The small difference existing between Valencia’s and Catalonia’s dialects should have made the dispute irrelevant had it not been for the fact that secessionist movements make use of these hypothetical origins to support their political views.
The War of Spanish Succession (1700-1715) between an Austrian and a Bourbon candidate to the crown meant the defeat and subsequent annexation by Castile of the Catalan Countries (1707-1715), and implied the annihilation of their quasi independent status. These countries' institutions -Government, legislation, universities, etc.- were abolished and new ones created in a unified nation state. Since most of the Catalan élites had supported the defeated Austrian side they were forced to emigrate, and were replaced by mostly Castilian Bourbon loyalists.

The decree regulating the new political situation -Decreto de Nueva Planta (1707 for Valencia; 1716 for Catalonia and Majorca)- contains the first institutional attacks against the official status of Catalan within Spain. Spanish was declared the main official judiciary language and Castilians were legally entitled to obtain administrative posts in the Catalan Countries, a right they had not previously enjoyed as foreigners. This policy of centralisation and castilianization became a recurrent feature of the Spanish Bourbon during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries: legal acts of many sorts were passed in order to enforce the official status of Spanish, its knowledge and its use.

While it was by no means the only institution used to promote linguistic castilianization, the school became a preferred target for this policy: in 1768 (Real Cédula, 23/VI), Castilian was officially imposed as the only language of use at school in order to:

"...extender el idioma general de la Nación para su mayor armonía y enlace recíproco." "to spread the Nation's language in order to achieve its greater harmony and reciprocal connection." (quoted by Ferrer i Gironès, 1986: 37).

Subsequently, many other new legal measures were imposed, such as forbidding the publication of teaching materials in Catalan (1773) or adopting the official Castilian grammar at school (1780). The same measures to castilianize were applied to Minorca when it was regained by the Spanish Crown in 1802.

The official rhetoric during this period is basically similar and comparable to that used in France to suppress the so-called patois: Spanish was the national language and its spread and general use would benefit the country. Languages other than Spanish were to be suppressed as a threat against the "unity of the motherland", and neither personal nor group rights were to hinder this process of nation-state building.

Widespread de facto tolerance towards Catalan in school may have produced a sort of rudimentary transitional programme starting in Catalan until literacy was acquired, giving more emphasis to Spanish after that point and in secondary education, and switching to Latin at the University (Arnau, 1980: 85). The substantial inefficiency of the legal norms making Spanish the compulsory means of teaching is clearly proved by their periodical restatement during the entire first half of the nineteenth century; government after government, ruler after ruler, felt the need to make it clear that Spanish was to be used as the sole language in schools, as, for instance, in 1825, 1828, 1834, 1837, 1838, 1849, 1857 (cf. Ferrer i Gironès, 1986: passim). It was not until the Ley Moyano de Instrucción Pública (1857) that Catalan was
definitely ousted from school and Spanish effectively introduced as the only language of primary education.

Catalan decline in the face of Latin and especially Castilian during the historical period called "La Decadència" (Decadence), spreading from the sixteenth to the early nineteenth century, is a much researched aspect of language choice for historians of literature. Finally, the very fact that Catalan reconquered its literary prestige and became amply used during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries represents a major historical transformation requiring a sociological, economic, and political explanation (for the history of Catalan literature, see Riquer, Comas and Molas, 1980-1987). Nevertheless, the significance attributed to literary studies should not conceal the fact that literature occupies a highly prestigious, though extremely reduced language domain, especially when one deals with societies where literacy constitutes the exception rather than the rule. Unfortunately, the fate of Catalan in literature has been much better researched than language choices made in the successive processes of language shift experienced in the territory of the Catalan Countries.

Catalan monolingualism seems to have been the norm among most of the population in the majority of the Catalan Countries, at least up to the second half of the nineteenth century, due to structural factors: on the one hand, sociodemographic trends did not favour contact with Castilian speakers; on the other, the weakly developed school system was basically unable to provide a minimum degree of mastery of Spanish. The scarcity of data in this field should not mislead us to believe that Spanish was widely known in the Catalan Countries. It has been calculated that, according to the official census Censo de Floridablanca (1787), by the end of the eighteenth century less than 2% of the population had some degree of literacy, and less than 4% of the young, adult male population might have been to some extent bilingual in Spanish (Moral, 1995). As late as 1870, only one sixth of the population was able to use Castilian in the island of Majorca (Siguan, 1992: 33). Even if these figures may have been higher for the major cities of València, Barcelona and Alacant, ignorance of Spanish was probably widespread until the twentieth Century (see also section 3.3.2). It should be taken into account that as late as 1920, 93.91% of the Catalan Countries population had been born in this geographic area, and allophone immigrants concentrated mostly around Barcelona (Arribas and Font, 1995: 84).

II Sociolinguistic evolution in the twentieth century

Irrespective of sociopolitical events, the twentieth century has witnessed a radical transformation of the Catalan demographic and demolinguistic make-up. Since the mid nineteenth century, Catalonia's industrialization process and events such as the 1929 Barcelona Universal Exposition attracted manpower from Spanish-speaking regions such as Aragon and Murcia (cf. Sentís, 1995 for a journalistic account of this first massive immigration). Thus, between 1900 and 1930, the population in the Catalan Countries increased by 30.7%, and reached five and a half milion by the end of that period (Arribas and Font, 1995: 77).
It is difficult to gauge the number of Castilian speakers in the Catalan Countries at the beginning of the present century, since no language censuses are available. Figures around 20% have been advanced for the city of Barcelona in 1900 (Galí, 1979: 12), while authors like Batista i Roca have proposed 16% for the whole province of Barcelona in 1920 (quoted by Galí, 1979: 12). All agree that this percentage was much lower outside Barcelona, so that:

"... hom pot concloure que l’any 1900 Catalunya era un país monolingue amb una minoria de parla castellana que, si bé no era prou forta per ella mateixa per constituir un perill lingüístic, ho era suficientment per a no ésser negligida..."... one can conclude that in 1900 Catalonia was a monolingual country with a Castilian language minority which, while not being strong enough by itself to represent a linguistic danger (for Catalan), was strong enough so that it not be neglected... (Galí, 1979: 12)

Though a considerable proportion of the population may have been monolingual in Catalan, a sort of diglossic relationship was firmly established among the minority which had been educated, with Castilian as the predominant language for formal and written usages. Nevertheless, since the second half of the nineteenth century, Catalan was regaining social positions and, as an instance, more and more literary work in Catalonia was being published in Catalan, with increasing success and social prestige.

The Spanish Civil War (1936-39) implied a considerable number of exiles and internal movements across Spain. The post-war (in the 50s) resumption of economic growth caused a huge immigration process leading hundreds of thousands of people from Southern Spain to Catalonia and the rest of the Catalan Countries during the 50s, 60s and up to 1975 (cf. Arribas and Font, 1995; Cabré, 1992).

Immigration has introduced a remarkable degree of linguistic heterogeneity into the Catalan Countries. Immigration to Catalonia (but not to other areas, such as the Balearic Islands) stopped abruptly around 1975. Nevertheless, the process resulted in the appearance of a large Spanish-speaking community in Catalonia distributed across all of its territory, but mostly around the city of Barcelona. As a consequence of the end of Castilian-speaking immigration, and despite the increase in foreign (especially African) immigration, the number of people born outside Catalonia has been steadily losing quantitative importance since the mid 70’s, although
it remains a very considerable proportion of Catalonia’s population.

Table 3.1. Geographical origin of the population in Catalonia. 1975, 1981, 1986. Percentages over 2 or more years old population*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>1981</th>
<th>1986</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalonia</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia / Balearic Island</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Spain</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The immigrant population constitutes a key element in understanding the sociolinguistic evolution of the Catalan Countries. Relevant as it may be, though, this demographic transformation is but one of the factors that intervene in the Catalan sociolinguistic landscape. Political, economic and other factors which will be partly reviewed in the next sections have also contributed to shape it.

Today, the sociolinguistic situation of the Catalan Countries clearly shows the results of the demographic and political vicissitudes experienced by this language community during the last centuries. While Castilian is universally known in the Spanish Catalan Countries due to school, mass-media and personal contacts, knowledge of Catalan still reflects its former status as an unofficial language without presence in the public arena. Thus, despite efforts during the last 20 years, knowledge of Catalan relies heavily on its being learned at home.

Table 3.2. Knowledge of Catalan in the Catalan Countries in the 90's. Percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Territory</th>
<th>Understand</th>
<th>Speak</th>
<th>Read</th>
<th>Write</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalonia</td>
<td>93.75</td>
<td>68.34</td>
<td>67.56</td>
<td>39.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Catalonia</td>
<td>63.20</td>
<td>48.60</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>9.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencian Community</td>
<td>82.10</td>
<td>50.60</td>
<td>37.70</td>
<td>15.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franja de Ponent</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>99.30</td>
<td>56.15</td>
<td>10.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balearic Islands</td>
<td>88.78</td>
<td>66.74</td>
<td>55.01</td>
<td>25.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Personal elaboration on a number of sources. Percentages in Catalonia are based on population aged 2 and over; in the Valencian Community, 3 and over; and, in the Balearic Islands, 6 and over. In all three cases, the data come from 1991 Census. Data from Northern Catalonia come from Média Pluriel’s (1993) survey, and do not include those speaking ‘a little Catalan’. Data from Franja come from Martín et al.’s (1995), survey, vol. 2: 33.

Regarding the rest of Catalan Countries, in Andorra, in 1989 Catalan was first language for 44.5% of the total population, Castilian for 37.7%, Portuguese for 7%, and French for 6.7% (Calvo et al., 1990). In l’Alguer (Alghero), estimates speak about 15-18.000 who can speak Catalan.
3.2. Language-in-education in the Catalan Countries during the twentieth century

3.2.1 Catalonia’s "regional" governments in the early twentieth century

The repression of Catalan aroused public opposition, expressed several times; but it was during the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the first one of the twentieth century, coinciding with the cultural movement known as the Renaixença and incipient Catalan regionalism in Catalonia, when the requirements to reintroduce Catalan in school and official life achieved momentum. Some significant documents from this period where the use of Catalan for teaching was publicly demanded were the Memoral de Greuges (1885) or the Message to the regent Queen by the Lliga de Catalunya (1888).

Monés (1984: 87 ff) places the first effective attempts to reintroduce Catalan into the schools in the period between 1898 and 1913. The loss of the last Spanish colonies in America and Asia (Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippines) in 1898 and the subsequent crisis encouraged the regionalist movement. In 1899 was founded the Associació Protectora de l’Ensenyança Catalana, the Association for the Protection of Catalan Teaching, in order to reintroduce Catalan into the education system. The City Council of Barcelona promoted activities in favour of the Catalan language, and, in 1907, the Diputació de Barcelona, or provincial government, founded the Institut d’Estudis Catalans (IEC), a centre of high research. In 1911, the IEC created the Secció d’Estudis Filològics i d’Expansió de la Llengua (Section of Philological Studies and Language expansion). It continued the work on language research and, in 1913 approved the new Normes ortogràfiques for Catalan, which soon became widely accepted. The process was further promoted by the newly created Mancomunitat de Catalunya or Catalonian regional government (1914-1923). In 1918 appeared the Catalan Standard Grammar. In 1922, the City Council of Barcelona created the Patronat Escolar de l’Ajuntament de Barcelona. This institution promoted the appearance of Catalan schools based on the Montessori method in the city.

In 1924, general Primo de Rivera took power and established a military dictatorship. The regional government was abolished, the Catalan flag was banned, and Catalanist acts prohibited. Important among his main goals, fighting separatism was to be accomplished with renewed oppression against Catalan; Castilian again became the compulsory language of school "from the very first day the child enters school" (quoted by Monés, 1984: 160). Catalan pedagogic journals and institutions were closed down and educational staff purged.

3.2.2 The Second Spanish Republic and the autonomous government

The dictatorship did not survive long. A short time after the fall of Primo de Rivera, the monarchy was abolished and the Second Spanish Republic installed (14 April 1931). Catalonian regionalist (liberal and conservative) and nationalist (leftist) parties enjoyed much support in Catalonia. As a consequence of previous agreements between Catalanian and
Republican parties, the new-born Republic acknowledged the right to use either Catalan or Castilian in kindergarten and primary education in Catalonia, while reminding of the need to teach Castilian (*Decreto de bilingüismo*, 29 April 1931).

The Spanish Constitution (9 December 1931) granted the right to organize their own education systems to the autonomous regions, but insisted on the need to preserve the knowledge and use of Castilian in schools (title III, chap. 2, art. 2).

The *Statute of Autonomy* (a sort of Home rule) project for Catalonia known as *Estatut de Núria* considered Catalan the only official language in Catalonia and granted personal linguistic rights to the Spanish-speaking, recently immigrated community. According to this project, primary schools in Spanish would be supported by the Catalonian autonomous government - *Generalitat* - in those localities where a minimum of forty Spanish-speaking children were registered. Despite massive support in Catalonia - was approved by overwhelming majority by the Catalonian (male) population in a referendum - this project underwent profound modifications in the Spanish Parliament which reduced substantially the degree of autonomy achieved. The final official text (*Estatut de Catalunya*, 9 September 1932) made Catalan official alongside Spanish and simply allowed for the creation of a new school system belonging to the *Generalitat*. The existing central government-owned schools would not even teach Catalan.

Meanwhile, the task of language standardization was concluded in 1932, when the *Diccionari General de la Llengua Catalana*, the official standard vocabulary, was finally published.

Economic and political crises in Spain ended up in the civil war (1936-1939). During this period, the *Generalitat* gained some extra power over the schools and attempted to spread the teaching of Catalan to all schools. Nevertheless, the final fascist victory suppressed these achievements.

### 3.2.3 Franco's dictatorship

#### I Overview and phases

General Franco's dictatorship (1936/39-1975) tried to annihilate the languages of Spain other than Castilian\(^{14}\). The first 20 years witnessed a conscious, systematic and ferocious strategy of direct repression and explicit prohibition. This policy has been directly attributed to a language specialist: Antonio Tovar, a phalangist (the local version of fascism), holder of the chair of philology at the University of Madrid and with a high post in the Ministry of Press and Propaganda until 1941 (*Solé i Sabaté and Villarroya, 1994: 15*). The government's language policy was accompanied by the somehow spontaneous and brutal actions of the military, police

\(^{14}\)Several authors have studied this policy. Among others, Benet (1973, 1995); Ferrer i Gironès (1986); *Solé i Sabaté and Villarroya (1994)*; Ainaud de Lasarte (1995) offer thorough views on this issue.
and civil servants. These actions ranged from burning all books in Catalan, irrespective of subject or political orientation, to fining those surprised speaking Catalan in public. Especially significant was the destruction of printing plates of the *Diccionari de la Llengua Catalana*, the standard dictionary (Solé i Sabaté and Villaroya, 1994: 51). Paintings on walls appeared during that period with messages like *Habl la lengua del Imperio*, "Speak the language of the [Spanish] Empire"; *Si eres español, habla español* "If you are Spanish, speak Spanish". Numerous testimonies exist of people having been admonished *no ladres*, "stop barking", *habla en cristiano*, "speak Christian" and others, when addressing Spanish civil servants in Catalonia. These and other practices were common, especially among the military, the *Guardia Civil* and the police until quite recently. Francoist language policy required that all public life be conducted through Spanish. Catalan, Basque and Galician were only allowed in private oral communications, and even there, this use was discouraged by the regime's propaganda.

The educational system became a major goal for this cultural genocide. Schools and universities were closed down, teaching staff purged and new, loyal Castilian-speaking teachers from all over Spain were hired to work in Catalonia (Solé i Sabaté and Villaroya, 1994: 118). School books not in accordance with the new regime were strictly prohibited and Catalan became absolutely forbidden. On 14 November 1939, for example, the *Boletín de la Provincia de Barcelona* stated that:

"... en la junta de inspectores se acordó manifestar a todos los maestros nacionales y privados de la provincia que el idioma vehicular en la escuela es únicamente el castellano." "... in the inspectors meeting it was decided to inform all private and public teachers that the language of instruction at school is only Castilian." (quoted by Arenas, 1989: 70)

The history of language education in the Catalan Countries during Franco's dictatorship has been repeatedly divided into a number of broadly coincidental periods by several authors (Monés, 1981; Bassa, 1990; cf. Arenas, 1989):

1. The *autarchic period* (1936/39-1957), when Franco's dictatorship was internationally isolated as the last fascist regime. It was then when the hardest repression took place and the scarce Catalan teaching activities had to be developed at private homes under private auspices. This period was strongly ideologically marked, with an emphasis from the Government side on dismantling the Republican influence and Catalanist deeds.

2. The *Planes de desarrollo (development plans) and technocratic period* (1957-1974/75), when Franco's regime became a partner of the U.S.A. in the struggle against communism. Phalangist ideologues were replaced by Catholic, more pragmatic technocrats. After several educational laws (*Ley de Ordenación de la Enseñanza Media, Ley de Formación Profesional Industrial*) political dogmatism lost ground in favour of more pragmatic views heralded by the Catholic conservative *Opus Dei*.

Some private initiatives in favour of Catalan were allowed during this period, such as folk music, some books and a short number of mostly Catholic magazines, some language courses,
etc. It was not until the *Ley General de Educación* or General Law of Education (1970) that a legal text made any reference to the possibility to include *native language teaching*. This was a clearly assimilationist text which allowed these languages into the school so that Castilian be better learned, and it was based on voluntary participation. Nevertheless, these possibilities were never implemented on a large scale. Spanish schools continued not to pay any attention to the multilingual reality of Spain, to the point that Castilian was expected to be taught as an L1 irrespective of the students’ actual L1. As a system, it was devised so that rapid assimilation took place and Catalan and the other non-Castilian languages disappeared altogether.

The last years of the Franco dictatorship were marked by political unrest, with growing opposition to the regime, both political and armed (ETA, GRAPO, etc.). Demands to have Catalan in school increased, especially in Catalonia, with a number of institutions and organisations publically asking for official recognition and language teaching. Several initiatives brought Catalan back to school in Valencia, where 142 schools taught some Catalan, and in Catalonia, were Òmnium taught Catalan to 10,000 people for 1972-1973 in primary and secondary education (Arenas, 1989: 75-76). Special attention was paid to the Barcelona Metropolitan Area, where hundreds of immigrant parents asked for Catalan classes in Santa Coloma de Gramenet and Cornellà del Llobregat, for instance: 1972-73, campaign in Santa Coloma de Gramenet; 1973-74: 3,300 students in Cornellà del Llobregat. Some city councils, on their part, provided financial support for the teaching of Catalan in post-school classes. A major political scandal occurred in August, 1975 when Barcelona’s city council refused to support Catalan language courses with a small amount of money (50 million pesetas).

This period saw the founding of a policy of collaboration between Catalan liberal nationalism and leftist (socialist and communist) parties against the Franco dictatorship, and the establishment of a "hegemonic political culture (...) [which legitimized] certain nationalist courses of action and delegitimiz[ed] the superimposed Francoist ideology." (Woolard, 1989: 140). A common ground was then established of basic principles shared by those which were to become the ruling parties in Catalonia, such as respect for Human rights and democratic procedures; social integration and promotion of the Catalan language were closely linked to these ideals in Catalonia.

II The debate between "bilingual" and "Catalan schools"

While the official school hardly allowed for the introduction of Catalan into the curriculum, the opposition political forces were unanimous in attributing a significant role to Catalan in the future schools in Catalonia. Nevertheless, opinions regarding what this policy would mean were far from total consensus.

In 1972, the *Fundació Artur Martorell*, linked with the pedagogical *Associació de mestres Rosa Sensat* (Teachers' Association "Rosa Sensat"), published *El bilingüisme a Catalunya*, a document addressed to the general public, which set goals for the future schools in the Catalan Countries. This and related documents advocated (a) highly developed balanced bilingualism
in Catalan and Spanish, and (b) mother tongue education in the initial courses. They proposed language mixed classes where the teacher would approach each pupil in his or her mother tongue, and where children would develop their linguistic abilities towards bilingualism from their first language. According to Bassa, this position effectively separated the children in the same classroom so that they turned into:

"... dues comunitats lingüístiques destinades a no trobar-se dins la mateixa classe, més que a l'hora de realitzar "activitats conjuntes..." ... two language communities doomed to not meet with one another in the same classroom, apart from the "combined activities hour". (Bassa, 1990: 59)

In 1975, the X Escola d'Estiu (Tenth Teachers' Summer school) introduced several paragraphs regarding this issue in its final document, and the XI Escola d'Estiu final document *Per una nova escola pública catalana* confirmed the same line (Rosa Sensat, 1976: 60). This position was quickly followed by a number of educationalists across the Catalan Countries and became known as *bilingual school*. It prompted the publication of teaching material with double versions, one in Catalan and the other in Castilian, to help bilingual teaching (Bassa, 1990: 59).

Clearly opposed to such views were the proponents of the *Escola catalana* or *Catalan school*, whose position is clearly stated, among others, in the *Manifest per l'Escola Catalana* (Arenas and Sabater, 1982: 20-30). They defended that Catalan should be the preeminent language in the new, democratic schools, and refused bilingual usage in the classrooms. Their arguments were not only pedagogical, but sociolinguistic as well. In their opinion, the Catalan Countries as a language community were comparable in demographic, economic, cultural, and other grounds, to many other medium-size language communities in Europe (e.g. Danish or Swedish), and Catalan was perfectly apt to play all roles in the educational system. Nonetheless, historical repression had produced an abnormal situation in which the language of education was not Catalan but Spanish, an arrangement that was threatening the very existence of the Catalan language community. This abnormality had to be urgently overcome by means of a school were Catalan would be the only means of instruction, as a result of the principle of territoriality.

This view was strongly supported by the *Delegació d'Ensenyament Català* of *Omnium Cultural*, a private cultural organization. Its *Manifest per l'escola catalana* (1976) is clear in this respect:

"1.2. Entenem per escola catalana aquella que utilitza el català com a llengua d'estudi i comunicació en tots els nivells i matèries, tant oralment com per escrit, des dels nivells maternals i preescolars fins als superiors del Batsillerat, per a tots els alumnes sense distinció." "We consider as a Catalan school that which uses Catalan as the language of study and communication at all levels and for all subjects, both orally and in writing, from crèche and kindergarten up to the highest in Baccalaureat, for all students without distinction." (Arenas and Sabater, 1982: 22)

According to this view, respect for the children required that the school taught them as much Catalan as possible, since societal rules favoured Spanish and prevented spontaneous language acquisition. School bilingualism would produce competent bilingual Catalan-speakers, but Spanish-speakers would remain mostly monolingual, since they had few societal contexts
encouraging active language learning. A strong emphasis was put on the need to integrate the new Catalans both linguistically and culturally.

### 3.2.4 Political transition towards democracy and autonomy

After Franco's death and Juan Carlos' I coronation in 1975, Spain commenced a period of social and institutional transformations aiming at establishing a constitutional monarchy, a parliamentary democracy, free elections and the elaboration of a new, democratic constitution. This period has come to be known as the political transition. The new constitution declared Castilian the official language of Spain and granted officiality to the other Spanish languages in their own historical territories (art. 3). A new territorial organization was laid down, that of the state of autonomies. According to this, Spanish nationalities and regions were to receive variable degrees of autonomy which included legislative power, and several functions would be transferred from the central state to the new autonomic powers.

Regarding language in education in the Catalan Countries, the political transition started in a situation where Catalan was still largely absent from the schools. According to López del Castillo, in 1976 there existed in Catalonia around 86 private, active schools where 24,885 pupils who were taught Catalan. From its part, Omnium Cultural declared to have taught between one and two hours of Catalan per week to 59,169 students (quoted by Bassa, 1990: 72). This figure rose to 171,465 for 1976-1977 (Arenas, 1989: 75-77)

In the Balearic Islands, the first school with Catalan as the sole means of instruction -Escola Mata de Jonc- started in 1974-75. The number of children taught Catalan remained very low, as in the Valencian Country, where there existed no chair of Valencian language and culture at the university until 1976.

On the whole, this situation has led some authors (Arenas, 1989: 73) to include the last years of the Franco dictatorship together with the first years of political transition in a period termed Period of tolerance towards the presence of Catalan in the schools (1970-1978).

### 3.2.5 The autonomous educational systems

#### I The sociolinguistic situation

As a result of immigration towards the Catalan Countries, mostly to industrial centres such as Barcelona's Metropolitan Area, the number of Castilian native-speakers on the eve of democracy had increased dramatically; for the first time in history, not only the whole Catalan native population had become widely bilingual, but a huge number of Spanish native speakers, most of them monolingual or only receptively bilingual, were established in the Catalan Countries. Language shift, in its turn, was not significant in Catalonia, but it reached threatening dimensions in the Valencian Country, where urban centres decatalanized intensely during Franco's dictatorship.
In 1975, only 74.3% of the people living in the province of Barcelona reported to understand Catalan, and just 53.1% claimed to speak it. And though immigration stopped drastically after 1975, due to the oil crisis, a decade later, in 1986, the proportion of first generation immigrants still represented more than 40% of the total population in the comarques (counties) of Baix Llobregat, Vallès Occidental, and Tarragonès; these were closely followed (between 30 and 39%) by Barcelonès, Vallès Oriental and Garraf (Reixach, 1990: 71). This does not mean that the rest of the Catalan Countries did not receive an immigrant population: despite the fact that they tended to concentrate around industrial and touristic areas and often formed compact, new, mostly Castilian-speaking neighbourhoods, it is also a fact that there is hardly any place in Catalonia -as in the rest of Spanish Catalan Countries- where native Castilian speakers are totally absent.

Castilian-speaking immigrants in the Catalan Countries did not follow the common pattern of language shift in three generations. Though predominantly working-class, their language was also that of the Spanish ruling classes, administration and public life. Two hundred years of linguistic repression and the successful, thorough learning of Castilian by Catalans had contributed to establish such patterns of language use that imposed convergence towards Spanish whenever a Castilian speaker was addressed (see section 3.3). Therefore, Spanish speakers were implicitly dispensed from learning Catalan. Immigrants not only succeeded in maintaining Castilian and transmitting it as a first language, but even passed on their language as the only language in a remarkable number of linguistically mixed couples (Vila i Moreno, 1993a).

The combined effects of language prohibition, intense alloglot immigration, and language shift towards Castilian, posed a real threat to the very maintenance of Catalan in the Catalan Countries: reaction to such a situation has been the intervention in those areas at hand, namely that of culture and that of education.\(^\text{15}\).

\(\text{II} \quad \text{The school system in Catalonia in the autonomous period: phases and school types}\)

The state of autonomies meant that each Catalan Country was granted an independent Statute of Autonomy or private constitution with varying degrees of self-rule. Each autonomous community was to have its own legislative and executive powers. This political and administrative separation has led to an increasing gap between educational systems in Catalonia with respect to the Valencian Country and the Balearic Islands.

Here I will concentrate on the evolution in Catalonia, which has proved to be the most dynamic. Globally, it can be said that the introduction of Catalan as a subject matter has followed a slower path in the Valencian Country and in the Balearic Islands, while its spread in

\(^{15}\)General overviews of the Catalan sociolinguistic situation are available, among many others, in Reixach (1990); Hall (1990); Carulla (1990) and Direcció General de Política Lingüística (1992); Ginebra \textit{et al.} (1992); Siguan (1992).
Catalan-speaking zones of Aragon is reduced to the optional subject of Catalan language arts. In the Valencian Country, two bilingual education models have been set up: a Catalan-medium school for Catalan-native speakers, and the 'immersion programme', i.e. a Catalan-Castilian medium school for Castilian-speakers, reaching 11.01% of primary education pupils. In French Catalonia there exist a few Catalan-medium schools, and Catalan is also taught on an optional basis throughout the educational system. Andorra, on the other hand, enjoys a triple system: it allows for a Spanish, a French and a young Andorran -Catalan-speaking- system. Those interested can refer, among others, to Arnau et al. (1992), Siguan (1992), Artigal (1993a), Artigal (coord)(1995), Govern d'Andorra (1994).

The year 1978 represents the beginning of a new period in the Catalonian educational system, that of the definitive reintroduction of Catalan. Popular pressure in favour of Catalan and autonomy led the political parties and, eventually, the newly recovered Generalitat of Catalonia to strengthen to bring Catalan back into schools. As Arenas (1993, 1994) pointed out, Catalonia's department of education already decided in 1978 to design future education along two main principles:

1. The definite will existed to spread the knowledge of Catalan to the whole population of Catalonia,

2. The ultimate goal was to attain an integrated school profile which, while encouraging bilingual and multilingual proficiency, was based on the Catalan School model, that is, with Catalan as the (main) language of instruction, and with pedagogy and contents adapted to the needs of children in Catalonia.

These two principles generated a language-in-education policy which has been gradually implemented via three major ways, also synthesized by Arenas (1994):

1. The creation of a legal corpus, which by April, 1994 amounted to 102 legal norms.

2. Teacher training, with a variety of courses on language, language didactics and pedagogy,

3. Specific programmes addressed at overcoming difficulties in the most complex situations, such as the Catalan immersion programmes and the Intensive plans of language normalization.

I am not dealing here with language spread at the university level, but it has to be borne in mind that Catalan has rapidly increased its presence as the language of teaching and administrative purposes to the point that it is now the majority language in all the universities in Catalonia, especially in technical and experimental disciplines. In this sense, see Servei de Llengua Catalana (1991); Gabinet de Llengua Catalana (1993); Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya (1994).
The transformation process from the traditional, Castilian-speaking school to the current system has been divided by Artigal (coord) (1995: 22ff) into three phases:

a. First phase: Enforcement of the compulsory minimum number of hours of Catalan Language Arts (1978-1983). In 1978, the teaching of Catalan and Catalan literature was declared compulsory for every primary and secondary school in Catalonia (Decreto 2092, 23 June 1978); it was eventually developed by the Orden, 18 September 1978). This decree introduced the principle of teaching via the mother tongue for primary education and professional training, and, therefore, the capacity to organize programmes in Catalan. The Statute of Catalonia (1979) declared Catalan to be Catalonia's own language (llengua pròpia). Both Catalan and Castilian were to be official in Catalonia, the former as the language of the territory, while the latter in its quality as Spain's official language. In 1981, the education system was transferred to the Generalitat educational service (Decree 2089/81, 3 October).

b. Second phase: giving priority to Catalan in Catalonia (1983 onwards). Research on competence in Catalan (Servei d'Ensenyament del Català, 1983) confirmed that the standards of Catalan among students were much lower than those of Castilian. Such a fact provoked a reaction addressed to "... giving priority to the educational level of the socially weaker language by making it a predominant instrument of communication and instruction within the school." (Artigal, 1993a: 37)

The legal precept to guarantee the knowledge and normal use of both languages has been developed primarily by means of the Llei de Normalització Lingüística (Law 7/1983, 6 April) or Law of Linguistic Normalization. This law stated that Catalan was the llengua pròpia (own or native language) of education and the administration of education in Catalonia at all levels, and that children had the right to start their education in their own language, either Catalan or Spanish, according to their parents' decision. Both languages should be taught and equally learned through the whole education system, and teachers were required to know both languages. The Law of Linguistic Normalization refused to introduce the concept of the mother tongue and preferred that of habitual or customary language.

The goal of balanced, highly developed bilingualism by the end of compulsory education is a highly ambitious, though not unachievable one, as the remarkable bilingualism achieved by most Catalan native speakers proves every day. As a government policy, it also has precedents elsewhere, such as Luxemburg's trilingual schools (Lebrun and Baetens Beardsmore, 1993) or Gwynedd county, where the policy is that of making "every child in the county thoroughly bilingual" in English and Welsh since 1975 (Baker, 1985: 55).

Further legal steps have been taken since the passing of the Law of Linguistic Normalization. Two legal norms, a Decree (D.O.G.C. 30 August 1983) and an Ordre (D.O.G.C. 8 September 1983) reaffirmed the freedom of language choice for kindergarten and the first four years of primary education, and introduced the compulsory use of a minimum of Catalan for at least one subject apart from Catalan language, either Natural or Social Sciences, from the fourth
year of primary education (Cicle mitjà); in secondary education, it became compulsory to teach at least two subject matters by means of Catalan. The inverse norm, that of using Castilian to teach at least a subject besides Castilian language arts, was introduced later (Decree 576/1983, 6 December). These resolutions ruled out—at least in principle—the programmes where Catalan or Castilian would stand as just a subject matter (cf. Arnau et al., 1992: 75).

c. Third phase: bilingual Catalan-medium education for all. Success in the implementation of bilingual Catalan-medium education, community acceptance and, last but not least, political support, have led to a recent phase which aims at a definite spread of Catalan-medium education to all schools in Catalonia. The deep school reforms currently in progress in Spain have given the chance to make another step towards that goal (cf. Artigal (coord), 1995). According to new regulations, Catalan stands as the 'normal' language of the educational system, and it is to be used as the medium of instruction for all subject matters but one (apart from Castilian language arts, of course), which is to be taught by means of Castilian. Catalan is also encouraged as the usual language of relationship in the schools:

“La llengua catalana, com a llengua d’aprenentatge i de comunicació, farà les funcions de vehicle d’expressió quotidiana, assolint en l’escola l’estatus de llengua usual, que vol dir de llengua que satisfà totes les possibilitats lingüístiques d’una comunitat.” “The Catalan language, as the language of learning and communication, will accomplish the functions of daily medium of expression, thus reaching the status of customary language i.e. a language that fulfills all linguistic possibilities of a community.” (Departament d’Ensenyament, 1993)

Thus, Catalonia's educational system as a whole adopts an additive bilingual education programme with major emphasis on the minority language. As pointed out in Artigal (coord) (1995), this last phase constitutes perhaps one of the most distinct characteristics of Catalonia's educational system, even in comparison with the other Catalan Countries, where different bilingual and monolingual school models remain side by side. In Catalonia, on the contrary, it is the whole primary education system that has adopted a bilingual additive programme which promotes the minority language. In the terms proposed in chapter 1, Catalonia's schools are expected to promote bilingual competence and use of Catalan among all students irrespective of their first language.

In the course of the last decade, a broad classification has been suggested several times (cf. Siguan, 1988: 455ff; 1992: 172), which distinguishes three types or models of education in Catalonia:

1. **Schools with instruction (mainly) in Catalan**, where Catalan is the means of instruction and internal and external communication,

2. **Schools with instruction (mainly) in Spanish**, where Spanish plays the role of language of instruction,

In both cases, the legal minimums of Catalan and Spanish language arts and language use as a means of instruction are expected to be fulfilled. In between, lies a third model:
3. **Schools with instruction in both languages**, where both languages are used in different proportions.

However, these should not be seen as clear-cut school models but rather as the result of a tension between those -individuals, schools, etc.- spearheading the spread of Catalan in the educational system and those lagging behind due to professional, ideological, practical, or personal reasons. This view is supported by the heterogeneous nature of the third model, since it is said to include:

"(1) schools whose objective is to furnish a real bilingual education, with initial schooling differentiated according to the family language of the pupils, and the school subjects subsequently divided between the two languages; (2) schools basically similar to Type 2, with instruction mainly in Spanish, but which consider the minimum legal requirement for Catalan to be insufficient and therefore give it a larger place in the curriculum and in cultural and extracurricular activities; (3) schools that are gradually becoming "Catalan" schools but have not yet finished this process; and (4) schools that have not arrived at a consensus concerning language policy, so that the presence of the two languages reflects a compromise or simply a lack of agreement." (Siguan, 1988: 456)

The three models stand as nothing more than the simplification of a continuum where opposing trends and tensions have thoroughly transformed the landscape of the Catalan educational system during the last fifteen years. The transformation of the system has been -and still is- dramatically quick. Some figures can help comprehend its real magnitude: from the 35 primary schools which allegedly made some use of Catalan as a means of instruction in 1978, to the 1,874 schools where Catalan was the sole means of instruction except for one subject matter and Castilian language-teaching in 1992-93, the change is really impressive. This increase has come about via the continuous transformation of all-Spanish schools into intermediate and, eventually, Catalan schools.

Table 3.3. Percentages of kindergarten and primary schools using each language as a language of instruction in Catalonia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language of instruction</th>
<th>Percentage of schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1986-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan-medium</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual, evolving towards Catalan-medium</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static bilingual</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian-medium</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4: Language of instruction in secondary education in Catalonia. Percentages of pupils being taught by means of each language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language of instruction</th>
<th>Academic year 1990-91</th>
<th>1992-93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Catalan</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Castilian</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The incorporation of Catalan as the main medium of instruction in primary education was scheduled to be finished during the 1995-96 academic year, whereas no date was clearly set for secondary education.

III The goals of the Catalan Conjunction Model: the school in the normalization process

If there is a term which can be considered central in Catalan sociolinguistic evolution, it is *normalització lingüística* (linguistic normalization). This term was coined during the 60s, spread in the 70s and became, during the 80s and 90s, a part of everyday vocabulary not only in the Catalan Countries but in the rest of non-Castilian speaking Spain.

The concept of linguistic normalization was proposed by Aracil (1965) to refer to the process by which a community reorganizes its own linguistic functions -namely language awareness and language control- so that the social functions of language can be adapted to changing external circumstances. In other words, linguistic normalization represents the elaboration and implementation of new norms of language use in order to cope with new needs. Typically, these new needs meant the conscious assumption of new functions so far reserved for another language. Linguistic normalization was intimately linked to two other concepts, those of linguistic conflict, or the competition between a dominant and a dominated language, and language shift. Linguistic normalization and language shift were the two possible outcomes of the linguistic conflict (cf. Aracil, 1965, 1986b *passim*; Ninyoles, 1972: 19-20; more recently, Mollà and Palanca, 1989: 113 ff; Mollà and Viana, 1991: 101-135. For a reappraisal, Vallverdú, 1980: 68ff; Branchadell, 1987; Kremnitz, 1990: 61ff; Bañeres and Romaní, 1994; Lamuela, 1994). Catalan sociolinguists denounced the idea of bilingualism being used by Spanish and French states as a myth to cover language shift away from the dominated languages (Catalan, Basque, Occitan, etc.) towards the dominant Spanish and French. They therefore required that a linguistic normalization process should be undertaken after the fall of
the Franco regime so that Catalan and the other non-Castilian languages in Spain could be restored and language shift reversed.

The success of the term 'linguistic normalization' during the 80's and 90's has been undeniable and simultaneously ambiguous. On the one hand, it is a fact that several laws regulating language issues in Spain make use of this designation (those of Catalonia, the Balearic Islands, the Basque Autonomous Community and Galicia). On the other hand, the very spread of the term has implied its transformation into a multiplicity of non-synonymous concepts. In the first place, it can be understood both as a process -as in the original definition- and a situation -its final goal-. Secondly, this final situation is not clear. At least three interpretations are currently feasible (Siguan, 1992: 99-102): (a) entire co-officiality, with both languages at the same level and used side by side; (b) co-officiality for public communications, with one of the languages being the official one for internal usage of administration; (c) language spread to the whole population, including immigrants, as the only way to escape language shift. The different concepts of linguistic normalization have been and still are widely present in the Catalan Countries. While its ambiguity may be problematic for language planning theory, it has proved essential for lowering social conflicts regarding language issues, since the final goals of linguistic normalization can be assumed by a larger amount of people than those expressed by a more precise definition (cf. Bañeres and Romaní, 1994). In fact, the whole process of Catalan language spread has consistently minimized social conflict and, indeed, has met little political opposition in Catalonia, at least until the 1993-94 language of instruction crisis (see section 3.3). This phenomenon has been undeniably helped by the fact that political organizations in the Catalan Countries are not organized along ethnic boundaries; thus, at least until the 1993-94 crisis, and despite inevitable difference in emphasis, all of them agreed in considering the promotion of the Catalan language as a common goal.

In coherence with the evolution of the views on linguistic normalization, the school catalanization process has focussed on progressively incorporating Catalan as the medium of instruction. The choice of Catalan as the school institutional language has been regarded as the best way to increase Catalan language standards, and to spread Catalan use among children. As a consequence, little explicit action on the other sociocultural goals of language-in-education planning discussed in chapter 1, i.e., language attitudes and ideology, and (non-institutional) language, has been taken. It is true that the increased emphasis placed by the autonomous school system on Catalan history and geography may be pointed out as a form of developing national awareness, and it is probably inevitable that Catalan language teaching includes a number of historical reflections which are ideologically loaded, but these attitudinal and ideological aspects do not seem to constitute a core value identifying the Catalan Conjoint School as a distinct school model. To express it in comparative, clearly understandable terms, no national anthem is ever sung in Catalan (and Spanish) schools, flags are rarely present; and it is highly unlikely that any school board would even dream of displaying lists of sentences written on blackboards in the main entrance with the saying 'I play in Catalan, I speak Catalan, I love Catalan', or that a club would be formed including those children who only spoke Catalan, in contrast with, for instance, Franco-Ontarian schools, according to Heller's (1994)
description. On top of that, Catalonia's teachers are far from being a homogenous population, both ideologically and linguistically, and they are therefore unlikely to convey a single, unified worldview. For instance, according to a survey among Catalan teachers, 58.4% declared that Catalan should not be the sole official language in Catalonia, only 52% believed that it was one of the school's goals to transmit a national awareness (without specifying which sort of awareness), and only 11.3% of teachers declared to aspire to Catalonia's political independence (Societat Catalana de Pedagogia, 1994).

The reticence towards raising language awareness is increased by the very methodological principles employed in teaching by means of Catalan as a second language. 'Catalan immersion' researchers have repeatedly emphasised that children develop their competence in L2 by means of engaging in significant interaction in this language. Imposing a given linguistic choice is seen as highly counterproductive not only for the relationship established between children and the school as an institution, but also for the very development of language abilities. Therefore, children are in theory free to speak whatever language they want.

As a consequence of all these trends, the Catalan school system finds itself in a contradictory position. On the one hand, it is expected to contribute to Catalan language normalization and spread; on the other, it reduces ideological and attitudinal action to a secondary role, and does not intervene in spontaneous language use. Catalan language spread is therefore left to the top-down effects of the language-of-instruction choice (cf. section 3.3.4).

**IV Obstacles to the catalanization process**

The spread of Catalan in the system of education has faced two major problems: (a) the dearth of teachers qualified to use Catalan as the means of education at the beginning of the 80's, and (b) the number and geographic concentration of Spanish speakers among the students' population. The division between privately-owned and public-run school networks has also played a role in this process.

Despite the existence of a small network of schools teaching through Catalan, the reality faced by the spread of Catalan at the beginning of the 80's was that of a scarcity of adequately prepared teachers. Several circumstances combined to produce this: First, after forty years of prohibition, very few Catalans were literate in their own language and even fewer had been trained to teach the language. Second, industrialization, the centralized civil service system and the appeal of a modern, urban society had driven thousands of Spanish-speaking teachers to the Catalan Countries. As a result, in 1978 just 52% of the teachers in kindergarten and primary education in Catalonia were able to speak Catalan (Arenas, 1990: 29).

This scarcity called for a determined action from the Catalan administration, and a number of measures had to be undertaken in order to modify the situation: some were of a linguistic and formative nature, as language courses for teachers, mostly known has the *Reciclatge lingüístic* or "language recycling", including the so-called intensive immersion programme for teachers,
and the granting of the diploma of Mestre de Català, Teacher of Catalan; others were of a strictly organizational nature, such as furnishing schools with personnel specialised in Catalan language teaching; measures were taken to progressively require getting a Catalan language diploma or to pass a language test to enter the public school system (Arenas, 1990: 28-42).

According to data from the 1989-90 school year, the number of teachers fully competent in Catalan had risen to 78%, while those holding a diploma were around 75% (Vial, 1990). For the academic year 1992-93, the percentage of teachers with a diploma to teach Catalan was 88% (Arenas, 1994).

V The Catalan Immersion Programme

The second problem faced by the spread of Catalan was the presence of a large number of children of Castilian mother tongue. I have already introduced the debate between proponents of school bilingualism and Catalan school in the 70's. As Catalan spread among schools in Catalonia, more and more research started to give evidence that teaching Catalan to non-native speakers would never achieve the goal of making them bilingual. But research pointed even further: while Catalan-speaking children learnt Spanish in any kind of school, Castilian speakers were not becoming productively bilingual in Catalan neither at Castilian-medium schools where Catalan was taught as a subject, nor at bilingual schools where each child was approached in his own language. This was one of the most important conclusions reached by an ambitious project launched by Catalonia's Department of Education in order to evaluate results of language teaching efforts (Servei d'Ensenyament de Català, 1983). There existed a clear risk of limiting the thorough learning of both languages only to Catalan native speakers, and such a possibility was unacceptable because it would eventually lead to either total language shift or societal division on language lines, and was therefore seen as running against social integration.

Integrated classes, where each child was taught via his/her language, did not seem to be the solution either, since extra-school factors determining language learning were too powerful to distort such a utopian project. Even worse, active use of the mother tongue was an exhausting task for the teacher, that risked to bring continually to the foreground ethnolinguistic tensions. As a former teacher of one of those schools put it, "You were reminding them all the time that they were either Catalan or Castilian." (Mab, immersion teacher, personal communication)

The evidence was that only those Castilian-speaking children attending Catalan schools were eventually obtaining a good command of Catalan. This conclusion led to the encouragement of Catalan-medium schools especially designed for the needs of Castilian-speaking children. A policy of teaching via a second language locally, known as Catalan linguistic immersion was launched. Schools using Catalan as the language of instruction for Castilian-speaking children were not entirely new, for they had existed at least since 1980 (Arnau et al., 1992: 137). The novelty was now that they enjoyed clear administrative support and, simultaneously, they started being termed immersion schools after the prestigious Canadian experience became
known in Catalonia (Arenas, 1990: 6).

Since the term immersion was applied to schools using Catalan as the language of instruction for Castilian speakers, research on French Canadian immersion has deeply influenced those programmes and Catalan researchers, to the point that it is often difficult to distinguish when theory being elaborated corresponds strictly to cases such as the Catalan one, or should rather be understood as applicable to all immersion cases. In fact, a conscious effort is detectable to draw theory beyond this generic immersion itself and to refer to the even more comprehensive concept of home-school language shift programme (cf. Artigal, 1989a, 1991; Arnau et al., 1992; Vila, I. 1995)

One of the theoricians of Catalan immersion, Artigal 16 (1989) has repeatedly stated three often quoted conditions considered to be relevant in a successful programme involving a home-to-school language switch. These are:

1. The home language and culture must enjoy high status,
2. Students' - and parents'- attitudes towards the school language, and reasons to learn it, should be positive,
3. The pedagogic treatment by which children acquire the new language should be adapted to their characteristics. A communicative approach should be applied by fully bilingual teachers which never forces the children to use their second language unless they wish so. The first language should receive an adequate treatment at school.

These three conditions are fulfilled by the Catalan schools which offer 'Immersion Programmes' 17. As a superordinate language, dominant in the mass-media and cultural production, spoken by everyone in Catalonia, and as a language of wider communication around the world, Spanish is not endangered at all. All teachers are highly competent bilinguals and do not impose the language onto their students, children in the Catalan Immersion Programme feel free to use their L1 until they are competent in L2. Finally, the main goal in a Catalan Immersion Programme is guaranteeing communication, so interactions in L2 are made significative to students via all sorts of contextualizing means (Artigal, 1989a: 19 ff).

The evolution of the Catalan Immersion Programme has been divided into two phases (Arnau et al., 1992: 138). In 1982, a Decree lifted most of the administrative requirements which hampered the adoption of Catalan as the means of instruction. Together with the Law of Linguistic Normalization, this represented a major encouragement for such programmes. Thus, between 1982 and 1984, an increasing number of schools progressively adopted Catalan as the

---

16 As a well-known researcher in the Catalan Countries, his books and articles have been highly influential among authorities, educators and the public in general, and he can be considered as one of the promotors of the Catalan immersion programme.

17 Catalan Immersion Programme is the term officially used to refer to this school model, and I will retain this term in this chapter.
means of instruction. Among them, many educational centres placed in areas where Castilian-speakers were the vast majority began so-called immersion programmes, usually as a result of the combined enthusiasm of parents, teachers and local authorities.

During the school year 1984-85, the Catalan autonomous educational authority gave a definite impulse to the process of language spread in education by means of the Plans Intensius de Normalització Lingüística (Intensive Plans of Linguistic Normalization) organized by the SEDEC (Service of Catalan Teaching). These plans were addressed at coordinating efforts in order to improve the knowledge of Catalan by the whole school community in given territorial areas. The intervention of the administration generated a dramatic increase both in the number of schools offering immersion courses and in student enrolment which had already reached 736 schools during the academic year 1990-91 (SEDEC files). In the school year 1992-1993, the immersion programme was extended to include up to the intermediate level of primary education, and the increasingly popular kindergarten for 3 year olds.

The changes experienced by society and the school system in Catalonia since the beginning of the Catalan Immersion Programme, and the rapid spread of this project have somehow modified its original characteristics. Concern about the current definition of Catalan immersion has been expressed by some specialists (cf. Artigal, 1990; Arenas et al., 1994; Arnau et al., 1992; Vila, I., 1992), since its distinctive psycho-pedagogic features have moved away from the original Canadian immersion in several senses.

In the first place, due both to its success and to parental and official pressure, Catalan immersion is becoming the standard language-in-education school model in most Spanish-speaking neighbourhoods. This expansion forced the administration to count not only with Catalan native speaking teachers, but also with Castilian-speaking teachers whose actual command of Catalan after the different Catalan language courses may vary depending on personal abilities and motivation. This very expansion puts at stake the optionality of this programme, since Catalan is clearly becoming the predominant language of education in Catalonia.

Secondly, Catalan Immersion Programmes include nowadays a small but growing number of foreign, non-Castilian-speaking children, mostly of Moroccan descent. Historically, immigration in Catalonia has overwhelmingly been of Spanish-speakers. It was not until the late 80's that significant numbers of children with L1 other than Catalan or Castilian started entering Catalan schools, and they have usually been incorporated into the regular classes. As their numbers rise, some L1 teaching -basically Arab- has been organized. This immigration is a new phenomenon in Catalonia, and has not yet deserved distinct attention, but its importance is doomed to grow in the near future due to the increase in foreign immigration.

The decade of implementation, public discussion and research has caused immersion to become a polysemic term. Among these diverse meanings, we can first identify that which defines immersion as the educational methods and techniques based on the use of a second
language which aim at additive bilingualism. This broad sense is the preferred meaning of educationists, psycholinguists and pedagogues (e.g. Artigal, 1989, 1991; Arnau et al., 1992; Arnau, 1993; Siguan, 1992). There exists in Catalonia a second, administrative definition: immersion is a school model which uses Catalan to teach Castilian-speaking children in contexts where these represent at least 70% of the pupils (cf. Arenas, 1990, 1993; Artigal, 1993a: 40). Such schools are eligible for a number of official aids, such as auxiliars de conversa -talk aids-, teachers prepared to help children with difficulties with spoken Catalan.

The mismatch between both conceptions is self-evident: the first one does not explicitly restrict the number of native speakers in the classroom, while the second does; the first one relies on pedagogy to establish the distinction, whereas the pupils' L1 is basic for the second definition.

There is at least a third, more popular interpretation of immersion, which equates it to using Catalan as the means of instruction for Castilian speakers, independently of any pedagogic consideration. Sometimes, the term immersion has been used as a simple synonym for education via Catalan, irrespective of the children's first language. These vague definitions have repeatedly appeared in the press and interfere with the other, more specialised ones.

The awareness of the differences between Catalan and Canadian immersion has grown during the last years, leading some scholars to suggest the independent existence of a “immersió a la catalana” (Siguan, 1995: ii). But the difference between both school models, and its current polysemy, seem relevant enough to question whether immersion remains a useful common label.

Catalan and Canadian immersion do not entirely share either their origins, environments, characteristics or goals. First, Canadian immersion represents basically a reaction to growing Francophone activity on the side of English-speaking parents trying not to lose their socioeconomic status, and it has spread across the country due to the official bilingual policy in Canadian administration (Swain and Lapkin, 1982: 1; Ouellet, 1990; Paulston, 1977b: 76). Catalan immersion constitutes the spearhead of the educational system of language normalization, which in itself is a section of a broader attempt at reversing language shift. Their origins cause a different view of the programme in each minority population: while Catalan-speakers amply support education via Catalan, which they see as a way to integrate the Castilian-speaking population, immersion is often seen as a Trojan horse of further English assimilation by francophone Canadians (Lapkin and Swain with Shapson, 1990: 649).

On a different level, Canadian families whose children attend an immersion programme enjoy a high or middle socio-economic status, to the point that they have been blamed as elitist (Lapkin and Swain with Shapson, 1990: 649). Catalanian parents who send their children to Catalan immersion usually belong to lower social classes (Artigal, 1989a: 62ff).

Concern about integration and avoidance of separated classes for different language groups remains central in Catalonia: Catalan schools refuse separating Castilian and Catalan speaking
children according to their L1 and, therefore, immersion schools often include a number of Catalan native speakers, leading to the widespread existence of mixed classes where native and non-native speakers study together. Indeed, even proponents of school bilingualism have always insisted on mixed classes\(^{18}\). This fact has sometimes aroused concern (Arnau et al., 1992: 141; Vila, I. 1995: 23) for it might prevent teacher adaptation to L2 learners and discourage L2 learning. While this danger has never been proved in Catalonia, there exists a strong public opposition against separation on language lines (cf. AVUI poll below). In Canada, on the contrary, Francophones are basically absent from French immersion programmes (Swain and Lapkin, 1982: 3).

Another difference is that Catalan immersion schools are often placed in localities where Catalan is quite commonly used, especially when immersion is understood as a pedagogic method via L2: in these contexts, it is social norms (language convergence towards Castilian) which prevent Castilian speakers from acquiring active use of Catalan, not scarcity of language input. This is not the case for the majority of Canadian immersion schools (Swain and Lapkin, 1982: 76).

Maybe the most important difference between the Canadian and Catalan programmes lies not in their didactic procedures but in their goals, which are not entirely shared. Regarding language competence, Canadian Immersion attempts at developing L1 native competence in all aspects, but only near-native competence in L2 on reading and auditory comprehension, to the point that balanced highly developed bilingualism is simply considered unrealistic (Harley, 1991: 13). The Catalan model claims much more ambitious goals, since balanced bilingualism and biliteracy in Catalan and Spanish is -maybe too optimistically- the official goal for everyone at the end of primary education (cf. Law of Linguistic Normalization).

But it is at the level of language use where the differences become enormous. Canadian immersion aims mostly at instrumental bilingualism, while in Catalonia the goal is integrative bilingualism. Canadian immersion was not thought of as an instrument for reversing language shift: English-speaking immersion students do not envisage integration into a new unified bilingual community, though Canadian national unity may as a result benefit from increased bilingualism. Catalan programmes, as a central instrument of normalització lingüística, do attempt to incorporate Spanish-speaking monolinguals into the Catalan speaking community by means of bilingualism, i.e., children are expected to use the language outside the classroom. Catalan immersion, as the rest of the Catalan school system, is struggling to reduce language borders between Catalan and Castilian-speakers in order to integrate the two language communities; therefore, not only language, but popular culture as well, such as stories, feasts, and other activities, are included in the school programme. Catalan immersion aims at integrative bilingualism for those who would otherwise remain monolingual. Canadian immersion, on the other hand, while promoting enhanced language proficiency in French and

\(^{18}\) During the 1993-94 crisis, the expression linguistic apartheid referring to the separation of children along language lines was used by the Catalan ministry of Education and gained some public currency.
mutual respect and appreciation, seems to attain a more instrumental bilingualism.

All these considerations make it difficult to apply the term *immersion* to the Catalan approach to additive bilingual education. It has an independent origin, its own characteristics and its own goals, not always coincidental with those of Canadian immersion, and usually far more ambitious. It is only in a broad sense, when considering immersion as a set of pedagogic techniques to teach majority children in a second language with additive outcomes, that this term seems appropriate. This is the meaning which Cummins (1989: 23; 1993b: 72) attributes to the term 'immersion' when applying it to Irish efforts to revive Gaelic via schooling in that language, or when he applies the term immersion to education via Basque and Catalan to Castilian-speakers.

Is Catalonia a particular case in this use of *immersion*? Catalan Immersion Programmes are by no means an isolated example, though they may constitute one the most ambitious in size and future expectations. The goal of Catalan immersion, that of promoting language knowledge and use and reversing language shift, can be found in many other minority communities all around the world. The prestige of the term *immersion* seems to spread this label from one to the other. This has happened since the very beginning of the Canadian immersion experience (cf. how Fishman (1976: 35) uses it in this broad sense). Today, we can see it applied to Gaelic-medium education in Ireland (Harris, 1991), Welsh-medium (Thomas, 1991), Euskera-medium in the Basque Country (Artigal, 1993b; Cenoz, 1993: 123; Ojanguren, 1993). This use of the label *immersion* contrasts sharply with the use of the same label for foreign language learning in cases such as Hungary (Duff, 1991) or Australia (Clyne, 1991; De Courcy, 1993), where little active use of the foreign language is expected outside the classroom. The American Integrated immersion programmes (Glenn and LaLyre 1991) would stand between both of them.

It is undeniable that education via a second language is still seen with suspicion among wide circles. The spread of the term *immersion* can probably be related to the acute need to escape this negative view and to adopt a positive label for education via a second language which aims at full bilingual proficiency. Research on Canadian immersion has proved that education via an L2 does not necessarily provoke detrimental effects. In the Catalan Countries in particular, the transition from L2 education in Castilian aiming at linguistic assimilation to L2 education in the minority language pointing at full bilingual proficiency and minority language maintenance has been extremely fast, and references to the undoubtedly related, though different, Canadian experience have proved useful to allay resistance from defenders of Castilian monolingualism. This may explain why the term *immersion* keeps being referred to in more and more minority language situations. But there seems to exist reasonable room to doubt about the convenience of using one and the same term to refer to these two different realities, at least in scientific research. On my part, I will restrain the use of the term 'immersion' to the administrative view as much as possible when referring to the Catalan experience.
VI The 1993-94 "language of instruction" crisis

In 1993, a debate about normalització lingüística and the role of Catalan and Spanish languages in education arose. Before September, a work of fiction attacking the school catalanization process gained some notoriety (Larra, 1992), and a small group of parents at a school in Barcelona (C.P. Reis Catòlics) - later condemned by the school's parents association - demanded education in Spanish and opposed the use of Catalan as the means of instruction in their centre for some days. This claim passed relatively unnoticed in the press, though a number of articles and letters to the editor appeared either against or in favour of immersion in several newspapers. The effects of this action were nevertheless relatively small and did not reach the public.

After the summer holidays, on Sunday, 14 September, some days before primary schools opened their doors, the Madrid-based conservative ABC newspaper, published a front-page photo of Jordi Pujol, President of the Generalitat de Catalunya (the Catalan autonomous government), with the headline Igual que Franco pero al revés: persecución del castellano en Cataluña "Just like Franco, but the other way round: Castilian persecuted in Catalonia". In a report, a number of parents were interviewed who claimed that their children's Castilian would suffer because of teaching in Catalan and that education in Catalan was a covert manoeuvre to eradicate Spanish. According to the newspaper, this was a widely held opinion in Catalonia which was not publicly expressed because of fear of eventual repression. This report evoked a strong reaction from both Catalan and Castilian-language mass media in Catalonia, accusing ABC of creating a false impression of what was going on in Catalonia and reminding that while Franco was a dictator, the Generalitat was a democratically elected government. The debate moved on for some days in angry terms between some conservative, Madrid-based mass-media (ABC, Epoca, Actualidad Gráfica, etc.) and Catalonian political parties and press, until it became known that only some twenty parents in a total of five schools in all Catalonia had explicitly asked to have their children taught exclusively in Castilian.

On 14 October, Epoca (a rightist magazine) accused the Catalan Government of creating a climate of terror in Catalonia regarding language. On 10 October, ABC accused the Generalitat of treating Spanish as a foreign language, the reason being that an overwhelming majority of schools in Catalonia used Catalan as the sole means of instruction in kindergarten and the first year of primary education. The reaction of the Catalan government was to remind that unless language immersion were used, only Catalan speakers would achieve a sound degree of bilingualism.

On 10 November, the newspaper El País leaked to the public a bill which the Generalitat was preparing in order to reform the Law of Linguistic Normalization. Among other aspects, this project stated the obligation for (private-owned) cinema, radio and TV stations to include a certain number of films or programmes in Catalan (either original or dubbed\(^{19}\)). This project

\(^{19}\) For nationalistic reasons, Franco's dictatorship forced dubbing instead of subtitling. Today, foreign films and programmes are overwhelmingly dubbed in all TV stations and cinemas. Although steadily increasing, subtitling remains
stated that those not applying this Law would be legally sanctioned\textsuperscript{20}. With regards to education (art. 14), Catalan was to become the language of "normal use", and children were entitled to "personal assistance" until this language was mastered. Catalan and Castilian languages would be compulsory subject matters and all children should be able to use "normally and correctly" both languages by the end of compulsory education. Finally, children would not be separated according to their \textit{llengua habitual} or "customary language"

Public debate focussed on this project, especially the sanctions. A round of meetings and deliberations among the political parties started so that the bill gathered maximal consensus. In the meantime, the debate on languages in Catalonia gathered momentum in the mass-media, with TV debates, reality shows and radio and TV talk-shows at prime-time discussing the issue.

On 24 December, the Supreme Court of Catalonia pronounced sentence that separating children in different classes was to be refused, but simultaneously recognized the right to have education in the "customary language". According to the Generalitat, this was to be achieved via personal assistance in language-mixed classrooms. This sentence had its origin back in 1983, when some articles from the Law of Linguistic Normalization had been taken to the Courts\textsuperscript{21}.

The polemics continued in 1994, when the Spanish Supreme Court made public (27 January) that it was studying the possibility of passing to the Constitutional Court the decision about an appeal (\textit{recurs}) against the Catalan Law of Normalization presented by a lawyer resident in Catalonia. The appeal had been lodged against the obligation to know Catalan at the end of primary education; against the fact that Catalan was the "normal" vehicle of communication in schools; and against the restriction of choice of "customary language" as the language of instruction to the initial period of primary education. The issue was eventually passed to the consideration of the Constitutional Court (15 February). The reaction to this decision was immediate: the President of the Catalan Parliament and other members of the Government of Catalonia declared that should the Law of Linguistic Normalization be declared unconstitutional, the Spanish Constitution would have to be modified.

During February, 1994, several prominent politicians, either Catalan or Spanish (among them, the President and Vice-president of the Spanish Government and the Spanish Minister of Education), publicly rejected the \textit{double educational-network}, i.e., the division of students according to their language in a Castilian-speaking and a Catalan-speaking independent network. Nevertheless, while the Law of Linguistic Normalization was still \textit{sub iudice}, the

\textsuperscript{20} Surprising as it can be, the Law of Linguistic Normalization did not allow for sanctions, i.e., its fulfilment was mostly a matter of personal good-will or contextual pressure.

\textsuperscript{21} For a fully detailed account of this judicial process, see Institut d'Estudis Autonòmics (1994).
Generalitat made clear that its reform would not be stopped, for its being unconstitutional was not even considered by the Catalonian Government.

In the meantime, several parents formed a parents’ committee in favour of Castilian as the language of instruction (C.A.D.E.C.A). This committee coordinated with other small organizations (Asociación Miguel de Cervantes, Asociación por la tolerancia, Enseñantes por el bilingüismo), most of them born during between 1993 and 1995, whose goals were to demand Castilian to be used more widely in the educational system and in Catalonia's public life as a whole. They claimed that linguistic normalization violated human rights, and insisted that education via Catalan:

(...) porta el nen a l’apatia escolar i, com a conseqüència, a un menor rendiment intel·lectual reflectit en la seva menor capacitat abstractiva i en la seva escassa disposició per a la concentració i l’esforç. (...) [aquest nen] acumula totes les dificultats que porten directament al fracàs escolar.” (...) leads the child to academic apathy and, as a consequence, to weaker intellectual performance which is reflected in his reduced capacity for abstract reasoning and in his scarce propensity towards concentration and effort. (...) [this child] accumulates all the difficulties that lead straight to academic failure. Robles et al., 1995)

No evidence was provided for such claims. The main public activities of these associations included lobbying, several scarcely attended demonstrations (always under 50 participants, according to the press), press communiques, and legal demands against the educational administration. They also sought signatures to force the Catalan government to open new Castilian-medium schools and 50% Catalan-Castilian schools (Robles et al., 1995).

Other language disputes flourished during 1994. Leaving aside the continuous campaign against the Catalan normalization process in a number of Castilian-speaking media channels from outside Catalonia, in February 1994 some judiciary sectors and the Popular Party fiercely opposed the project of encouraging bilingualism among judges by granting an extra number of points (the equivalent of years of experience, representing seniority), necessary for their professional promotion, to those judges who learned Catalan, Basque and Galician. It should be taken into account that, due to their direct dependence on the central government, the legal and judiciary domains had been so reluctant to accept Catalan that even Latin had been used more than Catalan in some Catalan courts (Josep Niubó, Barcelona judge, quoted in Avui, 18/11/95). Nevertheless, the project was ruled out in June by the Supreme Court. On another front, Antonio Gala, a much respected Andalusian writer, denounced in summer that his plays and Castilian theatre in general was discriminated against in Catalonia. Finally, in November the Real Academia Española required the president of the Spanish government to act in favour of Castilian by, among other measures, guaranteeing the learning of Castilian, determining the occasions in life in which the use of Castilian was to be compulsory ("debe emplearse la lengua común"), imposing mandatory quotas of Castilian on radio and television stations ("Disponer que las emisoras de radio y televisión dependientes del Estado emitan preferentemente en la lengua común (...). Imponer igualmente a las emisoras privadas una programación mínima en castellano, a horas razonables (...)") among other language policy measures (quoted by La Vanguardia, 9/9/94). The letter, publically condemned by a number of members of the Academia itself, was received with bitter criticisms by Catalan and Basque
institutions, who deplored the ignorance displayed by the Academia by its asking for already existing things (learning of Castilian was already compulsory), or by hiding the fact that Castilian was in reality the only language used by private TV.

On 23 December 1994, the Constitutional Court pronounced the sentence that Catalonia’s Law of Linguistic Normalization was in accord with the Spanish Constitution. In the Court's view, the Spanish Constitution did not impose a particular educational model, and left ample room to the autonomous governments to organize the school systems in their own territories. What is relevant to our purposes here is that the Court found that the Catalan "Conjunction Model", as it had come to be called due to the emphasis on avoiding separation on language lines, did not aim to diminish the Constitutional rank of Castilian, but rather aimed to prevent the creation of two segregated educational networks with potentially dangerous effects for social harmony.

"De igual manera, el desarrollo de la personalidad y la participación de todos los ciudadanos en la vida política, económica, social y cultural queda claramente favorecida si se consigue que los alumnos se doten de una capacitación lingüística suficiente en las dos lenguas oficiales a lo largo del proceso escolar, y ese es el objetivo que persigue la incorporación del catalán como lengua vehicular. Por tanto, el sacrificio del derecho de opción lingüística en la segunda enseñanza puede quedar también justificado por la consecución de todos esos objetivos y la defensa de esos otros valores." “In the same manner, the development of all the citizens' personalities and their participation in political, economic, social and cultural life is clearly favoured if it is achieved that the pupils be endowed with a sufficient linguistic capacity in both official languages during the educational process, and this is the goal pursued by the conversion of Catalan into the medium of instruction. Therefore, sacrificing the right of linguistic option in second education may also be justified by the achievement of all those goals and the defense of all those values.” (Tribunal Constitucional, quoted by Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 1994: 236)

This sentence fuelled some acrid criticisms from those opposed to the Generalitat's policy, who denounced it politically determined, and it constituted a betrayal of the Spanish-speaking citizens' civil rights. Nevertheless, polemics soon lost public support, and a few weeks later, the 'immersion crisis' was formally over.

It has repeatedly been pointed out that no sign of political opposition to the normalization process had been detected in Catalonia since the beginning of the eighties, when a manifesto against language policy in Catalonia (De Miguel et al., 1981) evoked a heated debate, including a terrorist action against one of its supporters. The fact is, though, that in 1993 the polemics reached such importance that even the foreign press commented upon it. What had changed in 1993 to create such a big upheaval?

The whole polemics should probably be explained in relationship to the announcement by the General Director of Language Policy in 1989 that a new orientation would be adopted that promoted not only knowledge of Catalan but societal use as well (Reniu, 1990). It is clear that the process of language spread at school (see tables 3.3 and 3.4) had reached some parents who for whatever reasons were reticent to it, who had up to that moment skipped Catalan as a

---

22The Catalan term segon ensenyament (Cast. segunda enseñanza) is an ambiguous term that refers to the educational process immediately received after the "initial education". Thus, it is not to be confused with "secondary education".
means of instruction for their children, and who now organized themselves to oppose it. In fact, one of the main protest centres was placed in Salou, a tourist village where knowledge of Catalan among school children was anomalously low (E. Boix’s personal communications on 1991 Census) due to the presence of some very recent Castilian-speaking immigrants. Nevertheless, the number of children actually involved in the polemics has never achieved significant proportions: by the end of 1994, the Asociación por la tolerancia claimed its manifesto against the Generalitat’s language policy had been signed by more than 24,000 citizens (El Temps, 3/10/94: 32); nevertheless, Castilian instruction had been actually required for 37 children in 1993, and for 79 in 1994 (out of 755,000 primary education children (El País, 14/9/94: 26), whereas between 4 and 25 children (depending on the source) had temporarily been withdrawn from school by their parents until all Castilian-medium instruction were guaranteed (El Temps, 3/10/94: 32, Avui, 22/9/94: 25). Such low figures do not seem to justify the attention paid by the media and politicians to the issue.

The analysis of the whole polemics should bear in mind its political context. During the crisis, many political analysts underlined the fact that the ruling Spanish Socialist Workers’ Party (PSOE), had not won the elections by an absolute majority for the first time in a decade, and it was strongly tainted by the effects of serious economic recession (more than 20% unemployment) and political corruption. The PSOE therefore sought the support of the Catalan Convergence and Union (CiU) liberal-Christian Democrat coalition, which was also the ruling coalition in Catalonia. On the other hand, the Spanish Popular Party (PP) -rightist- faced a weakened government, and, for the first time in more than ten years, sustained positive hopes to gain power in the next elections. To beat the socialist party, nevertheless, political instability became highly convenient, since it was expected to have pernicious effects on the PSOE public image as the party in government. The polemics on the language issue in Catalonia could have a multiple effect: the conservative would appeal to the spectre of Catalan separatism, and make any agreement with Catalan nationalists more difficult for the socialists, on penalty of appearing antipatriotic to the Spanish people. The PP, on its side, would appear to be the champion of Spanish interests. Finally, the possibility of gaining support from Castilian-speaking residents in Catalonia existed. The conservative interest in the polemics was supported by the fact that ABC and COPE radio-network, the two leading media promoting unidirectional critics, have been vigourously anti-socialist, and closely related to Spanish conservative circles for decades.

After the sentence dictated by the Constitutional Court, only some factions in the Popular Party questioned the legitimacy of the ‘conjunction model’, but the party itself launched an image campaign to appear to be a catalanist, non-nationalist party. In 1995, some weeks before Catalonia’s autonomous elections, this party vindicated the establishment of different school models; surprisingly enough, though, the issue was not evoked at all during the campaign, so the rise in votes obtained by the Popular Party in Catalonia was difficult to attribute either to its opposition to the Generalitat’s language policy or to its recent ‘recatalanization’.

On the whole, the view of the Catalan linguistic normalization process has dramatically changed. During the 80’s it used to be conceived as a unitarian process supported by all social
and political forces. Now, it is regarded as a debatable issue, and severely criticised (mostly by) conservative, Spanish-nationalist positions, which have compared it, among others, with stalinism and communist dictatorship (Jiménez Losantos, 1993), with terrorism and nazism (Vidal-Quadras, 1996), and with ethnic cleansing, (Robles et al., 1995). Mass media from outside Catalonia have become extremely suspicious about Catalan, and relationships between Catalans and Spain as a whole are said to have significantly deteriorated. The consensus has been broken, and new initiatives, such as reforming the Catalan Language Normalization Law so that language promotion could be spread beyond the administration itself, have been postponed sine die.

3.2.6 Current situation and future perspectives

I Results of the catalanization of education

It has been repeatedly pointed out that education in Spain does not enjoy a strong tradition of standardized evaluation of academic outcomes (e.g. Arnau, 1993a: 85; Artigal (coord), 1995: 86). Neither Spanish nor Catalan have at their disposal the large amount of standardized tests designed to assess linguistic competence and other abilities which are available for English and French. Moreover, the spread of Catalan as a means of education is still too recent and personnel too few to even dream of competing with Canadian efforts to assess the impact of bilingual education.

Nevertheless, there exist already a number of investigations dealing with the outcomes of the process of school catalanization. These have been propelled mostly by the Servei d'Ensenyament del Català (SEDEC), a branch of the Catalan Department of Education; by the Institut de Ciències de l'Educació-Universitat de Barcelona (ICE-UB); and by the combined action of both. Most data, but not all, refer to children who were in the officially designated immersion (until recently, up to 10 years) or at the end of this period. Research on bilingual education in Catalonia has be organized along several major lines:

1. **Spread of Catalan-medium education**: A first line of research examines the extent to which Catalan has spread across the educational system as a language of teaching. This concern responds to the obvious link between linguistic normalization goals and language teaching and use. These data are usually published by the SEDEC, but not exclusively. Recent examples of this line of research are Vial (1992); Bel (1990); Arenas and Vial (1992); Arenas (1994).

2. **Competence in Catalan and Castilian**: A second line of research focusses on linguistic

---

23 Leader of the Popular Party in Catalonia.

24 Again, this is only partly related to language issues, and it is not at the heart of the issue. The Catalan nationalists' support to the weakened Socialist party has been the logical object of attack of those trying to break this parliamentary pact and desiring new elections.
competence in Catalan and Castilian. Since its very beginning, concern over language competence achievements has been central to the evaluation of the Catalanian Conjunction Model. To date, all evidence leads us to believe that there exist a number of factors influencing language acquisition in Catalonia, and these can be synthesized as (a) family language, (b) degree of use of Catalan at school, or school model, and (c) oral versus written competence.

According to the available data, Catalan native speakers reach high levels in both oral Catalan and Castilian across Catalonia. Their command of written Castilian is universally high, to the point of being comparable to that of native Castilian-speakers, but only those in Catalan-medium schools reach an equally high level of written Catalan (Vila, I. 1993). Castilian speakers score very high for all oral and written abilities in Castilian in whatever sort of school. On the other hand, they only reach high levels of competence in Catalan when they attend Catalan-medium schools, though these remain significantly lower than those of native speakers when oral competence is considered; in Castilian-medium schools and in schools using both languages as a means of instruction, their eventual command of Catalan is significantly lower (Servei d'Ensenyament del Català, 1983; Bel, 1990; Oriol et al., 1990; Vila, I., 1993a; Serra and Vila, 1993). A collateral line of research has dealt with methods to assess language competence: Serra and Arnau (1992) would be a good instance of such a line.

These results confirm the basic assumptions of bilingual education: whenever two languages are present in an imbalanced situation, minority -in this case, Catalan- students require L1 education to maintain and develop their competence in L1, at no cost for L2 competence. For their part, majority students -Castilian speakers here- need maximal L2 education to increase their competence in the minority language, and this option can be followed at no expense for their L1.

3. **Impact on academic achievement**: A third line of research deals with the effects of the catalanization process on academic achievement. Only a few studies have been devoted to this issue, and results are contradictory: some have found no negative effects, and even positive trends, while others have pointed out some retardation among immersion students in mathematical calculation (e.g. Boixaderas, Canal and Fernández, 1992; Ribes, 1993). Unfortunately, this research has focussed on children in initial and medial primary education, while nothing is known about eventual results, retardation being attributed to the initial emphasis on second language teaching and learning (cf. Serra and Vila, 1993 and, especially, Vila, I., 1995: 53-57).

4. **Didactic and pedagogic research**: There exists a fourth line of research which is mostly addressed at strictly didactic and pedagogic issues, such as Belart, Carceller and Soliva (1991); Artigal (1993b).

5. **Attitudinal research**: Rarely explored in Catalonia, probably due to the fact that Catalan

---

25 For a more detailed explanation of each type of research, see Vila, I. (1992: 61-64; 1993b: 89ff; 1995); Artigal (coord), 1995).
and Castilian-speakers attend the same schools in mixed classrooms and are not offered the possibility to be transferred to monolingual L1 school models. Comes, Jiménez and Alcaraz (1995) stands as the only study specifically addressed at attitudes towards the school catalanization process. Ribes (1983, 1993) and, marginally, Sarramona et al. (1990b) deal with attitudinal aspects.

Finally, several states of the art have been published, combining the different lines in an unequal way. Instances of these are, among others, Artigal (1989a, 1993a) and Artigal (coord)(1995); Siguan (1988, 1992); Arnau et al. (1992); Vila, I. (1992, 1993a, 1993b, 1995); Serra and Vila (1993).

II Bilingual education and language use

Since the beginning of the 90s, a new concern has been publicly expressed: increased use of Catalan as the language of instruction does not appear to be promoting the use of Catalan as the language of children's informal interaction (Arnau et al., 1992: 150). The concern with the use of the Catalan language is by no means entirely new, as can be derived from the overviews of sociolinguistic research (cf. Pérez Saldanya, 1993: 40 ff; Boix and Payrató, 1994), and it had appeared somehow marginally in previous research (e.g. Arnau, 1985). But it was around 1990 when the umpteenth polemic about Catalan focussed on the future of the language in terms of language use: several authors denounced the fact that while Catalan was being learned and language competence spread, actual use of Catalan was not increasing and language shift towards Castilian had not been arrested (Prats, Rafanell and Rosich, 1990). These positions were partially refuted by others (Vallverdú, 1990), and a public debate was prompted which was known as the debate on the future of Catalan. Among the different arguments, one was of special relevance to our research: some authors claimed that Catalan was at risk of latinization or irlandización, i.e., becoming a widely studied language without active speakers (e.g. Artigal, 1990: 15; Prats, Rafanell and Rosich, 1990: 22). Lack of consistent research on the actual outcomes of school use of Catalan did not allow discussion to move further than simple speculation. Eventually, the General Director of Language Policy announced a new phase of language planning was to start with a particular emphasis on what was to be called social use of Catalan (Reniu, 1990).

Simultaneously, research in the field of second language acquisition was confirming the need to learn about Castilian speakers' language use in order to explain their competence in Catalan. Paradoxal results were encountered in Bel, Serra, and Vila (1991) (cf. review in Vila, I., 1995): on the one hand, knowledge of written and spoken Castilian was dependent on individual capacities, rather than social variables such as family language or degree of Catalan-language use at school. Conversely, competence in Catalan depended not on individual capacities but rather on social variables: standards in written Catalan were dependent on the extent to which Catalan had been used as the means of instruction, while standards in spoken Catalan remained dependent on the pupils' first language. This last result struck the researchers, for it had been previously assumed that increased use of Catalan as a means of instruction should encourage
Catalan language knowledge. Nevertheless, this was not the case: Castilian-speaking pupils attending Catalan-medium schools did not score significantly higher than their Castilian-speaking peers at schools where Catalan and Castilian were equally used (p = 0.1003) (Vila, I., 1995: 32); in all cases, Castilian-speakers remained below their Catalan and bilingual peers.

It was argued that only spontaneous use of Catalan could account for these unexpected results in Catalan competence (Bel, Serra and Vila, 1993: 108; Vila, I., 1993: 181). Informal peer-use of Catalan in Catalan-Castilian medium schools would be higher than assumed and responsible for the acquisition of spoken Catalan. In fact, the percentage of Catalan-speaking peers in the classroom seemed to support such a causal link.

Table 3.5. Skills in spoken Catalan according to the subjects’ first language and the percentage of Catalan-speakers in the classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First lang.</th>
<th>Cat-speakers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>74.22</td>
<td>12.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>80.32</td>
<td>11.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>85.90</td>
<td>19.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65.20</td>
<td>20.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66.79</td>
<td>17.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>73.22</td>
<td>15.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>70.33</td>
<td>17.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>78.08</td>
<td>13.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N: number of subjects; X = mean; S: standard deviation; Categories with N < 5 have been suppressed. Source: Vila, I., (1995: 33).

Mena, Serra and Vila's (1994) study found its origin in these considerations. The research, considered by the very authors as a pilot project, consisted in the recording of the informal interactions of eight different subjects, four Catalan speakers and four Castilian speakers, distributed by pairs in four schools. Schools were selected according to two variables: language of instruction (either only Catalan or Catalan and Castilian), and according to the pupils (predominantly Catalan -more than 80% of Castilian-speaking pupils- and predominantly Castilian -more than 80% of Castilian-speaking pupils). Thus, each subject was expected to represent one of the eight possible combinations (e.g. Catalan speaker in a Catalan-medium school and predominantly Castilian-speaking class). All the subjects were highly competent in both languages.

Catalan speakers were recorded as using their first language in preference to Castilian except for one case, that of the Catalan subject in a Catalan and Castilian school with more than 80% of Castilian speakers. On the other hand, the results supported the importance of the language of education in the use of Catalan by Castilian-speakers: only those subjects in Catalan-only classes made active use of this language for their informal interactions; context was very significant, also: the Castilian-speaking (female) subject in the predominantly Catalan-
speaking class used Catalan almost as much as her classmates. On the other hand, mixed turns (i.e., including code-switches) reached very modest proportions, and were produced only by subjects with considerable use of Catalan.

Table 3.6: Percentage of Catalan, Castilian and mixed speech turns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort of class</th>
<th>Subj.</th>
<th>First language</th>
<th>Catalan</th>
<th>Castilian</th>
<th>Cat-Cast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inst.: both Pred. back.: Cast-sp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cast-speaker</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>96.33</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cast-speaker</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>97.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst.: both Pred. back.: Cat-sp</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cast-speaker</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>95.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cast-speaker</td>
<td>87.73</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst.: Cat Pred. back.: Cast-sp</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cast-speaker</td>
<td>44.36</td>
<td>53.13</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cast-speaker</td>
<td>92.78</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst.: Cat Pred. back.: Cat-sp</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cast-speaker</td>
<td>90.49</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cat-speaker</td>
<td>95.05</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inst.: Language of instruction; Pred. back.: Predominant background of class-mates in linguistic terms, i.e., majority of Castilian speakers (Cast-sp) or majority of Catalan speakers (Cat-sp). Source: Mena, Serra and Vila, 1994: 20.

With regards to the interlocutor, this research confirmed that most of the Catalan used by subjects 1 and 3 was predominantly addressed to adults (mostly teachers); strikingly, subject 5, i.e. the Castilian speaker in a class with more than 80% of Castilian speakers following an immersion, Catalan-only programme, used Catalan significantly with other pupils.

Table 3.7: Number of speech turns in Catalan according to interlocutor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort of class</th>
<th>Subj.</th>
<th>First language</th>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>Pupil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lg of in.: both Pred. back.:Cast-sp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cast-speaker</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cast-speaker</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lg of in.: both Pred. back.: Cat-sp</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cast-speaker</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lg of in.: Cat Pred. back.: Cast-sp</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cast-speaker</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Thus, according to these results, the widely assumed perception that Castilian-speaking pupils in immersion courses do not use their Catalan for peer-interaction would be contradicted by empirical data.

As a pilot study, only limited representativeness can be afforded to these results. Unfortunately, Mena, Serra and Vila (1994) arose from psycholinguistic and educationalist motivations and did not include considerations from sociolinguistically-based research on language contact and use. Thus, while considerable effort was devoted to, for instance, calculating the time each subject spent speaking each language, the analysis of their language...
norms was not taken into consideration, and the classification of linguistically mixed speech turns does not clarify what sort of mixtures were produced. Notwithstanding these limitations, this study constitutes a significant step towards the approach between psycholinguistic concerns on language learning and sociolinguistic concerns on language use.

III The Catalan conjunction model: future developments

The future is always extremely difficult to predict. Nevertheless, a number of feasible developments can be speculated.

Public opinion on the school catalanization was assessed by a number of polls in 1994 and 1995. One was published by AVUI newspaper (Avui, 2/2/94), usually considered to be close to the Catalan nationalist coalition CiU. According to this poll, only 11.6% of the inhabitants in Catalonia wanted separate schools for Catalan and Castilian-speakers, while 85.6% disagreed with such a separation. In the same poll, 19.1% considered the Generalitat's language policy incorrect or rather incorrect, while 72.1% considered it correct or rather correct.

A second study was published some months later by the Spanish Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas (CIS), directed by Miquel Siguan. According to this study, while 50% of the population declared Catalan to be his/her own language and 49% declared Castilian, 62% declared they preferred Catalan to be the means of instruction, while 27% declared they preferred Castilian (Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas, 1994: 61).

On April, 17th La Vanguardia published a third poll on the issue, according to which 72.0% of Catalonians approved of "immersion"-compare with 35.8% for the whole of Spain-, while only 13.4% opposed it -19.6% for the whole of Spain. More importantly, only 14.2% of Catalonians considered language to be a serious problem for coexistence in Catalonia -in contrast with 36.7% who did for the whole of Spain.

One year later, before the Catalan elections on 19 November 1995, other polls detected variable degrees of social conflict with regard to language: according to El País (9/10/95: 16), 56% of Catalans would deny the existence of a 'linguistic problem'; 27% agreed with the statement "Those who speak only Castilian start having problems in Catalonia, and may even be discriminated against in some cases"; and 16% believed that "the Catalan language still has difficulties due to the predominance of the Castilian language". Some days later La Vanguardia (22/10/95: 16) published another poll according to which 81.7% of Catalans answered 'no' to the question "do you think that in Catalonia language constitutes a problem for coexistence?", and only 15.9% agreed. It is remarkable that one year earlier (December 1994) the answers to this question were 73.5% for 'no' and and 24.2% for 'yes', so a significant reduction in 'yes' answers was detected.

26It is unfortunate that the question was stated in non-exclusive terms, so that it cannot be used to accurately assess the degree of social conflict.
Comes, Jiménez and Alcaraz (1995) was a survey on the attitudes expressed by a sample of Catalonia's Castilian-speaking pupils, between 10 and 15 years old. This study evaluates the position of some of the main actors of bilingual education, the children and teenagers themselves, with regards to their own schools.

Its results confirm the wide support bilingual education receives among the pupils themselves; it can be said that, at least in theory, Catalonia's Conjunction Model is in relative agreement with these attitudes, for it does include the use of Castilian as the language of instruction of one subject matter. Nevertheless, the mandatory character of this model is objected to by the pupils (question 57), although it is legitimate to suggest that these objections have more to do with its ‘mandatory’ character (Cast. obligatoriamente) than with its actual content, as proved by the striking differences obtained in questions 54 and 57.

Table 3.8: Attitudes towards bilingual education among Castilian-speaking pupils (10-15 years old).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Indif.</th>
<th>N.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47. Do your parents like your being taught by means of Catalan?</td>
<td>73.59</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>22.31</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Do you think it is necessary to learn by means of Catalan?</td>
<td>65.96</td>
<td>12.16</td>
<td>21.26</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Do you think the school must teach some subjects by means of Catalan?</td>
<td>83.84</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Do you think the school must teach all subjects by means of Catalan?</td>
<td>15.74</td>
<td>83.98</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Do you find it all right that some subjects are compulsorily taught by means of Catalan?</td>
<td>65.50</td>
<td>33.20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


On the whole, the conjunction model does not seem to find significant opposition among Castilian-speaking pupils in Catalonia, although its mandatory character may arouse suspicions and Catalan monolingual education may be rejected. At least as far as its more direct actors -pupils- are concerned, there seems to be little space for social confrontation regarding language of instruction; opposition to the conjunction model does not seem to have achieved significant support among its potential clients.

The Catalan and Spanish political arenas do not seem to allow for major changes in the foreseeable future. In the 1995 elections for the autonomous Parliament, the liberal-democrat, nationalist CiU party lost its absolute majority, while the PP, the only party which had somewhat opposed the Law of Linguistic Normalization and the school catalanization process, recorded a noticeable increase; nevertheless, linguistic polemics had been punctiliously avoided during the campaign, so a causal link between both facts is not straightforward. Should the PP win the March 1996 general elections, it seems reasonable to expect that this party
would not manage to obtain an absolute majority. In any case, the PP would possibly have to arrive at some sort of agreement with the Catalan nationalists and, therefore, water down the attacks against linguistic normalization. This change of attitude was already perceptible after the Catalan elections. In the meanwhile, Spanish nationalist attacks against the Generalitat have been now 'transferred' to the Balearic Islands, where the newly appointed president, Cristòfol Soler (ironically, a member of the PP, dominant in the Islands), has announced projects in favour of school catalanization.

Once the conjunction model has been fully implemented in primary education, with Catalan as the main means of instruction and at least one subject matter being taught in Spanish, the Generalitat will continue to promote the use of Catalan as the means of instruction in secondary education, but here the horizon of complete catalanization seems far more remote due to its own structural characteristics. Teachers' individual freedom of language choice in the classrooms appears deeply rooted in this domain, so a slow progress of Catalan is likely to take place.

All evidence to date denies that Castilian proficiency has suffered from the process of Catalan language spread, probably due to the fact that this language is omnipresent in Catalonia, both as a mother tongue and as a second language, heavily predominant in the mass media and economic life, and continues to be present in the school curriculum. But there persists the possibility that despite its ample use in Catalonia, shrinking use of Castilian as a school language may provoke a decrease in linguistic standards. If that competence loss came into being, the educational administration in Catalonia would have to reevaluate its language policy, so that its goals of highly developed, balanced bilingualism be attained.

But before that hypothetical point is reached, other factors will occupy the educational authorities. Castilian speakers continue to obtain lower degrees in bilingual proficiency than Catalan native speakers. Ignasi Vila (1995) furnishes evidence that the notion that language is learned by use has still not been thoroughly implemented, and convincingly argues for considering the best strategies for (formal) spoken language teaching. He also points out the significant linguistic deficiencies detected in the teachers' speech. It is especially worrisome that linguistically inadequate models constitute the only contact with spoken Catalan for a considerable number of pupils in predominantly Castilian-speaking areas.
3.2.7 Language in education in Catalonia: summary

The position of each language in education has remained at the centre of the struggle between Catalan and Spanish nationalisms since the eighteenth century. The current balance of power has favoured a broad consensus about the final outcome of language education in Catalonia which is reflected in its legal texts: balanced, additive, highly developed bilingualism for all the population irrespective of first language, and Catalan language promotion.

Thus, at least according to its legal definition, the Catalan Conjoint School Model seeks two main sociocultural goals: (a) regarding language competence, the spread of competence in Catalan and the retention of the current high levels of proficiency in Castilian; (b) regarding language use, increased use of Catalan irrespective of first language. While the first goal is clearly stated even in legal terms and has been often researched, the second one is more vaguely defined and seldom explicitly discussed. A third, attitudinal/ideological goal of increased appreciation of Catalan has received less attention. Language behaviours are implicitly expected to be transformed by language-of-instruction choice.

The existence of a large Castilian first language population has encouraged the development of a model which uses a second language as the means of instruction. Such a model has been termed immersion despite significant differences with the original Canadian immersion experience, sociolinguistic goals being probably the most important. These differences make it questionable to refer to the Catalan conjunction model as an immersion model.

Language knowledge is not the only goal of language policy in Catalonia: promoting the use of Catalan, and encouraging social integration are basic goals as well for the Catalan conjunction model. It is only from this perspective that we can understand what constitutes a major concern in Catalonia: the effects of bilingual education on language use. Put differently, what are the consequences of implementing programmes which turn Catalan into the languages of instruction? Thus, educationalist and sociolinguistic research comes to a common field: the analysis of bilingual education impact on language use.
3.3 Language contact and language choice in the Catalan Countries

In the next sections, the issue of language contact in the Catalan Countries will be discussed, so that the transformations produced by the school can be adequately assessed. I start by offering a glimpse of the main lines of research and points of interest concerning this issue to date. A sample of prescriptive, grammatical, sociolinguistic, and other approaches will be enumerated so that the reader may obtain an -inevitably broad- view of what this field of research has represented in this European area. Once this general presentation is done, I will turn to the studies dealing particularly with the main object of the present research: language choice and code-switching patterns in the Catalan community.

3.3.1 Theoretical approaches to language contact and code-switching studies in the Catalan Countries

Due to the history of linguistic conflict between Catalan and Castilian, Catalan researchers have been particularly aware of language contact phenomena, and sustained efforts have been devoted to their understanding. Several strands of research and several scientific traditions can be identified.

A first group would be that formed by educationalists, psychologists and psycholinguists. Most of their research on language contact, in direct connexion with educational projects, has already been reviewed in section 3.2.

A second strand of research has dealt with several theoretical and applied linguistic aspects; conducted primarily by linguists and grammarians, it has focussed on normative language, but other aspects, such as terminology, etymology and historical grammar, second language education, social dialectology, etc., have also been developed. These will be briefly commented in the section 3.3.2.

A third strand of research, conducted by social psychologists, sociologists of language, sociolinguists, anthropological linguists, and more recently pragmaticians, has examined the links between language and societal factors, especially language shift, language choice and code-switching. These studies will be dealt with in the rest of section 3.3.

Finally, less linguistically oriented research, often originating from legal, political, historical, and other studies, which have also dealt with language contact and language choice issues, will not be presented here.
3.3.2 Catalan - Castilian language contact research

Much of the initial concern with contact phenomena in the Catalan Countries was prescriptive in nature and linked with the attempt to establish a "literary" (i.e., standard) language. After three centuries of suppression and decay, the nineteenth century literary movement known as the Renaixença (Renaissance) gave new impetus to the usage of Catalan as a language of belles lettres and culture, and thus the need for a standard variety became acute. Among the main difficulties faced by such an endeavour was the strong influence Castilian had left on written Catalan in the form of heavy borrowing and morphosyntactic, semantic and orthographic calques. Such a language mixture, it was felt, was inadequate to express a full, independent cultural life. Much of the work of codifying a Catalan standard language consisted of the identification and eradication of unnecessary castellanismes, or transcodic markers of Castilian origin (cf. Fabra, 1983: 1).

The results of Catalan codification during the first third of the twentieth century were never fully implemented. The Spanish Civil War (1936-1939) ended with the victory of the Spanish version of fascism. Catalan was forbidden and its teaching ousted from schools. When it was privately resumed, Catalan language teaching adopted the mission of salvar els mots "saving the words" (Espriu, 1973), i.e., making it possible that the language survived political repression as undamaged as possible. The by then semi-clandestine Catalan language academy, the Institut d'Estudis Catalans, preserved Fabra's work and adopted a puristic perspective, which favoured archaisms and rejected loanwords. Catalan teaching remained associated with avoidance of castellanismes for the few who enjoyed such opportunity of language learning. Grammars and other normative works published during this period usually included remarks on language contact phenomena to be avoided by learners, not only in their writing, but in their speech as well.

After the arrival of democracy in the 70's, officialisation of Catalan and its introduction into school favoured research on the language in general and on language contact phenomena in particular. The number of dictionaries, lexicons, brochures, and other publications dealing with castellanismes and addressed to the larger public grew considerably. The newly-born mass-media in Catalan often reserved space to popularise the criteria of language correction (e.g. the first Catalan newspaper after the dictatorship: AVUI). The language model adopted, however, was excessively formal and conservative, and often diverged from spoken varieties in lexical and morphological aspects. These inadequacies were already underlined by López del Castillo (1976), who not only enquired into the status of the spoken features and different transcodic markers, but also suggested which should be integrated into the standard variety.

Language expansion to new language domains proved the over-puristic language model to be inadequate for mass-media and language teaching needs, and a public debate opposed those in favour of a standard closer to the spoken varieties (known as lights -in English- or proponents
of català 'light', "diet Catalan") to those who preferred the formal language to remain more separated from the oral uses (català heavy, known as the heavies). Historic loanwords were of course in the middle of the battle, with heavies rejecting them and lights asking for their official recognition (cf. Pericay and Toutain, 1986; Tubau, 1990; Grup d’Estudis Catalans, 1992).

Today, this polemic has practically vanished. The Institut d’Estudis Catalans in 1995 published a new normative dictionary accepting some loanwords while refusing others, and a new normative grammar has been announced for the near future. The standard language has given up most of its archaic features and seems to be fairly established, although some vacillation remains (cf. Solà (ed) 1992, Solà, 1994), and the presence of transcoding markers in the normative language remains a field of interest for a number of researchers (e.g. Badia, 1994; Ruax, 1994).

Especially significant in the linguistic study of language contact in the Catalan Countries have been historical studies. On some occasions, these furnished the elementary tools to evaluate between different options for those working on normative linguistics. The acceptance of loanwords has often depended on their written recording previous to the Catalan Decadència ('Decadence') period, which stretches between the fifteenth and the early nineteenth centuries and constitutes the phase of sociopolitical, linguistic and cultural subordination to Castile and Castilian. Thus, the work of historical linguists and etymologists such as Colon (Colon, 1975) or Coromines (1971, 1980-84), has often dealt with language contact and left its imprint on normative language. On other occasions, the studies have not been directly related to normative efforts, but rather with the many episodes of linguistic contact in the history of the Catalan Countries (cf. Nadal i Prats, 1982).

Payrató (1988), in his review of Catalan-Castilian contrastive analysis, pointed out that studies in this line had rarely gone beyond "simples constatacions" (simple observations), often biased by extralinguistic prejudices, and this applies to much contact linguistic research. Payrató’s (1985a) synthesis of linguistic developments on language contact constituted a much welcomed exception to that particular bias. His proposal of extending Weinreich’s (1953) schema of phonetic interference to all sorts of interference has been widely quoted and adopted in the Catalan texts (e.g. Blas Arroyo, 1993: 48-52). As a whole, linguistically-oriented interest in language contact has grown since the 80s, as the IX Col.loqui de l’Associació Internacional de Llengua i Literatura Catalanes clearly proved.

Following the European tradition of focussing on rural varieties, Catalan linguists have often dealt with geographic dialectal variation. Unfortunately, Catalan's rich tradition of dialectology has paid little attention to urban varieties, and especially to Barcelona, to the point that more pieces of research exist today about alguerés, the Catalan dialect still spoken in l’Alguer (Alghero), Sardinia, than about Barcelona’s Catalan (Boix, 1993); also little has been the attention paid to it by Catalan sociolinguistics, mostly concerned with the sociology of
language.

Little research has been done to date which characterizes the varieties of Castilian as spoken not only in Barcelona but in the whole of the Catalan Countries. Researchers’ pro-Catalan attitudes partially explain that other contact issues have remained comparatively unexplored. Thus, transcodic markers of Catalan origin in Castilian have deserved less attention. Leaving aside research on history of language contact (e.g. Colon, 1976) only a handful of articles has dealt with this subject from a more contemporary perspective: Moll (1961), Badia (1964), Solà (1980), Pujante (1985), Tuson (1985a, b), Turell (1994), Szigetvári (1994). It is not surprising that this interest has been higher in Valencia, where language shift towards Castilian has progressed so much that it is seriously threatening Catalan survival.

Social dialectology and variationism has often dealt with Catalan and Castilian simultaneously. Studies have been more frequent in the Southern Catalan-speaking area, i.e., around the city of Alacant (Alicante in Castilian; see Gimeno and Montoya, 1989, for bibliographic orientation), although other areas have also been researched: Gómez Molina (1986), Blas Arroyo (1992, 1993), Turell (ed), (1995). These studies have usually confirmed the existence of a number of lexical and morphosyntactic features of Castilian origin which are firmly entrenched in spoken Catalan, and vice versa. The relative influence of transcodic markers on each language is nevertheless not comparable: due the historical relationship between both languages, Catalan contains numerous lexical, morphosyntactic and phonological items of Castilian origin, while Castilian shows a more superficial influence of Catalan. These features can often be related to social variables such as first language, social class, age, educational and professional status, and often witness the process of language shift from Catalan to Castilian (especially in Valencia). Today, some corpus projects envisage research on language contact as a relevant goal, such as the Corpus of Contemporary Catalan at the Universitat de Barcelona (Vila i Moreno, in press) and the Corpus of Castilian at the Hispanic Department of the Universitat de Barcelona, while others, such as the Corpus lingüístico de la Universitat de València consider this a more remote goal of study (Briz, 1993, and personal communication).

As a consequence of this state of affairs, and in conjunction with the scarcity of analysis of functional variation in either Catalan and Spanish Castilian, an integrated view of the total linguistic repertoire in the Catalan Countries is today still lacking (cf. Boix, 1993). This lack of information becomes acute in the case of Barcelona and its metropolitan area, for the sources to describe Barcelona’s Catalan and Castilian are short in number and rather approximative.

Tusón (1985a, b) constitutes the most complete attempt at characterizing Barcelona’s linguistic repertoire to date, though it stands as to just a first hypothesis. Her classification is based on the existing bibliography and on the author’s own research and states explicitly some of the criteria which should be used in characterizing every variety. The main criteria are (Tusón, 1985a: 75ff) (a) mother tongue, which distinguishes between native speakers and non-native speakers
of each language; (2) geographic area. In the case of Catalan, this criterion distinguishes between city quarters (barri). In the case of Castilian, it distinguishes according to birth place; (3) age, which in the case of Catalan distinguishes between the older generation, a middle age generation, and a (future) young variety. In the case of Castilian, it distinguishes between 1st, 2nd, and 3rd generation. Based on these variables, Tusón describes a number of varieties which purportedly form Barcelona's linguistic repertoire.

In comparative terms with other communities, the scarce enthusiasm deployed by Catalan researchers around the analysis of purely grammatical aspects such as syntactic constraints to code-switching, or the systematic study of language contact varieties is surprising. Linguistic proximity between Catalan and Castilian cannot be held responsible for such a situation, and other, more sociological reasons, should probably be investigated.

Still in comparative terms, it is particularly noticeable that the term *interference* is of wide currency in Catalan linguistics (e.g. Gimeno and Montoya, 1989: 40; Argente, 1991). This circumstance should strike the foreign reader; leaving aside the undeniable heritage of Weinreich (1953), this survival in the face of competing terms such as *transfer* might be attributed to a number of factors: among others, the prestige gained by Payrató's (1985a) use of the term, the weak development of second language acquisition research in the Catalan Countries, as well as the fact that *interference* as a term conveys a negative evaluation towards foreign items which is useful in a situation of language corpus purification.

Researchers from other fields of linguistic enquiry have also occupied themselves with language contact (cf. Boix, Payrató and Vila, in press). Teaching of Catalan as a second language has recorded some research on language contact, but publications in this field have been fewer than expected (e.g. Assessoria, 1972; Tió, 1982). Much practical activity on language contact is currently under way in the field of Catalan terminology, which is the object of study of the *Centre de Terminologia Catalana* -TERMCAT- and several university departments (cf. Ortuño, 1992; TERMCAT).

### 3.3.3 Research on language choice up to the 1970s

Contact with Castilian has been one of the most recurrent term of historical and cultural studies. In geographical terms, Catalan linguistic borders have remained practically stable since the fourteenth century in the face of Castilian, to the east and south, and Occitan and French to the north, with the only exception of a small southern territory in the area of Elda and Orihuela / Oriola (Southern Valencia). Montoya (1986) has described the process by which Catalan retreated, and was finally replaced by Castilian between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, in terms of competing patterns of language usage between a language which spreads as

---

27 See Boix (1993: 95-124) for an alternative overview with a stronger emphasis on socio-psychological research.
"natural language" (first language) and the language being replaced.

We saw in sections 3.1 and 3.2 how the Catalan Countries have undergone a partially successful process of language shift. It is therefore not surprising that most social and anthropological research on language contact has focussed on language shift and language maintenance. Especially during the 60s and 70s, engagement against language shift constituted a *sine qua non* label among Catalan sociolinguists. The establishment of territorial autonomous powers after the arrival of democracy allowed for a broader approach, although language maintenance and shift still remain a major topic (for a historical reappraisal, cf. Strubell, 1993; Vallverdú, 1991; Vila i Moreno, 1995a).

The study of language choice up to the late 70s was bound to that of functional distribution of languages and diglossia à la Fishman (cf. Vallverdú, 1980). Historical language shift in the Catalan Countries has been repeatedly analysed as a top-down process, starting from the highest classes and the most prestigious linguistic domains and progressively affecting the rest of the social pyramid. Scholars generally agree upon the fact that a diglossic-like situation was established in the Catalan Countries during at least part of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in which Castilian was used for high functions and Catalan for low functions (e.g. Aracil, 1968; Ninyoles, 1969; Vallverdú, 1979, 1980). Ninyoles (1969, 1971) and Aracil (1968, 1983) have reviewed the process of Castilian language spread in Valencia from psychosociological and ideological standpoints. Ninyoles (1969, 1971, 1972) denounced the process of language shift towards Castilian produced via diglossia à la Fishman, and the psychosoiological notion of auto-odi or self-hatred.

Catalan sociolinguistics has usually connected bilingualism with the process of language shift towards Castilian promoted by successive regimes in Spain, and has stressed the fact that bilingualism constitutes an unstable step towards language replacement. In the frame of his ideological critique of bilingualism, Aracil (1973) denounced the manipulation of bilingualism as a myth to cover language shift from Catalan to Castilian, emphasising the links of this process with that of social dominance, and insisted on the need to transform the patterns of language use (*normes d’ús*) if language shift was to be arrested. It is in this context that, in 1974, Aracil proposed an opposition between *alternança convencional* and *alternança intencional* (cf. situational and metaphorical code-switching in Gumperz’s terminology) (cf. Aracil 1979: 33 and 44-49).

As we saw in section 3.1.2, although we know little about the real extent of bilingual competence before the nineteenth century, most data (basically wide-spread illiteracy and the reduced presence of Castilian-speakers in the Catalan Countries), seem to point to general monolingualism and a reduced usage of Castilian in quantitative terms. The effect of language shift among the highest classes, and the first waves of labour immigration at the end of the nineteenth century, may have modified pre-existing norms of language use. As time goes by, it
becomes increasingly difficult to obtain direct testimony on what patterns of language choice existed in the Catalan-speaking community before the first significant Castilian-speaking immigrations in the 1920’s, the Civil War (1936-1937) and the arrival of the great immigratory fluxes of the 1950’s and 1960’s. We know of contradictory trends: the progressive reduction and eventual disappearance of adult Catalan monolinguals, due mostly to school action and the Castilian-speaking mass media (radio since the 20s), points to the spread of Castilian knowledge. But we do not exactly know when Catalan monolinguals stopped representing significant proportions of the Catalan population. As late as 1932, the Spanish army still issued some provisions regarding Catalan monolingual recruits pointing that they were supposed to learn Castilian, which suggests that these monolinguals were not as infrequent as one might guess (Raguer, 1994: 146). Dalmau (1936: 48) indirectly confirms how widespread Catalan monolingualism might have been when giving it as an established fact that *pagesos o vells catalans analfabets* 'peasants or older illiterate Catalans', did not speak Castilian in a society where peasants represented a significant percentage of the population (53% of the active population in Catalonia worked in agriculture in 1900, 34% in 1930; Mayayo and Pomés, 1995: 104). Even *during* the Civil War, the importance of Catalan monolingualism was enough to make bishop Guitart require permission in 1938 to use Catalan in his parishes; strikingly, Ramón Serrano Suñer, *Ministro de la Gobernación* in the fascist government, accepted his petition "until Castilian is understood by everybody." (Raguer, 1991: 253ff)\(^{28}\).

As a whole, though, the fascist victory and rule subsequent to the Civil War enforced new patterns of language choice which secured the status of Castilian as the sole formal and written language by means of crude repression and military imposition (Ferrer i Gironès, 1986; Solé and Villarroya, 1994; Benet, 1995). The post-war sociopolitical context combined with (and promoted) language shift among urban middle classes in the major cities of Valencia, and the massive arrival of immigrants multiplied the occasions to actively learn and practise Castilian. The norms requiring accommodation to Castilian seem to have become general during this period.

Badia (1969) represented a first attempt at empirically analysing Barcelona's sociolinguistic reality by means of sociological means, although his results are not regarded as reliable due to the hazardous sociopolitical conditions which surrounded the study. Anthropological studies are more recent, and had to wait until the late 70, with Tuson and Calsamiglia (1978).

---

\(^{28}\)I owe this quotation to Dr. Emili Boix.
3.3.4 Language norms in the late 70s and early 80s: the legacy of dictatorship

I Language choice for addressee-specification

Tuson and Calsamiglia (1978; cf. Calsamiglia and Tuson, 1980, 1984) represented the first attempt at systematically studying language choice and code-switching in the Catalan Countries by means of observational techniques. Several peer-groups of youngsters from Sant Andreu del Palomar, a neighbourhood of Barcelona, were approached by means of an ethnographic methodology. Four of these groups were selected, and two interactions from each one - one formal and the other informal - were recorded and analysed.

This research confirmed the significance of code-switching by reason of the receiver (alternança per raó del destinatari), i.e., the adoption of a language to interact with (or in front of) a given speaker. The predominance of such a pattern was attributed by the authors to the imbalanced situation of Catalan and Castilian in Catalonia, where a bilingual group and a monolingual one were living side by side. According to the authors, it was the presence of (Castilian) monolingual individuals, reinforced by Castilian status, which imposed the choice of Castilian upon bilingual Catalans.

Calsamiglia and Tuson confirmed that ingroup communication took place in the ingroup language, i.e., Catalan for Catalan-speakers and Castilian for Castilian-speakers, and no situational code-switching occurred. The amount of code-switching of any sort was very low among the former (8 out of 249 speech turns or 'intervencions' during the formal, 7 out of 328 in the informal interaction), and scarcer in Castilian-speakers' ingroup communication. Interactions in linguistically heterogeneous groups recorded an equally low degree of Catalan language use among Castilian-speakers, who hardly switched to Catalan. On the contrary, these interactions showed abundant code-switching on the part of Catalan-speakers, who systematically adopted Castilian to address Castilian-speakers.

29From now on, I will focus my attention on Catalonia and refer to the rest of the Catalan Countries only incidentally. This option is due to several factors:

a. The bulk of language choice and code-switching research has dealt with Catalonia, principally Barcelona;

b. Only in Catalonia has an active language policy struggled to transform norms of language use by denouncing them and promoting alternative norms; language policy in the rest of the Catalan Countries has not significantly challenged pre-existing linguistic norms;

c. Especially significant here is that no observational, qualitative research has been carried out in either the Valencian Country, the Balearic Islands or Northern Catalonia regarding this subject. Approaches to the issue outside Catalonia have adopted either a macroscopic or an experimental, social psychological approach (see, for instance, Ros and Giles, 1979; Conselleria de Cultura, Educació i Ciència, 1989a, 1989b, 1990; Ferrando et al., 1990; Universitat de les Illes Balears, 1986). Semi-structured interviews have also been employed (Querol, 1989). Invaluable as all of these are, they only offer one side of the story and do not necessarily provide an accurate reflection of actual behaviour, for they only deal with self-declared data. As an unfortunate consequence, we lack an observational point of contrast which seems essential for comparative research.
Calsamiglia and Tuson argued that code-switching could not be displayed for rhetorical purposes in linguistically-heterogeneous groups, for it was being used for addressee-specification. Indeed, the number of such phenomena was remarkably low. In linguistically-homogeneous groups, on the contrary, this function was available for bilinguals -i.e., Catalans-, but, as we have seen, their exploitation of such a resource was actually very moderate.

II Linguistic etiquette and ethnic identity

K. Woolard (1983, 1989) set the terms which have been more fruitfully investigated by latter researchers in Catalonia. On the one side, she examined the notion of ethnic identity and its links to sociolinguistic behaviour. On the other, she has described the basic norms which regulated linguistic etiquette in Catalonia.

Woolard (1983, 1989) described the many facets of ethnic identity posed by the question 'Who is a Catalan?'. She argued that several criteria were simultaneously used to answer this question: First of all, birthplace, which opposed Catalan-borns to Andalusians, Murcians, Galicians, Castilians, etc., and was the dominant criterion in the immigrant-origin enclaves. (Woolard, 1989: 38). In this context, 'Catalan' would not carry any 'cultural' or ethnic identity. A second criterion, that of descent, had not been greatly elaborated in the Catalan context. A third criterion was also recorded, that of sentimental allegiance to Catalonia; it was often used to disqualify Castilian-speaking industrialists of Catalan descent in their claims that they were Catalans, since some of their opponents accused them of defection; it was also used by Castilian-speaking immigrants to claim their 'Catalanness'.

"These three different criteria of identity, though accepted in certain contexts, are all completely eclipsed by a single predominant shibboleth of group membership: language. In common parlance, a Catalan is a person who uses Catalan in a native-like way as a first, home, and/or habitual language. Though this is not the definition necessarily given when people are asked directly, it is one that emerges consistently in discussions about the social and political situation of Catalonia, of Barcelona, and of neighbourhood and family." (Woolard, 1989: 40)

Next to Catalans, the other ethnic identity based on language and identified by Woolard was named by different terms: the old murcià or murciano (literally, native of Murcia), andalús (literally, Andalusian), immigrant (immigrant), the derogatory term xarnego (similar to Paki or negro in other contexts), and, most especially, castellà (Castilian). The two first and the last one had spread their original meaning, which made reference to a particular Spanish region, to embrace the whole Castilian-speaking immigrant population and their Castilian-speaking offspring. Woolard claimed that a unitary Castilian identity which subsumed regional identities, such as Andalusian or Aragonese, was therefore emerging "(...) in the social process of social interaction with a self-conscious Catalan community that defines itself through its language." (Woolard, 1989: 43). In Barth's (1969) terms, this new identity was meaningful in
contrast to the Catalan one, and despite efforts to be denied "(...) the two terms Catalan and Castilian are used as an exhaustive contrast set by the overwhelming majority of individuals in Barcelona." (Woolard, 1989: 43).

Identity in Barcelona, thus, depended basically on language competence and language use. A Catalan was one who spoke Catalan with Catalans, and adopted Catalan for the regular language of home and family. "Simply put, the act of speaking Catalan socially converts an immigrant into a Catalan, whatever her/his origin may be." (Termes 1983: 284, translated by Woolard, 1989: 62). Speaking Castilian to Castilian speakers did not imply that a Catalan was no longer a Catalan.

"only when Catalan speakers regularly choose Castilian in interaction within the home and the intimate family circle as a habitual language are they usually considered to be castilianized and no longer truly Catalan." (Woolard, 1989: 63)

Castilians, on their side, were those who used Castilian with other native speakers of Castilian (and most of the time).

Woolard (1983, 1984, 1989) described two basic norms which regulated language choice in Barcelona at the time of her field-work. The first pattern was compulsory choice of the ingroup language when members of the same linguistic group interacted. Language being the primary source of ethnic differentiation, and Catalan identity being coveted, code-switching did not have such ample room to develop as in other communities, such as Puerto-Ricans in New-York.

"It is my contention that because interlocutor identity is a key trigger to codeswitching in Barcelona, this linguistic resource cannot be used routinely to fulfill other functions in ingroup discourse. Extensive use of Castilian in the [Catalan] ingroup could be misinterpreted as a statement about the ethnic identity or loyalty of one of the participants." (Woolard, 1989: 65)

Code-switching was only available to those truly bilingual, i.e., Catalan speakers, and restricted both in quantity and function: Quotations and sayings, basically, and mimic of particular Castilian dialects for humorous effect. Metaphorical switching to Castilian to convey authority, formality, distance, etc., on the contrary, was not used, and switches to Castilian were usually flagged (Woolard, 1989: 65). The author also referred to the existence of some "switchers", individuals who made ampler use of language alternation in ingroup arenas, considering them "(...) often socially deracinated." (Woolard, 1989: 66).

Intergroup contacts had their particular dynamics. The definition of an encounter as either an ingroup or an outgroup interaction depended on a number of physical, stylistic and sociopsychological details which are not of relevance for this discussion. With regard to intergroup contacts, Woolard (1983; 1989) described two30 main norms of language choice.

30Woolard (1985) divided each pattern into two further patterns and, thus, distinguished four different norms. I have
These norms were based on ethnic identity; their accomplishment depended on successful identification of the interlocutor's ethnic membership and/or ideological principles regarding ethnicity.

The first norm was called the *accommodation rule* and was stated as follows: "Catalan is the marked case and Castilian the unmarked case to be used with all unknown quantities as well as known outsiders." (Woolard, 1989: 69)

This norm was described as *traditional* "... by which is meant only the tradition of the past forty years.", i.e., the dictatorship period (Woolard, 1984: 99), and had two variants. The first, strongest one, required selection of Castilian not only for intergroup interactions, but for formal and written purposes as well, while the second one reserved Catalan for all ingroup communication and required Castilian for any other purposes. Any failure to prove Catalan identity -such as an accent in Catalan- would trigger a reevaluation of the encounter and a switch to Castilian, for "Traditional Catalan etiquette leads speakers to accommodate not simply to their interlocutor's language proficiency but also to his or her linguistic identity." (Woolard, 1989: 73). The first, 'stronger' variant, being externally imposed by Francoist repressive language policy, was rapidly broken after dictatorship went away, especially for oral purposes. The latter, on the contrary, remained fully active.

The second norm described by Woolard was named the "bilingual norm":

"By this norm, all members of the community have the right to express themselves in their native language; this implies that every member of the community has a duty to be at least passively bilingual." (Woolard, 1984: 100)

The "bilingual norm" represented a fundamental change in the traditional norm:

"If under the accommodation norm it is the addressee's identity that determines language choice, under the bilingual norm it is the speaker's identity that is the principal determinant. According to this norm, it is not impolite for speakers to continue using their language even when responses come in the other." (Woolard, 1989: 77)

In fact, this norm concealed two political views or variants under a coincidental pattern of language use: On the one side, this norm indexed an ideological position which allowed for free language choice on the basis of personal decisions; on the other, a position that desired not only maintenance of Catalan in front of a Castilian speaker, but active convergence of the latter towards Catalan. The difference between them was inexistent in practice (cf. Woolard, 1984: 100). On the side of Catalan speakers, strong and weak versions of the bilingual norm could not be distinguished, for both implied the maintenance of Catalan in any circumstance. On the side of Castilian speakers, paradoxically, 'free choice' corresponded to maintenance of

referred to this subtler distinction as the opposition between 'strong' and 'weak' versions of each norm.
Castilian in any circumstance, i.e., their behaving as Castilian monolinguals acting under the accommodation norm (cf. Boix, 1993: 113).

The bilingual norm was "rarely applied effectively" (Woolard, 1989: 78), in spite of the fact that it "was [verbally?] espoused by a majority of my teenaged informants, including working-class, monolingual Castilian-speakers." (Woolard, 1989: 72).

"While it would seem to define a middle ground of mutual tolerance and respect and is deemed by many to be the ideal, this norm is rarely applied effectively. Bilingual conversations in which two participants use different languages are seen as anomalous, generate unease, and are rarely stable." (Woolard, 1984: 100)

The obvious consequence of such rigid patterns of language use were two-fold: On the one hand, they reinforced ethnolinguistic borders between Catalans and Castilians, preventing language shift from spreading among the Catalan-speaking group. On the other hand, they made it unnecessary for Castilians to learn Catalan, for they could feel safe in their monolingualism. These conclusions were supported by the scarce number of Castilian speakers productively competent in Catalan.

Why was anybody learning Catalan then? Leaving aside those who had learned the language as children in Catalan-speaking neighbourhoods, or in homogeneously Catalan-speaking environments, Woolard's research emphasised two crucial aspects:

a. Catalan was being learned by peer-group pressures, while pressures from "above", i.e., power-related ones could raise negative reactions and opposition: "In a society where linguistic and class divisions largely coincide, pressures for linguistic assimilation may be interpreted in terms of larger class conflicts." (Woolard, 1989: 132) Catalan being simultaneously a prestige language and an ethnic language, the author considered the opposition between integrative and instrumental motivations to be out of place. Learning Catalan at that time implied both motivations.

b. First generation immigrants were learning Catalan in a higher proportion than Barcelona-born Castilian speakers. This finding was related with their need to reconstruct the formers' social person in a new environment:

"I suggest that the critical factor determining differences in language behavior is that first-generation immigrants are forced to redefine their social identity and network of social relations when they come to Catalonia. (...) Barcelona-born Castilian speakers do not have the same options for the change of identity that the acquisition of the Catalan seems to imply. Because they live in the social setting in which they were born and among the relationships that they formed from their earliest years, they have more at risk in attempting to change their linguistic identity." (Woolard, 1989: 135)

---

31Catalan was not a prestige language for the upper class, which had already shifted to Castilian (McDonogh, 1986), but was retained by middle and lower (native) classes and enjoyed prestige among them.
Catalan language was extremely linked to Catalan ethnicity. Its learning and spread to the newcomers and their descendants required that such a link become weakened.

III Code-switching as a group-barrier levelling-device

Woolard's cogent analysis of humorous use of language mixing and switching in Barcelona during the early 80s deserves a mention here. Woolard (1988) examined how Eugenio, a nightclub entertainer, achieved massive success as a story-teller by conveying the feeling that he was speaking a mixture of Catalan and Castilian. The actual amount of mixture was not too large: Approximately 80% of Castilian and 20% of Catalan, and many of his features were indeed characteristic of spoken Catalan in Barcelona. But his idiosyncratic way of combining both languages, with a moderate recourse to intrasentential code-switching, nonce borrowing and phonological mixture, and his erasing of the addressee-specificator function for code-switching were distant enough from Catalonia's patterns of language use to provoke:

"(...) a new twist on the phenomenon of categorical perception described by Labov (1966), in which deviation from a norm is perceived as far more salient than its actual frequency would warrant; variable performance is perceived as categorical." (Woolard, 1988: 57)

After her dissection of code-switching rhetorical functions, Woolard came to the conclusion that by his combining both languages, Eugenio included both linguistic groups into a fictional world where peaceful interaction and harmonious co-existence of linguistic groups was possible.

IV Syntactic and pragmatic considerations

Almost simultaneously (1983-84) with Woolard, another American researcher was doing fieldwork in Barcelona. Gonzales' study, which appeared in 1993, argued for "(...) an integrative approach to codeswitching with methodological standards that can afford valid investigative cross-comparisons." (1993: 23), and constituted the first approach to the issue of Catalan-Castilian code-switching clearly concerned with syntactic constraints. Two main hypotheses were examined in this dissertation:

"(i) Situational hypothesis A bilingual will switch codes if and only if a change occurs in the speech situation (change in interlocutor, topic or setting).

(ii) Grammatical constraint Hypothesis The structure of utterances with two codes present is governed by grammatical constraints." (Gonzales, 1993: 24)

Gonzales' research employed three different techniques in order to obtain valid data: (a) speakers' assessments of a list containing switched utterances designed to test different constraints, (b) speech recorded during interviews with six informants, and (c) data recorded during a dinner party with three of her informants. According to her interpretation, results
confirmed the existence of grammatical constraints governing code-switching, especially those proposed by Timm (1975), and disconfirmed Poplack's equivalence constraint. In any case, constraints could be overridden by functional considerations.

Regarding social and interactive considerations, neither topic nor situation could be held responsible for code-switching (Gonzales, 1993: 172-3). On the contrary, code-switching was primarily an addressee-specification device:

"The single most important factor conditioning the use of Catalan or Castilian is some form of sociolinguistic knowledge associated with the addressee. This finding supports the classic interlocutor constraint, previously proposed in the codeswitching literature. What has not been firmly established, however, is the information bilingual speakers rely on in selecting the appropriate code of address." (Gonzales, 1993: 200)

Nevertheless, conversational dynamics influenced language choice and switching.

"A similar tendency was observed in the Barcelona dinner gathering where addressees often followed the code used by the speaker introducing a topic. Consequently, the speech stream was composed of chunks that were predominantly Catalan or Castilian" (Gonzales, 1993: 172-3)

Intersentential code-switching was hardly recorded during the interviews, but very frequent during the dinner. On the contrary, intrasentential code-switching was rare in both contexts: 1.8-4.0% during the interviews, 1.2-2.6% during the dinner party (Gonzales, 1993: 135) These results contradicted the widespread, although seldom empirically proven assumption that informality favoured intrasentential code-switching: in her Barcelona data, intrasentential code-switching during the interviews was twice as frequent as during the dinner party (Gonzales, 1993: 135).

Regarding methodological aspects, Gonzales (1993) argued for the inclusion of the speakers' judgement in the analysis of syntactic constraints, and proposed explanations for the large degree of variation among speakers' judgements encountered in her study.

Gonzales' study provides a valuable point of comparison to take into account when considering Catalonia's sociolinguistic landscape in the early 80s. Rather than describing the whole speech community, her attempt was that of explaining how middle-class bilinguals managed their complex linguistic repertoire. On the whole, her findings confirmed Tuson, Calsamiglia and Woolard's appreciation that addressee-specification was the fundamental function served by code-switching, although some consideration for extra conversational factors might also play a secondary role, and gave empirical support to the statement that intrasentential code-switching did not achieve large proportions.

Nevertheless, Gonzales' work seems fundamentally flawed in a number of aspects. In first place, her study allegedly focussed on Barcelona bilinguals' behaviour; although level of actual competence in Catalan of her informants' was never made clear, data from her excerpts suggest
that at least two of them (VC and RS) were highly imbalanced, Castilian-dominant speakers, and doubts exist whether they could be considered fluent in Catalan. Some of these examples are self-explanatory: some of their switches are typical of Castilian-speaking learners of Catalan at beginning or intermediate levels, such as articles in examples (89) los profesors 'the teachers', and (90) només los primaris 'only the primary ones'; others, like VC's utterance sintem a taula 'shall we sit at the table' (repeated later without self correction!; Gonzales, 1993: 178), instead of seiem, ens asseiem, or even the widespread Castilian borrowed ens (a)sentem, attest to a very weak control of basic vocabulary and morphology. Taking into account that imbalanced bilingual speakers of Castilian-speaking origin probably did not represent more than 20-25% of all speakers of Catalan in Barcelona at that time\textsuperscript{33}, it is highly debatable that conclusions from the speech of Gonzales' sample should be considered representative of Barcelona bilinguals code-switching patterns. It is especially dangerous for the representativity of this study that it was precisely these two speakers, plus a native Catalan speaker, who furnished the dinner party material.

Second, Gonzales' test and analyses are based on prescriptive linguistic criteria rather than on the varieties actually spoken. Standard languages alone are seldom good guides to understanding language contact situations, but less than anywhere in Barcelona in the early 80s, when normative, standard Catalan was a novelty for most speakers, maximum when "(...) only one informant reported some formal schooling of Catalan, (...)" (Gonzales, 1993: 72). In Gonzales' research, phenomena of syntactic convergence, borrowing and calque are simply ignored and jumbled together. No consideration at all is given to potential differences between widespread, old loanwords (e.g. jefe, 'boss', bueno 'well', etc.), and unattested switches such as:

\begin{align*}
(1) & \quad \text{VC} \quad \text{una otra ciutat a part de Barcelona?} \\
& \quad \text{instead of} \quad \text{una altra ciutat...} \\
& \quad \text{VC} \quad \text{(Do you mean) another city aside from Barcelona? (Gonzales, 1993: 120)} \\
(2) & \quad \text{JR} \quad \text{només era el paraguas} \\
& \quad \text{instead of} \quad \text{paraguia or paraigües} \\
& \quad \text{JR} \quad \text{it was only the umbrella (Gonzales, 1993: 120)}
\end{align*}

This approach to language contact phenomena leads the author to theoretical cul-de-sacs, such as analysing the syntactic constraints that permit the one-word switch cuidant 'taking care of' (Castilian cuidar with Catalan gerundive morphology). In fact, cuidar is a very old loanword in Catalan which was eventually included in the normative dictionary in 1995; it should not be used to test syntactic constraints. Another example was provided by the analysis of the verb enxuxfar as a switch to Castilian (Gonzales, 1993: 121), when this loanword from Cast. enchufar 'to plug in' constitutes the only form known by all Catalan speakers for decades; only

\textsuperscript{32} An approximate English translation might be "Do we sit at the table?"

\textsuperscript{33} In 1986, bilinguals with Castilian as their first language represented approximately 40% of all bilinguals in Barcelona Metropolitan Area (Subirats (ed.), 1990: 82, my estimate). It is not unsound to imagine that at least half of them were competent bilinguals. This hypothesis leaves us with less than 20% of significantly imbalanced, Castilian-dominant bilinguals.
recent puristic language planning efforts have produced a Catalan genuine equivalent, *endollar*, which is still not widespread.

This normative approach has dramatic consequences for Gonzales' syntactic constraints test. Grammatical constraints are tested not on the basis of real language, but on the basis of examples that correspond to varieties which the speakers do not know. Let us compare a couple of examples (3 and 4):

(3)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{puc comprar un pero no ambos} & \\
\text{I can buy one but not both} & \\
\text{(utterance 54)}
\end{align*}
\]

Leaving aside that Catalan requires a pronoun following *comprar* (i.e. *vull comprar-ne un*), the fact is that *pero* is a widespread borrowing from Castilian, especially among Castilian native speakers, while *no* is homophonous in both languages; on the other hand, *ambos* is a formal term in Castilian whose Catalan formal equivalent *ambdós* was with all certainty unknown to the informants. The utterance was expected to test Gumperz's (1976) gapping constraint, but how can one presume that the informants interpreted that there is a switch before *pero* and not before *ambos*? what about *no*? were they aware of any switch at all? A second example is provided by:

(4)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{és la llei de la cual tothom parla} & \\
\text{es la ley de la cual todo el mundo habla} & \\
\text{(utterance 97)}
\end{align*}
\]

These twin utterances were proposed as a test for Poplack's equivalence constraints. While de la cual / de la qual are pronounced quite differently in each standard language Cast. [de la kwal] / Cat. [dɔ la kwaɬ], spoken varieties do not always retain these differences, so that speakers may simply not perceive that any switching at all has been produced. On top of it, both utterances are formal variants whose everyday equivalents are Cat. *és la llei que tothom en parla*, és la llei de què tothom parla, és la llei de la què tothom parla, and Cast. *es la ley de la que todo el mundo habla*.

A final problem with this test is related with the information elicited from the informants. The speakers were asked whether the utterances were "possible" (Gonzales, 1993: 74). It is not clear at all what this possibility implied for the informants, for they could have interpreted it as 'correct', 'feasible', or potentially produced in the adequate situation' (and what is then the adequate situation?).

These examples and many others make the utterance assessment test produced by Gonzales a highly questionable instrument. It is not surprising that the answers recorded more than 58% of dispersion with only 6 subjects. In my opinion, the test should be dramatically changed if it were to be used again.
3.3.5 The conscious transformation of patterns of language use: results of language planning efforts

Aracil had put it plainly: language maintenance is not a quantitative matter of either raw numbers or percentages of who speaks what language, but rather a qualitative issue of when the language is used, with whom and for what purposes. Strubell (1981: 239) insisted on the need to break the norms which forced Catalans to adopt Castilian in order to address Castilian-speakers and, based on accommodation theory, warned that such a change should be simultaneously supported by a friendly attitude lest it be perceived by the addressee as an aggression. Concern with patterns of language was to become a constant in the Catalan Countries, and it was to affect language planning.

In 1982, the General Directory of Language Policy launched its first campaign expressly designed to promote the modification of patterns of language use and addressed to the wider public. Its main slogan was "El català, cosa de tots" Catalan, an issue which concerns all of us The campaign came to be known as the Norma campaign, making use of the ambiguity in Catalan between the common name norma (i.e., norm) and the proper name Norma, which was given to the campaign's central symbol, a cartoon character representing a young girl (Direcció, 1982; Strubell, 1992). Norma was faced with everyday language contact situations and reacted by adopting new norms of language use which favoured Catalan. The goals pursued with Norma's campaign were double: In the first place, it encouraged Catalans to use Catalan in domains heretofore reserved to Castilian, such as official administrative affairs and other formal intercourse. In the second place, it attempted a modification of the common pattern of converging to Castilian once that language was used.

The Law of Linguistic Normalization passed by Catalonia's autonomous parliament in April 1983 represents a central element of modern language policy in Catalonia. The law, which was unanimously approved, embodies the agreement of all political parties on a number of basic points. According to the Law, both languages were equally official, although Catalan was declared to be Catalonia's llingua pròpia or "own language". Argelaguet (1992) has described how the Law of Linguistic Normalization implied that all sides made significant concessions in order to obtain a consensual text: on the one hand, Catalan nationalist parties had to reduce their emphasis on promoting the use of Catalan; on the other hand, the socialist party, with a linguistically heterogeneous political basis, had to convince its followers that Catalan normalization was in their interest. The danger of creating a societal cleavage along linguistic lines was felt as a real threat. In this context, the promotion of language knowledge was felt to be in the interest of all sides, and therefore adopted as a first step which could be assumed by all. Other steps had to be postponed. As a consequence, language-in-education planning was invested with a main role in the linguistic normalization process.

Two other campaigns of comparable characteristics followed the Norma campaign: The first, informative one took place by the end of 1983 and beginning of 1984 and publicized the recently approved Language of Normalization Law, its meanings and its goals. The second one
was designed to counteract the growing disenchantment and exhaustion among Catalan language supporters. It emphasised the need for personal commitment on the side of speakers to encourage language spread, and its motto was *El català depèn de vostè* "Catalan depends upon you". In contrast with the *Norma* campaign, which evoked a remarkable popular consensus, the "depèn de vostè" campaign brought about many angry reactions. Language professionals felt the government was evading its responsibilities in the promotion of Catalan and transferring language promotion to individual activism (cf. Strubell, 1992: 188). Simultaneously, it was felt that nothing was being done to transform language habits which favoured Castilian usage in public and private institutions. This feeling grew among those most involved in language promotion and was mixed with a sort of despair when realizing that their efforts were not transforming societal reality in the short term.

The early 80s signalled a turning point in the history of Catalan sociolinguistics, for the discipline became institutionalized, taught at the universities and encouraged by the autonomous governments. Several official language agencies were created whose goal was promoting Catalan (Direcció General de Política Lingüística, Servei d'Ensenyament del Català, Institut de Sociolingüística), and these institutions facilitated new research which departed from the ideological critique predominant during the 60s and 70s and leaned towards more empirical approaches and methodologies (cf. Strubell, 1982, 1993; Torres, 1988). Catalan sociolinguistics had been born in opposition to a dictatorship and was heavily loaded with critical ideology. The new sociopolitical situation, though, required new methods and a new discourse.

In this context, A. Bastardas, a member of the new generation of Catalan sociolinguists, himself recently arrived from U.S.A. and Quebec, launched a hypothesis which transformed language planning in Catalonia: According to this hypothesis, originating from Quebec language planning experience and particularly on Corbeil (1980), a distinction should be established between institutionalized and interpersonal relationships. In the former, individuals, or at least some of the individuals who take part in the interaction, do not act as such but on behalf of institutions. These individuals, therefore, represent the institution, and their patterns of language use can be influenced by it. In interpersonal relationships, on the other hand, it is personal features -friendship, personal allegiances, etc.- that come to the forefront. The hypothesis goes on by suggesting that language recovery and spread (i.e., *normalització lingüística*) in a democratic society should address its efforts at modifying institutional patterns of language use in such a way that the language being promoted achieves hegemony. Interpersonal patterns of language use will eventually be transformed as a consequence of institutional modifications. The new generations will eventually socialize themselves with new patterns of language use. (See a later version of this hypothesis in English, which includes Bourdieu's notion of *habitus*, in Bastardas-Boada, 1991).

I propose to call this the "top-down hypothesis", in opposition to the previous, wide-spread assumption that language change would be brought about by community ("popular") and
individual pressure, which I suggest to term "bottom-up", for pressure is then exerted at community level and from the community on the state.

This new hypothesis was radically adopted for Catalonia's language policy. Efforts to modify interpersonal language use declined and faded away. Since the top-down hypothesis spread, it is institutions that have been increasingly encouraged by the autonomous government to modify their patterns of language use.

Nevertheless, questions about the accuracy of the vertical hypothesis remain open. The first one is qualitative, and it addresses the assumption that interpersonal patterns of language use will be modified by increasing institutional pressure. It remains unclear that this is the case in a society where language choice is addressee-governed rather than domain-governed. The second one is of a quantitative nature: How much pressure is it necessary to exert from institutional communication on interpersonal ones so that the latter adapt to the former? And, further, is it possible to reach such a point in an officially bilingual country?

Sociolinguistic research has addressed these questions in one way or another, and has often confirmed that norms of language use in Catalonia are currently experiencing a transformation. As a result of Catalan 'linguistic normalization', modifications in the patterns of language choice and code-switching suggested by Calsamiglia, Tusón and Woolard started to appear during the 80s. Up to now, a majority of authors have agreed upon two basic points: code-switching has become more frequent and less predictable, and sociolinguistic attitudes are changing. But there is lesser agreement about the exact scope of these changes.

Language use in the Catalan Countries has often been scrutinized during the 80s and 90s in Catalonia. In January 1995, the Institut de Sociolinguística Catalana had assembled 278 bibliographic items related to the issue, almost all produced during that period. Two intersecting social domains have been privileged objects of research: the educational system and the young. This is no coincidence, for both were -and still are- regarded as the key to language maintenance.

"In Catalonia the importance of the school in the whole process of catalanization is enormous. The school is seen as one of the more important means of widening the use of the Catalan language." (Tuson, 1985a: 43)

Other researchers have examined language use in other domains such as mass media, work sphere, or administrative activity.

Different approaches have been used to analyze language choice and language use. In the next sections, I will first review some significant macroscopic analysis which should help understand the major trends, and only then move to microscopic and interpretive research.
3.3.6 Language situation in the 80s and 90s: Macroscopic analyses

In this section I review some of the macroscopic analyses which have dealt with either the whole of the Catalan Countries or Catalonia or with Barcelona Metropolitan Area. Other researches that have examined language use in other localities in the Catalan Countries or in Catalonia herself (e.g. Bastardas, 1985, Bastardas, 1986; Erill, Farràs and Marcos, 1992) will be considered only incidentally here. For a thorough bibliographic review, see Boix and Payrató (1994), Romaní and Bañeres (1994) besides those already pointed out.

I Language knowledge and use in the Catalan Countries: General trends

As a result of the language policy promoted by the autonomous governments, passive and active knowledge of Catalan has considerably increased in all the Spanish Catalan Countries, but especially in Catalonia (for a synthetic view, Reixach, 1995). The introduction of Catalan as the main means of instruction has undoubtedly been the basis to achieve most transformations in language knowledge. It is evident that bilingualism has basically spread among the youngest speakers, while the rest of the population has not experienced significant increases in spoken Catalan. Graph 3.1, based on the census figures\(^{34}\), shows Catalan language competence (‘speak’) for the each age group in 1986, and its situation five years later.

Graph 3.1 makes it clear that, while language policy has not dramatically affected those beyond school age, it seems to be effective in improving the levels of bilingual competence among the youngest generation. Nevertheless, these are just competence figures. Since use does not automatically follow competence, it is necessary to check whether norms of language use have been transformed by language policy.

\(^{34}\)I owe this inspired graph to Modest Reixach.
The survey directed by Prof. Siguán and published as Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas (1994) constitutes the first official attempt by the Spanish state to systematically elicit information about language competence, use and attitudes in the communities where Castilian is not the only official language (bilingual communities with non-official languages were not included). According to its results, and in clear contrast with the other autonomous communities, Catalan in Catalonia was slowly progressing at all levels.

Table 3.9. Knowledge of Catalan in Catalonia, Valencian Country and Balearic Islands. Percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Cat.</th>
<th>Val.</th>
<th>B. I.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can understand, speak, read &amp; write</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can understand, speak and read</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can understand and speak</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can understand</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot understand</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas (1994: 14)

As for knowledge of Catalan in Catalonia, results were significantly better than those yielded by the successive censuses. To give only two comparative figures, while according to this survey 74% of residents in Catalonia could speak Catalan, according to the 1986 census they numbered only 64%, and this figure rose to 68% in 1991.

Concerning language use, Catalan was the "principal language" of 50% of Catalonians, 34% of Valencians and 50% of Balearic Islanders (Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas, 1994: 20). Very few respondents considered both languages as equally "principal" for them (1% in Catalonia and Valencia, 4% in the Balearic Islands). Equally scarce were those choosing both languages for personal relationships.

---

35 Data about Valencia came under heavy fire, for they not only displayed a gloomy situation for Catalan, but diverged from other official surveys. According to some sources, the survey did not take into account that Valencia includes a historically Castilian monolingual region: results from this area seem to have been mixed up with the rest of Valencia, distorting them.
Table 3.10. Language of personal relationships of those capable of speaking Catalan in Catalonia (74% of total population). Percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Cat.</th>
<th>Cast.</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Other lang.</th>
<th>Do not know/proc.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal language</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To father</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To mother(^{36})</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To partner</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To children</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To friends</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas (1994: 26)

Relations with a single person were clearly monolingual. Only relationships with friend seemed to offer possibilities for much bilingual interaction, and this was congruous with the addressee-specification functions attributed to code-switching in the previous sections. The 8% of bilingual use with one's children -especially in view that 14% could not answer this question- suggested that a transformation could be in course (see below). This increase in the number of bilinguals was further supported by a comparison between the interviewees' principal language and their children's language.

Table 3.11. Comparison between interviewees' principal language (Int) and the language their children talk to each other. Percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Catalonia</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In Catalonia, a small increase was recorded among bilinguals, which seemed to erode the Castilian-speaking group. In Valencia the trend was clearly the opposite.

Other situations and language domains presented different configurations of language use, but

\(^{36}\)Due to an obvious error, this row lacks 9% of subjects. It sounds nevertheless reasonable that they should be added to Castilian, given similarities to "to father" percentages.
all included better results for Catalan language use than the previous tables.

Table 3.12. Language of personal relationships of those capable of speaking Catalan in Catalonia (74% of total population). Percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language domain</th>
<th>Cat.</th>
<th>Cast.</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Do not know/proc.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking to those who live at home</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering the phone</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing to a friend who knows Catalan</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking for something on the street to someone unknown</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking for something to a local policeman</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to the bank</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking notes for personal use</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At work, at the study centre</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas (1994: 28)

Again, results overwhelmingly favoured monolingual behaviours, i.e., bilingual Catalonians seemed to prefer either one language or the other, but very little bilingual use was recorded for a given situation.

Finally, language was not seen as a decisive factor when establishing relationships with other people. According to this survey, 18% of Catalonia's population would prefer to relate with Catalan speakers, while 12% with Castilian speakers, while 70% would not care about the others' language (Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas, 1994: 39)

II Language use in higher education

In the early 90s, several surveys studied the sociolinguistic situation at several universities (Servei de Llengua Catalana, 1991; Gabinet de Llengua Catalana, 1993; Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, 1994). Their results coincided in several points37:

37Although the analysis is mostly drawn from the Universitat Politècnica data, results do not differ significantly from those in other universities.
Catalan was being used as a formal language by a large majority of those who also used it as an informal language. The strongest version of the accommodation norm, the one requiring Castilian as a formal language, could therefore be considered mostly abolished from higher education, although a few professors were still reluctant to speak Catalan in the classes due to the fact that some students might not understand Catalan. Nevertheless, data proved that students were the group with a higher competence in Catalan. Only students recently arrived from non-Catalan speaking areas -a minute proportion- claimed they did not understand Catalan.

An appreciable proportion of Castilian speakers were actively using Catalan as a second language for academic and/or informal purposes. Simultaneously, there remained a significant proportion of Castilian speakers who were making no active use of Catalan, and some of them did not have any command on productive activities.

People who considered Catalan as their language were a majority among teaching and administrative staff, on the one side, and among students, on the other. As a consequence, Catalan was being widely used in all domains. But it was difficult to assess to what extent this behaviour was due to the sheer number of native speakers or rather to the implementation of a new norm requiring Catalan as a formal language. Put differently, was Catalan being used as an ingroup language in front of an understanding -in all its meanings- Castilian-speaking minority, or rather was Catalan advancing thanks to active use by this minority as well?

Results were difficult to assess, for the difference between questions often prevented comparing answers, but they pointed to the first option rather than to the second. At the Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, for instance, 61.6% of teaching staff declared Catalan to be his/her language (llengua pròpia), 6.4% declared both, and 29.8% claimed Castilian as such (Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, 1994: 25). Classes at the same university were given always in Catalan by 54.8% of teachers, mostly in Catalan by 5.2%, while 4.8% used both, 29.4% always used Castilian and 5.2% mostly Castilian. The difference between those who considered Catalan as their first language (68.0%) and those who were using it at class (64.8%) was therefore small, and still favourable to Castilian. (Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, 1994: 43)

As expected, written activities were catalanizing more slowly than oral ones. Most important for our purposes here, little difference could be detected between language domains. There was no clear sign that, for instance, Catalan was advancing much faster in formal domains than in interpersonal relations.

38Results for the Universitat Autònoma were comparable, while the question was put differently at the Universitat de Barcelona and cannot be compared.
A significant transformation regarding linguistic etiquette was suggested by results. A proportion of Catalan-speakers was no longer admitting to automatically converge towards Castilian. On the other hand, convergence towards one's interlocutor's language choice scored high in many cases. This implied that (a) not all Catalans were switching to Castilian, and (b) not all Castilians expected automatic accommodation, but rather switched themselves.

III Language use in the autonomous administration

Tudela (1994) surveyed linguistic competence, use and attitudes among the Generalitat's workers. Part of this population (total = 25,053) was inherited from the Spanish administration when the autonomous system was created, but a significant percentage has been hired since then by the new authorities. As a group, this population strongly diverges from Catalonia as a whole: it is younger (71.5% between 21 and 40 years old), predominantly female (57.3% women to 42.3% men), and much better educated (only 1.4% has not finished primary education, and more than 55% holds a university degree). In employment terms, the difference between these workers and the rest of the population is more striking: they are logically employed, in their majority as civil servants (66.5%) and, in any case, almost all of them enjoy stable contracts. They also diverge in their first language: 63.86% have Catalan as their first language. Knowledge of Catalan (Mean = 8.6 over 10) is well above Catalonia's mean. As a result, the linguistic environment is heavily Catalan dominant: only 17.9% of those who answered the survey claimed to have less than 60% of Catalan-speakers as their work-mates, and only 4.3% claim to have no Catalan-speaking colleague around. Finally, their employer - the Catalan autonomous government - is undoubtedly the institution which has most invested in Catalan language spread in the whole of the Catalan Countries.

This environment favours Catalan language use, to the extent that the use of this language is clearly in the majority, with 75% of respondents having Catalan as their 'habitual working language' and 85.2% having either Catalan or Catalan plus another language as such. One could conclude from these data that a new, formal domain has been created where usage of Catalan is required: Catalonia's autonomous administrative system.

Again, though, it is hard to say to what extent these favourable results for Catalan should be attributed to the norms transformation, or rather to the overwhelming majority of Catalan-speakers. In fact:

"La conducta diferenciada segons els interlocutors és un fenomen observat en cadascun dels quatre grups lingüístics." "Different behaviour according to the interlocutor is a phenomenon which has been observed for each of the four linguistic groups. (Tudela, 1994: 25)

Such figures should take into account that 21% of the questionnaires were not returned. Despite their anonymity, there exists the possibility that a percentage among them were 'forgotten' simply for ideological opposition and fear of negative repercussions (Tudela, 1994: 7).
The transformation of behaviour affects Catalan-speakers, who do not accommodate so frequently to Castilian, as well as a part of Castilian-speakers who actively use Catalan on many occasions. In fact, persistence of the Castilian accommodation norm is so strong that, even in such a pro-Catalan environment, only 46.1% of subjects declared to speak Catalan to a Castilian-speaking subordinate (among them, 60.1% of all Catalan speakers), 42.1% to a Castilian-speaking colleague (52.8% of all Catalan speakers), and 36% to a superior (45.3% of all Catalan speakers) (Tudela, 1994: 23).

Despite these figures, 72.6% agreed with the sentence "Quan em relaciono amb castellanoparlants tinc el costum d'utilitzar el castellà." "When I relate with Castilian-speakers, I am used to speaking Castilian." (Tudela, 1994: 28) and felt accommodation to Castilian was the main obstacle to Catalan language spread, well above any other considerations.

**IV Language use among teens**

Doyle's (1993) doctoral dissertation studied the competence in Catalan and Castilian, the norms of language use, and the linguistic attitudes of a sample of secondary school pupils in several areas of Barcelona. Her results confirmed those of previous studies on language behaviour: as a result of Catalan normalization, competence in this language was spreading among Castilian speakers and overall positive attitudes towards the language were recorded. The author detected a growth in the use of Catalan, to the extent that "Norms of language use are remarkably distinct from one decade ago." (Doyle, 1993: 82)

Unfortunately, a number of points may cast shadows of doubt about the reliability of her conclusions. Several methodological aspects in this research could be objected to: the use of Castilian monolingual questionnaires containing Latin-American dialectalisms and/or language mistakes such as supone instead of supón 'suppose that...', or sintido instead of sentido 'felt'; or the lack of reference to basic bibliographic sources (e.g. Boix, 1989/1993). Besides that, although Doyle's results seem to confirm the overall increase of Catalan language use among Castilian-speaking teens, the lack of social representativeness of Doyle's sample hinders further extrapolation.

Doyle's consideration that Catalan is more used outside the home than inside it should be handled with maximal care, for it may be a by-product of her own questions: she systematically obtains higher results for 'both languages' when the interlocutors were plural (e.g. "relatives", "peers") rather individual (e.g. "father", "mother"), and when they were unknown (e.g. "strangers") rather than known (e.g. "friends"). Given the addressee-specification norms prevalent in Catalonia, it is only predictable that plural and lesser determined interlocutors may be the object of higher variability (i.e., use of both languages) than the singular, well-known ones; but this circumstance does not seem to allow for the conclusion
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that: "(..) there is a strong indication of social pressure to use the [Catalan] tongue in instrumental exchanges and among peers." (Doyle, 1993: 87).

Last but not least, the author comes up with conclusions that could have received simpler explanations. For instance, she detects "a striking co-linear relationship between parents' education and language usage." (Doyle, 1993: 110). Such a result is all but striking, for, due to their immigrant origin, Castilian speakers remain overrepresented in Barcelona's lower classes and underrepresented in the higher, better educated strata. Doyle's conclusion, though, points to language policy to explain such an arrangement:

"The extraordinary co-linear relationship between level of education and habitual language usage indicates that the spread of Catalan is a somewhat elitist path, due to the intellectual nature of the normalization campaign in which heightened awareness of the need to defend the tongue has come through the educational system." (Doyle, 1993: 111)

V Language use in other domains

While the educational and autonomous administrative fields succeeded in spreading Catalan as a language of use, other domains lag still well behind that goal (cf. Direcció, 1992).

Catalan has achieved a remarkable position in the mass media and entertainment industry, but always as a secondary option in the face of Castilian. Castilian's predominance is still very strong as a written language in the work sphere, due to widespread illiteracy in Catalan. The work sphere does not seem to constitute an independent domain for oral purposes, but rather follows the rest of interpersonal norms.

Some institutions have been particularly reluctant to the acceptance, knowledge and use of Catalan. The police, army, administration depending on the central government, to the point that sometimes their usage of Catalan is more an anecdote than a common fact.

VI The increase in the number of bilinguals

The 90s started with an alleged increase in the number of people considering themselves 'bilingual' as opposed to Catalan and Castilian speakers. According to the data obtained from two successive editions of the Barcelona Metropolitan Survey, ethnolinguistic groups experienced a remarkable transformation: Castilian speakers decreased and 'bilingual' speakers multiplied.
Table 3.13. Comparison between linguistic groups in the Barcelona Metropolitan Area (1985-86 and 1990). Percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language group</th>
<th>1985-86</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both languages</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other languages</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n =</strong></td>
<td><strong>4910</strong></td>
<td><strong>3770</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As the authors acknowledged, though, there existed doubts about the extent to which one could consider valid a comparison between data from both surveys, for a minor -but potentially significant- modification had been implemented in the questionnaire: In 1985-86 the question asked was *Quina és la seva primera llengua* "What is your first language?, while in 1990 it was *Quina és la seva llengua* "What is your language?" (Subirats (dir.), 1992: 38, 39)

The same survey confirmed that (a) Catalan knowledge was increasing among the youngest, due to school action, and (b) the number of those declaring themselves Catalan diminished among the youngest cohorts, probably due to the different birth rates between autochtons and immigrants in the 60s and 70s

Graph 3.2. Percentage of Catalan, bilingual and Castilian-speakers in the Barcelona Metropolitan Region in 1990.

![Graph 3.2](image)

Source: (Subirats (dir.), 1992: 42).GràficII.2, 40

Bilinguals seemed to increase especially among the generations under 35, and they played an important role in the spread of Catalan knowledge; according to the authors:

"Es fa de nou evident que aquest grup és el que reflecteix la via de progrés del català, mentre que el grup dels que consideren que la seva llengua és el castellà es manté bastant impermeable a la penetració del..."
It becomes again quite evident that this group [bilinguals] is the one which constitutes the way for Catalan to progress, while the group of those considering Castilian as their language remains quite impervious to Catalan penetration." (Subirats (dir.), 1992: 41)

Based on the 1990 Barcelona Metropolitan Survey, Rambla (1993) argued that occasions for social contact (intersection among both groups, in his terms) between Catalan and Castilian linguistic groups was on the increase, and hypothesised that:

"Deu existir una identitat mixta que no troba tanta dificultat a passar del castellà al català. [en comparació amb els castellanoparlants, segons Woolard (1989)]” “There must exist a mixed identity that does not find as much difficulty to pass from Castilian to Catalan. [as was the case for Castilian speakers according to Woolard (1989)]” (Rambla, 1993: 9)

and concluded that this was indeed the case for a number of social positions and geographic areas.

Probably as a result of the combination of many factors, linguistically mixed families started to modify their behaviour. Vila i Moreno’s (1993a) review showed how Castilian monolingualism was losing ground among these families in favour of Catalan and both languages.

Table 3.14. Language transmitted by linguistically mixed families' patterns in Barcelona and its region. Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cat.</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Cast.</th>
<th>Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>58-61</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Àrea Metrop. BCN</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regió Metrop. BCN</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Vila i Moreno (1993a: 13)

VII Macroscopic analysis: some conclusions

Macroscopic analyses have so far confirmed that competence of Catalan is spreading basically among the younger generations. It seems sound to attribute this increase to the school action, for this is the most significant variable which has been deeply transformed during the last decades and which affects mostly children.

---

40 The questions posed by each survey and the bibliographic references are:
1.Language used by children to address their parents (Arnau, Boada i Rodríguez, 1971, quoted by Strubell, 1981: 153).
2.Language used with the children (Strubell, 1981: 154).
In order to understand these data it should be noted that Barcelona (the town) is surrounded by an industrial, heavily Castilian-speaking belt; together, they form Barcelona Metropolitan Area. Barcelona Region includes Barcelona Metropolitan Area together with several surrounding counties where Catalan speakers constitute a higher percentage.
Macroscopic analyses have also confirmed that Catalan has quickly occupied a remarkable number of formal domains in Catalonia, such as public administration or higher education. This confirms that the formal 'diglossic' configuration was externally forced and that, once official impositions were lifted, Catalan was able to recover much of the lost ground.

Finally, macroscopic analyses have stressed the monolingual nature of most relationships in Catalonia. While preference for Catalan or Castilian may vary, there seems to be a heavy trend towards the 'one-at-a-time' norm that discards, for instance, code-switching as the unmarked language of communication with the same interlocutor. Nevertheless, the potential increase of new 'bilingual' speakers might in some way facilitate the bending of this norm.

### 3.3.7 Norms of language choice and code-switching in the 80s and 90s

While macrological analyses furnished data about the advance of Catalan knowledge and use, micrological research dealt with the transformation of patterns of language choice and switching.

#### I A new diglossic configuration?

Tuson (1985a, 1991) attempted to trace the transformations in course in the significant language domain of primary education. To do so, she used an ethnographic approach to observe 5th graders' (10 year old) classroom interaction, and a teachers' training centre in the Barcelona area between 1983 and 1985, and complemented her data with interviews and questionnaires. Both educational centres had made Catalan their 'institutional' language, i.e., Catalan was the language chosen for all academic and bureaucratic activity, and both included Catalan and Castilian native speakers in appreciable numbers.

Tuson (1985a) made it clear that the norms described in previous work had been modified in a number of ways. First, at least some Catalan schools and Teacher Training centres had succeeded in implementing a language norm demanding the use of Catalan as the 'institutional language':

> "The data presented and analysed reveal an important change, almost unthinkable only some years ago. The Catalan language has become in a certain number of schools the primary language, the "H" language, using Ferguson's (1959) terminology; the language used for all formal, academic purposes.” (Tuson, 1985a: 206)

and this norm was applied even by some not born in Catalonia. This new norm had increased the amount and functions of code-switching, for it now indexed not only addressee-specifierator (or rather his/her linguistic group), but also level of formality: Catalan could be resorted to by some bilingualized Castilian-speakers to transform the interactional frame into a more academic one, and, conversely, Castilian could be used to show informality and/or solidarity.
towards Castilian speakers. Overlap between contradictory norms of behaviour could also be detected. Despite her initial reference to diglossia, Tuson specified:

“What our data show is that the binomial one language - one situation does not always work. Bilingual speakers have the two languages integrated and use them for communicative purposes in the same way that monolinguals would use different styles of one language” (Tuson, 1985a: 211)

Tuson’s emphasis was on classroom activities. Nevertheless, she also gathered some self-declared data about informal language use by means of interviews and questionnaires. Contrary to what was happening for classroom activities, her data signalled a significant maintenance of the former accommodatory norms towards Castilian, in spite of Castilians having bilingualised: for instance, while 14 children declared Catalan to be their first language, 4 declared bilingual, and only 4 declared Castilian as their first language, not a single child declared to speak only Catalan when playing, and 3 declared to use only Castilian. In fact, some of the adult subjects she had recorded speaking Catalan pointed out that their informal, interpersonal communication was more in Castilian (Tuson, 1991: 180).

Tuson claimed that a new norm had been created which required Catalan to be spoken in formal interaction in some academic domains. This set of norms ran counter the norms applied by the wider society. Tuson’s question was to what point both norms coexisted:

“Do these two set of rules interfere with each other? Can one of them occupy the domain of the other? What the data show is that they can be perfectly compatible. Again, whether or not the new norm is going to be applied later on outside the school is something that depends on other factors” (Tuson, 1985a: 210)

II Code-switching on the increase

In 1987, seven years after her first fieldwork in Catalonia, K. Woolard went back to Catalonia. She was impressed by Barcelona’s sociolinguistic transformation:

“En general vaig trobar que a la Barcelona central el català era, de forma notable, més visible i més audible ara que el 1980. No solament catalanoparlants natius, sinó també els castellanoparlants eren els causants d’aquest ef ecte.” "Generally speaking, I found that Catalan was remarkably more visible and audible in central Barcelona than it used to be in 1980. Not only native speakers of Catalan, but also Castilian speakers caused that effect."(Woolard, 1992: 203)

Woolard felt that the taboo against what she had termed “bilingual norm” was being eroded; code-switching, defined as the intermittent use of Catalan and Castilian in the same conversation, occurred more frequently than seven years before. The change was attributed to the irruption of Catalan into the formal domains and the subsequent modification of traditional norms (Woolard, 1992: 207).

Her observation of a class of 1st year BUP pupils (1st year of secondary education, 14-15 years) allowed her to detect transformations in the link between ethnicity and language choice. Castilian speakers still followed the patterns she had described seven years before. Some of them were catalanizing thoroughly, to the point of using Catalan with each other, and,
therefore, becoming members of the Catalan speaking group; others remained outside of any private or public usage of Catalan. But a third, new, intermediate group, was detected, formed by some Castilian-speakers who had learned Catalan and spoke it fluently with Catalan speakers, but retained Castilian for many usages, and use it with each other. These last students were considered to have a "new, more bilingual identity" (Woolard, 1992: 216), and were comparable to the catalanized group in socio-economic terms: they all lived in linguistically mixed areas where interaction with native Catalan speakers was easy and common, and they belonged to the middle class. The second group, on the contrary, were working class, living in Castilian-dominant neighbourhoods.

Woolard's (1992) observations regarding the weakening of the accommodation norm towards Castilian and the emergence of a new, intermediate group formed by bilingual Castilian speakers were qualitatively significant but unfortunately did not contemplate that neither group was remaining isolated from ethnolinguistic contact. The other side of the story was, then, what was happening with the Catalan-speaking group? Although Catalan language attrition and loss has not been researched in Catalonia, it is by no way unheard of. The widely publicized case of Carles Busquets, the Barcelona F.C. goalkeeper, a native Catalan-Castilian bilingual who lost his productive abilities in Catalan after moving to Badia, an immigrant town in Barcelona's industrial belt, is a case in point here (El País, 1/9/95). Another case of total castilianization was commented in Bierbach (1983: 111).

III  "Increasing freedom for code-switching" among the young

Boix (1989, 1990a, 1990b and 1993, the last one representing a reevaluation of his findings in the light of Bourdieu's *habitus* proposal) constituted a two-fold research that continued the tradition started by K. Woolard of combining a psycho-sociolinguistic experiment for attitudes assessment with participant observation via ethnographic methods. Boix's fieldwork was carried out in 1987 and 1988. His target population was formed by teenagers from the area of Barcelona in paraeducational activities. Due to their age, these subjects had already studied Catalan at school and were -supposedly- therefore bilingualized. Boix's goal was evaluating whether new attitudes had appeared regarding language use and linguistic behaviour, and analysing code-switching patterns\(^{41}\).

Observations took place in a highly catalanized environment, and were complemented by tape-recordings and interviews. Self-declared data revealed the spread of language convergence among subjects: Convergence was a matter of *courtesy* for some of the Catalan-speakers; yet, a significant percentage of Catalan speakers (28%) declared to diverge from Castilian in informal interactions. Only 30% of Castilian speakers declared not to converge towards Catalan with Catalan speakers; most of the Castilian *divergers* lived in peripheric, Castilian-
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\(^{41}\)Here I will exclusively deal with data regarding code-switching. Sociopsychological data obtained from the segmented dialogue test are dealt with in the next section.
dominant areas, and declared not to converge mostly by reason of their incompetence in Catalan. These behaviours were confirmed by observations (1993: 189).

Boix (1993: 192) signalled that the progressive bilingualisation of Castilian-speaking youth was allowing for greater freedom in language choice and code-switching, to the point that code-switching as an unmarked behaviour was detectable on certain occasions. Ingroup interactions were still held in the ingroup language, but Catalan was now felt to be appropriate for public activities (Boix, 1993: 200), something described as "increasing freedom" for code-switching.

"En els joves que he estudiat, en contextos favorables al català, en canvi, noves normes d'ús favorables a l'ús del català competeixen amb la tradicional de convergència generalitzada amb el castellà." "On the contrary, among the young I studied, in contexts favourable to Catalan, new norms, favourable to the use of Catalan, compete with the traditional generalized convergence towards Castilian." (Boix, 1993: 205)

Two factors intervened in the persistence and/or modification of norms: (a) language competence, which was still imbalanced towards Castilian, and (b) linguistic group, which kept favouring co-members. Nevertheless, Boix warned that this new situation did not imply a dramatic transformation of previous patterns of code-switching. As a general rule, he pointed out:

"Les normes d'ús tradicionals de convergència cap al castellà han estat substituïdes per una llibertat més gran en les normes d'ús lingüístic, però amb un context sociolinguístic que fa sovint innecessari haver de triar el català per a la majoria de la població de primera llengua castellana i que fa més cómode continuar triant el castellà per a la minoria de llengua catalana." "Traditional norms of convergence towards Castilian have been replaced by larger freedom in the norms of language use, but this has happened in a sociolinguistic context that makes it often unnecessary to choose Catalan for the Castilian L1 majority, and that makes it more comfortable to choose Castilian for the Catalan language minority." (Boix, 1993: 212)

IV Language choice in foreign language courses: Nussbaum (1990)

Nussbaum's (1990) doctoral dissertation focussed on a group of French teachers in training courses and attempted to analyse how they used the three languages in contact, bringing pragmatics and discourse analysis into the field of Catalan-Castilian code-switching and language choice research. Her fieldwork took place during 1988.

Nussbaum considered domain analysis of little use in Catalonia's educational institutions and discarded any reference to diglossia (Nussbaum, 1990: 52). In her opinion, Catalan researchers had misregarded situational and conversational factors, but these could fundamentally contribute to the understanding of linguistic repertoire management.

Nussbaum's analytical framework incorporated the Geneva school basic concepts (communication endolingué - monolingue & bilingue- vs. exolingue), and can be considered basically interpretive (Gumperz, 1982, 1990; Auer, 1984, 1989). In her view, situation, analysed in ethnographic terms, and not domain, was ultimately responsible of base language
choice. Participants may try to modify (a) situation, or (b) base language, by resorting to another language (language commuting), and they may always switch codes for discourse related purposes.

Nussbaum’s (1990) analysis showed how French was the base language for didactic activities, while Catalan was the base language for less formal and non-didactic activities. This was consistent with the fact that Catalan was the usual language of a majority of participants (although a majority of them had Castilian as their first language), within their professional links with educational institutions, and with the explicit adoption of Catalan for such uses made by the trainers. Nevertheless, Castilian was not only the base language for non-didactic interactions for a number of Castilian speakers, but all participants consistently converged to the formers’ language choice (Nussbaum, 1990: 232). No diglossic configuration could be posed, since Castilian speakers could successfully challenge Catalan as the base language at any point and would be followed by the group in their choice. Nussbaum pointed out that bilingual conversation was indeed scarce, and examined some examples of code-switching on the part of some Catalan speakers talking to Castilian-speakers as instances of linguistic bargaining (regateig) between both participants. This bargaining was brought about by conflict between language competence, the accommodation norm and the aspiration to maintaining one’s own linguistic identity. Nevertheless, this constituted a "sophisticated and uncommon phenomenon in Catalonia“ (Nussbaum, 1990: 298).

Regarding discourse-related contact phenomena, Nussbaum described several of its functions and suggested a difference in their exploitation: less competent speakers would try to impose their preferred language and code-switch to facilitate their production in L2. Competent speakers would not only accommodate to the former, but also switch to facilitate the others' comprehension, and use code-switching for other discourse functions.

V Persistence and transformation of norms

Pujolar’s (1991b, 1991c, 1993) observations of spontaneous encounters of undergraduate students and their subsequent interviews confirmed that language norms were not remaining stable. In the first place, ingroup communication was still being held in the ingroup language, but subjects had increasing difficulties to distinguish who was a co-member and who was not. Ethnolinguistic stereotypes were quickly losing their face value for subjects used to living in a mixed environment. And even more important: "Errors i confusions semblaven ser una cosa freqüent en la vida dels entrevistats." "Errors and confusions [regarding attribution to a linguistic group] seemed to be frequent in the lives of the interviewees." (Pujolar, 1991c)

A case of persistence in confusion was detected: two Catalan-speakers used Castilian to interact, for they had mistaken each other for Castilian speakers when they met. Significantly, not even the discovery that they were both Catalan speakers made them modify their language
choice. Generally speaking, the language one used to be introduced to someone else, or even the language the introductor used, was being taken as a clue to choose either Catalan or Castilian. A Castilian speaker consistently speaking Catalan was regarded as a Catalan. Thus, while language was apparently strengthening its function as the basic key for attribution to a linguistic group, attribution itself was felt, at least by some subjects, to be of less importance.

Pujolar (1991b, c) confirmed the minor extent of "bilingual conversations" and contradicted Woolard's claim that they were spreading, for only a single linguistic exchange following this pattern was recorded.

VI Bilingual conversation and transcodic markers among non-metropolitan adults

A multidisciplinary research team has been studying the social, anthropological and linguistic consequences of group contact in La Canonja (Tarragona). In direct opposition to the slow transformation of patterns of language choice and code-switching suggested by the rest of the literature, Pujadas and Turell (1993) obtained a surprisingly different result in their research in La Canonja, a small district in the Tarragona suburbs. They describe La Canonja as an ethnic battlefield (camp de batalla) between Catalans and immigrants, where contact across linguistic lines was scarce, linguistic accommodation something belonging to the past, and linguistic divergence (i.e., everyone spoke his/her language to the members of the other group) the norm rather than the exception (Pujadas and Turell, 1993: 305).

The stable separation of Catalan and Castilian, with a relatively small amount of transcodic markers and a moderate increase in code-switching was also challenged by this research. Several linguistic modalities were identified in La Canonja and classified by the authors: two of them monolingual, the rest bilingual. The two monolingual modalities were:

a) Catalan spoken by Catalan native speakers (described as monolingual although it was "full of borrowings and calques, and including some switches to Spanish"), and
b) Castilian spoken by Castilian-speaking immigrants, apparently free from any language contact marks.

The bilingual modalities were:

c) Catalan spoken by Castilian native speakers of immigrant origin, with some switches to Castilian;
d) the modality used by the son of a linguistically mixed family, quite instable regarding language choice;
e) the modality produced by Castilian-speaking immigrants who did not speak Catalan but had frequent contact with Catalan-speakers; their modality was full of loanwords
and (short) switches to Catalan; and, finally,
f) the modality spoken by Castilian-speaking immigrants who could not speak Catalan but had much contact with Catalan-speakers, which was characterized as an "absolutely mixed bilingual modality".

In a final, quantitative analysis of their data, it was discovered that the group which switched the most to the other language was that of Catalan native speakers, followed by bilingual immigrants (see table 3.15). Castilian discourse is by far the least mixed, although an amount of switching is also perceived and analysed (Turell, 1994)

Table 3.15 Number of code-switches in La Canonja. Absolute frequencies (N) and mean per speaker for each group (Mean).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Subj</th>
<th>Sentential</th>
<th>Intrasent.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan speakers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biling. immigrants</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monol. immigrants</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pujadas and Turell (1993: 315)

The apparently contradictory fact that the variety with the highest frequency of code-switches was considered a monolingual variety was explained by the authors by pointing out that this variety maintained both languages clearly distinguished, while bilingual modalities "unconsciously" mixed them up.

The corpus of La Canonja has also been used to describe the main transcodic markers encountered in Castilian (Turell, 1994) and Catalan (Turell, 1995a) from a linguistic point of view, and to obtain some quantitative data from transcodic markers in Catalan. Although simply indicative (based on 5 speakers), Turell's (1995a) most significant results may be the high probability of appearance of discourse adverbs (namely bueno ‘well’) and the fact that it was among the youngest speakers, not among the middle aged, that widespread loanwords were more frequent.

The results obtained by Pujadas and Turell (1993) are striking in the light of the research in the Catalan Countries: they consider bilingual conversation as the predominant pattern of intergroup communication, and they describe some highly mixed varieties which had previously gone unnoticed. Leaving aside their number of informants, these results might be attributed to a number of factors: (1) they might reflect a high degree of intergroup tension, substantiated in the reluctance to accommodate to the interlocutor; the reasons why such tension would be greater in La Canonja than in the other areas nevertheless remain unclear; (2)

---

42 Turell (1995b) appeared too late to be included in this thesis.
they might be attributed to the methodology used for data gathering; it should be borne in mind that recordings for this research were obtained from life histories, and we will see in the next section that self-declared and observed behaviour do not necessarily coincide. These second possibility would also account for the highly mixed varieties described in this article: if the interviews had been held in Catalan, these mixed varieties might be the (bilingual) modalities produced by some heavily Castilian-dominant speakers placed in the -for them, rare- situation of having to speak Catalan.

VII The mass-media

The mass-media has been the domain most cared for by language policy, next to education. A Catalan public radio (4 channels) and TV (2 channels) have been set up to broadcast entirely in Catalan in Catalonia, while a Catalan monolingual radio and a bilingual TV channel have been created in Valencia. The Spanish TV regional stations broadcast a number of programmes in Catalan as well, and a number of local radios and TV stations exist with a variegated language policy (cf. Institut, 1992). On the other hand, private TV channels make very scarce use of Catalan (cf. AVUI, 6/2/95: B16).

In accordance with the Generalitat's language policy, Catalonia's public TV has fully implemented the bilingual conversation norm: officially, Catalan is used with anyone for all purposes, regardless of his/her first language, unless he/she is a Castilian-speaking living outside of Catalonia, in which case Castilian is used. This policy has provoked the unexpected effect that many Castilian speakers attending these programmes start their interventions trying to converge towards Catalan, despite their weak competence in the language, or apologizing for their inability to speak Catalan. The Catalan maintenance rule creates sometimes awkward situations: As an instance, in "Dret a parlar" (27 January 1995), two guests, a Basque lady living in Galicia and a Spanish civil servant from Madrid who did not understand Catalan were individually interviewed in Catalan by means of simultaneous translation in the framework of a public debate.

But this official policy is often broken by a conflict of norms which prove that it runs against societal patterns of language use: Pujolar (1991b) and Boix (1993: 114) have analysed TV programmes where language choice swings between the 'Bilingual norm', firmly maintained by the (professional) moderator, and the 'Castilian accommodation norm', subconsciously applied by all participants when addressing Castilian-speakers. It is often obvious that off the record chats with Castilian-speaking guests are held in Castilian. This conflict of norms is not only produced by guests or the public. The very conductors fail from time to time to restrain from

43M.T. Turell nevertheless claimed that at least some of these bilingual modalities were maintained by the subjects for their own interpersonal relationships, including that of sibling to sibling, at least in one case (personal communication).
accommodation, and this is quite a frequent feature among reporters on the street interviewing witnesses of any event, especially when the reporter's question is not supposed to be broadcast (e.g., the interviews to winners of the Christmas lottery prize in 1994). The result is a diffuse feeling that the bilingual norm is an artificial norm which only applies in controlled situations in front of the camera.

VIII Frequency of transcoding markers in Catalan

In the frame of a large Catalan language corpus launched by the Department of Catalan Philology of the Universitat de Barcelona (cf. Payrató (ed.), in press), Vila i Moreno (in press a, in press b, in press c) analysed the frequency of all sorts of lexical transcoding markers in a sample of 16 different Catalan registers. These recordings had been gathered from a variety of real communicative situations ranging from spontaneous peer conversation to highly formal situations, such as academic lectures or religious services. Most subjects were native speakers of Catalan, but not all of them. Therefore, these were not strictly ingroup interactions, especially the most formal ones. Although the sample was biased towards the young, middle class, and with a background including some formal study of Catalan, and the speakers were therefore not representative of the whole linguistic community, it was felt to broadly reflect Catalan functional varieties.

Although provisional due to the reduced amount of data analysed (16 samples of 10 minutes), results ran against the widespread assumption that oral Catalan was replete with transcoding markers. Out of a total of 31,815 lexical units, this research only detected 580 lexical transcoding markers (i.e., 1.82%) of any nature, including code-switches and borrowings. Once 96 proper names were eliminated from this list, the number fell to 484, i.e. 1.52% of the total number (Vila i Moreno, in press a: 6). Most of these units were widespread borrowings still unaccepted by normative language.

Regarding code-switches (including one-word switches, as opposed to established loanwords), the number of lexical units to be considered as such in the corpus was almost irrelevant from a quantitative point of view, for it did not exceed the number of 30, i.e., less than 0.1% of the total of lexical items and little more than 5% of all lexical transcoding markers. On the other hand, only 6 units of a level higher than the word (i.e. phrase, sentence, etc.) could be regarded as switches. This was attributed by the author to the fact that, contrary to what other authors had claimed, code-switching preserved an addressee-specificator function and served for intergroup linguistic negotiation; since only people fully competent in Catalan had been recorded, there was little need for such bargaining.

IX Multi-voicedness of code-switching

Pujolar (1995) adopted a radical constructivist stance towards code-switching and language use
in general that denied the existence of objective truth, emphasised its social nature, and required research to focus on processes rather than on systems. Based on ideas derived from Bakhtin's 'multiplicity of voices', Foucault's 'regimes of truth', Bourdieu's (himself criticised as excessively determinist) 'habitus' and 'field', Goffman's 'face', 'framed activity', and 'theatrical metaphor', among others, Pujolar analysed the identities of two groups of working-class youngsters in Barcelona, one of them composed exclusively of Castilian speakers and the other composed mostly by Castilian speakers but integrating bilingual and Catalan speakers as well.

Pujolar (1995) defined a number of discourse and other social processes whereby these youngsters built their social identities, with special attention being paid to their masculine and feminine versions. In his view, code-switching and code choice - including style shifting - was conceived as a way of expressing alternative social voices, which were enumerated without claiming exhaustivity (Pujolar, 1995: 254), as the authority voice, the group voice, the stereotypes (e.g. the peasant, the fool, etc.); sometimes the voices did not belong to a different narrator, but rather to a different time and space. In this inventory:

"(...) I will try to convince the reader that many voices articulated through Catalan and Spanish were similar, but many others were not; and that a close analysis of these voices provided evidence that the Spanish ones were clearly more central to the construction of the identities of the peer group." (Pujolar, 1995: 255)

Indeed, Pujolar's analysis showed that Catalan remains external to both groups in many ways. Most of his Castilian speakers did not use it at all; some of the men investing in a traditional, working-class identity similar to that described by Willis (1977) claimed to "hate" (sic; Pujolar, 1995: 321) everything Catalan, for it represented an imposition from the school system; while others claimed they liked Catalan. Nevertheless, these attitudes did not seem to materialise in divergent behaviours. On the other hand, women, who were striving to obtain clerical jobs and studying secondary (or even higher) education, saw Catalan in a more positive way and made some efforts to practise it. These attempts were often fiercely criticised by some of their male peers. Next to these apolitical subjects, a handful of politicised Castilian speakers showed contradictory patterns with regards to Catalan, ranging from avoidance of the language, to conscious efforts to be addressed in Catalan by native speakers. Finally, Catalan native speakers accommodated to their interlocutor's first language and seemed to incorporate large amounts of code-switching to Castilian in their ingroup chats. In any case, though, Catalan remained a voice external to both groups, to the extent that: "Indeed, Catalan was a relatively dry, one-sided, inexpressive, maybe mono-voiced language in the way they used it." (ibid.: 292)

Pujolar's (1995) thesis provides a number of interesting reflections, especially on the role gender may play in bilingual behaviour, and contains valuable examples of Catalan-Castilian code-switching. He confirms that Castilian speakers may resist the use of Catalan at school, and bears testimony of two subjects who decided to become anarchists in order to legitimise their rejection of speaking Catalan. He also points to the increasing utility of Catalan at work:
"[according to his subjects] It was common for employers to hold interviews in Catalan, probably because they wanted to see evidence of bilingual skills, the competence in Spanish being taken for granted. (...) Nevertheless, competence in Catalan appeared to be seen by many just as a job requirement, particularly for dealings with outsiders. I saw no evidence that, for anybody, Catalan was the language used in the workplace amongst workmates." (Pujolar, 1995: 371)

Nevertheless, his radical constructivism, and his emphasis on conscious choice are at odds with justifying the macro-societal coincidences consistently detected by the quantitative (and other) approaches mentioned before, and which his theoretical proposals apparently attribute to 'coincidental' reflections. On the other hand, in the light of Auer and Li Wei's contributions to the understanding of conversational code-alternation, Pujolar's emphasis on analysing code-switching as a change of voice seems excessively simplified. Paradoxically, some of Pujolar's subjects (of those scarce subjects who do code-switch on a regular basis) appeared to have gone a long way along the road of de-socialising the contrast produced by combining both languages (cf. section 2), and seemed to invest code-switching with conversational, non-social functions. Consider for instance the following example (Catalan in standard characters, Castilian underlined; his translation and linguistic analysis):

"Clara: perquè el Salva ha fet un - u- un acto de militancia . vui dir el Salva abans no parlava mai el cas-mai mai el cast-. català . mai- mai - era - anarquista -i- sì eres anarquista pues- tú hablas en castellano- pero nun va conèixer l'Aleix ... hizo un acto de militancia
Because Salva performed an - a- an act of militancy - I mean Salva before never used to speak Cast- never Cast- Catalan- never-never He was an anarchist- and If you are an anarchist, well ... you speak in Castilian - But he met Aleix ... [and] performed an act of militancy [IA10: 477-81] (ibid.: 274; his translation and interpretation)

The fragment hizo un acto de militancia seems considerably removed from a second voice, at least in comparison with quotations, and appears to be used as a conversational device to keep narration moving. In any case, Pujolar himself has to acknowledge this more conversational function of code-switching:

"Additionally, many switches to Spanish appeared to be done simply to add dramatism and liveliness to a narrative. In these cases, the Spanish voice took over parts of the narrative mode itself, although it became a voice meant to display more involvement, accompanied by gestures and vocal effects." (ibid.: 288)

### 3.3.8 Attitudinal aspects

Several authors have worked within a social psychological approach (e.g. Garcia Sevilla, 1981, 1984), especially in the framework of language accommodation and ethnolinguistic vitality theories (Viladot, 1989, 1993; Ros and Giles, 1979). I do not intend here to give a full account of language attitudes and attitude research in the Catalan Countries. Rather, I will concentrate on the analysis of attitudinal factors related to patterns of language choice, which has focussed on two often intertwined aspects: (a) attitudes towards language choice and switch, and (b) intergroup relationships.
I Attitudes towards language use

Bierbach's (1988, 1991) fieldwork in 1986 allowed for a reinterpretation of language norms in terms of three patterns:

(a) The 'minority norm', consisting of the systematic accommodation to Castilian on the side of Catalans.
(b) The 'militant counter norm', consisting of the maintenance of Catalan in intergroup exchanges for nationalist and "language-didactic" reasons.
(c) The 'tolerance norm', according to which everybody was supposed to use his/her preferred language and understand others.

It is obvious that (a) corresponds to Woolard's 'accommodation norm', while (b) and (c) coincide with her 'bilingual norm'. As was the case for Woolard (1989), differences between (b) and (c) were scarce in terms of actual language use. Only the amount of transcodic markers was distinguishable, since (c) was a:

"more recent 'compromise' attitude that gives most room to use c[ode] s[witching] (or other types of "marques transcodiques") as a differentiated (stylistic, situation defining...) contextualization device."
(Bierbach, 1991: 498)

but no quantitative analysis was carried out to prove such a claim.

According to Bierbach, (c) corresponded to a 'tolerant' attitude [her term, in opposition to (a) 'conformist' and (b) 'militant'], and represented an attempt at "(...) overcoming the 'political' meaning of [language] choice, and at achieving a 'natural' (pragmatic) use of (one's own) [language]." (Bierbach, 1991: 498). As was the case with Woolard (1992), no consideration was made of the fact that this norm implied the maintenance of the minority norm for Castilian speakers.

Bierbach (1989: 45) offered an example of a phenomenon which had escaped Woolard (1989): Not only Castilians were 'catalanizing', but some lower-class Catalans were also adopting Castilian as their main language, due to peer-pressure. This was confirmed by Pujolar (1995).

Pujolar (1995) made the point that Castilian speakers often complained they were denied the opportunity to practise Catalan by native speakers themselves, for they immediately switched to Castilian. This practice was hard to overcome by beginning speakers, who sometimes had to make explicit their desire to be addressed in Catalan in spite of their linguistic lacunae. On the other hand, while Castilian speakers often tended to politely offer the possibility of being addressed in Catalan to native speakers, ethnographic observation seemed to point that they did not expect this offer to be taken seriously; in fact, on several occasions, these very speakers complained of their interlocutors' impolite behaviour of speaking Catalan to them, and attributed them with political intent (Pujolar, 1995: 313).
II Mismatch between declared and observed behaviour

One of the recurrent features in language attitude research has been the mismatch between declared and observed data. Several investigations have recorded high percentages of subjects avoiding convergence towards Castilian. For instance, according to self-declared data gathered by Boix (1993) during his experimental research, divergent patterns were on the increase among young Catalans, while decreasing among Castilian-speakers (see graph below).

![Graph 3.3 Subjects distribution according to their self-declared behaviour. Convergent or divergent towards an Interlocutor belonging to the out-group. Source: Boix (1992: 166)](image)

Catalan-speaking **divergers** reached 40% of their own linguistic group, a figure that has not been supported by any observational study and showed strong ingroup favoritism, while Castilian-speaking divergers diminished to 33.7% of their own linguistic group and did not express negative attitudes towards the outgroup. The latters' divergence was to be understood in terms of sheer linguistic incompetence (Boix, 1993: 167).

Pujolar's (1991b, c) undergraduate students also considered the 'bilingual norm' to be widely followed, to the extent that 50% of Catalan-speakers did claim to follow it (!). The reasons adduced by Catalan speakers who claimed not to converge towards Castilian were variegated. They were helping Castilian-speakers to learn Catalan, and worked for the latters' integration, they fought the imposition of Castilian, and, importantly, they claimed a weak competence in Castilian and to feel more at ease speaking Catalan. Castilian speakers who did not speak Catalan offered their weak competence in Catalan as the main argument. Observational results contradicted the alleged spread of this 'bilingual norm'. In the case of Pujolar (1991b, c), only a single linguistic (!) exchange was recorded to follow this pattern.

The very same phenomenon of mismatch between declared and observed data was recorded by Nussbaum (1990: 154, 176), now with a further element of discordance. While observed data confirmed the absolute hegemony of convergence towards Castilian monolinguals' language...
choice, and individual answers to a sociolinguistic questionnaire acknowledged this norm, the
very subjects denied their accommodating to Castilian when the issue was discussed in group.
Nussbaum points out that the subjects were "surprised" and "reluctant to accept" these results.

This mismatch between observed and self-declared data might reveal more than the simple
incapacity to control one's linguistic behaviour. Pujolar's subjects answers were interesting in
that Catalan-speakers were not only offering the 'official' (i.e. Generalitat) reasons to diverge
(language learning, social integration, nationalism), but also a reason which linked them with
the only legitimate non-convergent behaviour before the 70s (see section 3.3.9). They claimed
little competence in Castilian. And this behaviour was not being faced by Castilian
maintenance but by accommodation towards Catalan. On the other hand, the refusal to accept
the prevalence of the accommodation norm in face-to-face interaction might be related to its
negative evaluation in (some of) the educational milieux, i.e., this refusal would be indexing
an ideological position in favour of Catalan normalization.

III. Intergroup attitudes

Although a number of attitudinal studies have been realized in the Catalan Countries and in
Catalonia regarding language and culture, I will only review some directly linked with the
issue of language use.

Viladot (1993) adapted and applied to the Catalan case the conceptual tools of ethnolinguistic
vitality developed by Howard Giles and the Bristol School of social psychology of language.
Her subjects were secondary education students in several schools of Barcelona. Viladot's
results depicted three groups defined in societal and psychological terms: a) Catalans, with
Catalan as their first language, high indexes of Catalan language use, a strong Catalan identity
and weakly identified with Spanish identity; b) mixed (mistes), with Castilian as their first
language, a lower degree of Catalan language use and Catalan identity; c) Spaniards, with
Castilian as their first language, low-to zero use of Catalan, and self-defined as Spaniards in
terms of identity.

Catalan's strong identity did not prevent their massive converging towards Castilian when
talking to Castilian-speaking peers. Nevertheless, once internal differences were looked for, the
stronger Catalan identity was declared, the more subjects said to diverge from Castilian
(Vilador, 1993: 85, 87).

Catalan as a language seemed not to count as a decisive identity marker any more. For these
subjects, Catalan identity appeared dissociated from the fact of speaking Catalan. Only 39.4%
of the Catalan group considered speaking Catalan as essential to be a Catalan (21.6% of mixed
group, 29.5% of Spaniards), while 89.4% of Catalans, 91.1% of mixed, and 83.3 of Spaniards
declared that "feeling Catalan" was enough to be regarded as such (Viladot, 1993: 75).
Woolard (1992) carried out an experiment by means of the matched guise technique in order to analyse linguistic attitudes, and compared her results with those she had obtained during her first visit to Barcelona. According to her analysis, Catalan had increased its prestige in Catalonia. Linguistic groups displayed preference for their co-members. But, in contrast with the situation seven years before:

"Als joves catalans ja no els importa tant qui parla català, sinó més aviat que el parli. Encara més important per fomentar un major ús de la llengua catalana és el fet que els castellanoparlants ja no penalitzen els qui parlen català com a segona llengua reduint-los els sentiments de solidaritat." "To Catalan youth, who is speaking Catalan is not as important now as the fact that he/she is speaking that language. Even more important for the promotion of Catalan language use is the fact that Castilian speakers do not anymore penalize those who speak Catalan as an L2 by reducing their solidarity feelings." (Woolard, 1992: 239)

Boix (1989, 1993) also included an experiment on attitudes regarding patterns of language use. These were measured by means of a segmented dialogue test applied to a sample of secondary education students (therefore, it was not strictly representative of young Catalans from a sociological point of view). Some of his most significant findings were (Boix, 1993: 157ff):

- Subjects assessed their co-members more positively.
- Subjects did not differently assess the actors according to their linguistic convergence / divergence (in opposition to Woolard's findings).
- The most relevant variables to predict language attitudes were linguistic membership and self-declared linguistic behaviour. Subjects who declared a more divergent behaviour displayed attitudes which were more positive towards their co-members than the rest of the subjects, irrespective of the actor's behaviour.
- Language competence and identity (defined in terms of Catalan vs. Spanish) were not significantly related to language attitudes.

Finally, Rodriguez-Gomez ' (1993) doctoral dissertation approached Santa Coloma de Gramenet's Castilian-speaking, immigrant workers in order to understand their participation in the process of nation-building. According to her interpretation, immigrant workers felt linguistically discriminated by Catalans since their first arrival in the 20s and through the whole century, including the Franco period. Based on her informants' opinions, Rodriguez-Gomez argues that Castilian-speaking immigrants did not learn Catalan because, although Catalan was intimately connected to those who had economic power in Catalonia, learning it did not really guarantee social mobility. They regarded Catalan as part and parcel of formal education and as a necessary tool for individual social promotion, but simultaneously refused job discrimination according to language competence in Catalan.
3.3.9 Language norms in Catalonia in the 90s: some considerations and a tentative synthesis

I The norm labels and the traditional Catalan-maintenance pattern

Although by now the labels ‘accommodation norm’ and ‘bilingual norm’ may have gained some currency among language contact specialists in the Catalan Countries, I consider these labels misleading in several ways. Some of them have been pointed out in the text, and can be synthesised as follow. On the one hand, the term ‘accommodation norm’ suggests that accommodation can only take place from Catalan to Castilian; this was not the case even in the early 80s, when a (reduced) number of Castilian speakers learnt and actively used Catalan, and even less today, when growing evidence confirm that more and more Castilian speakers learn and use Catalan on a daily basis. Thus, the term requires to be specified as ‘Catalan accommodation norm’ (Castilian accommodating to Catalan? Catalans accommodating to Castilian?) and its complementary ‘Castilian accommodation norm’. On the other hand, I have serious doubts that the ‘bilingual norm’ can be regarded as a norm, at least in the sense I used in chapter 2, for it seems to hide too much internal variety. First of all, evidence suggest that bilingual conversations such as the ones implied by the term ‘norm’ are an infrequent phenomenon. Moreover, there is rational doubt whether it corresponds more often to a prolonged language negotiation where two speakers seek to impose their respective language on each other, or to an agreement according to which each speaker can use the language he or she prefers.

Probably due to a slight bias in age and socioeconomic origin in her informants, Woolard (1983, 1989) did not perceive a third pattern of language use which, as a remnant of the sociolinguistic situation previous to Franco, had survived through dictatorship and was still alive, though clearly receding. According to this norm, some adults, basically the elderly, and most especially when coming from villages outside Barcelona, were entitled to address anybody in Catalan, most especially youngsters and children. This was especially true when the latter were in a situation of social inferiority, such as attempting to ingress a family by marrying one of its members, and/or when the youngster had shown some willingness to learn Catalan, or even a rudimentary knowledge of it. The practical result for such a situation was either a bilingual dialogue where each interlocutor maintained his/her language, frequently accompanied by good-will demonstrations of understanding from the Castilian speaker, or convergence towards Catalan from the latter. Their focus on young, urban generations has so far led other researchers not to take this choice pattern into account, but it is clearly different from Woolard’s ‘Bilingual norm’. First, it is not a ‘new’ norm, but rather a remnant of a previous Catalan-monolingual situation in which competence in Castilian was not presumed for everybody and where social interaction was expected to be carried out in Catalan (cf. section 3.1.2 and 3.3.2). Second, it was not explicitly linked to ‘political ideology’ but rather to language incompetence. Older and rural people were not expected to be fluent in everyday Castilian -this was indeed a common case-, and it was felt that forcing them to speak a
language which they did not command meant an untenable loss of face.

In the early 1990s, (some) Catalan language supporters were establishing a bridge and linking themselves with this rationale, when arguing their refusal to converge towards Castilian not in ideological terms but rather as a consequence of their lack of competence in Castilian. May that be the sole explanation for their behaviour? Probably not, for no decrease in competence in spoken Castilian has so far been detected in any research in Catalonia; therefore, we have to presume that this explanation was being used as a way out of the possible conflict originated by refusal to converge towards Castilian.

I propose to reinterpret all these language choice patterns as two norms, taking into account the historic considerations made during this chapter. On the one hand, the Catalan preeminence norm, deriving from the original monolingual situation, where Catalan was the unmarked choice in the Catalan Countries for all but the reduced number of bilinguals or trilinguals (in Castilian and/or Latin). This was obviously the only feasible norm for monolinguals and weak bilinguals, and probably remained overwhelmingly dominant at least up to the first immigrations of Castilian speakers. The other second norm is the Catalan subordination norm (or Castilian preeminence) norm, which requires Catalan speakers to accommodate to Castilian speakers. This norm probably spread simultaneously with Catalans’ bilingualisation, and probably made most progress after 1920-30, when compulsory education in Castilian, administrative and politic pressure, and massive Castilian-speaking immigration transformed the previous Catalan-predominant landscape. It derives from Castilian speakers' monolingualism and Catalans' increasing -and compulsory- bilingualisation.

These two norms seem to correspond more clearly both with historical development and with speakers' perceptions. On the one hand, the Catalan preeminence norm is not only the sole feasible pattern for monolinguals, but is also coherent with the fact that earlier immigrants became totally assimilated. On the other hand, the Catalan subordination norm represents the status quo arrived at by two language communities in a process of merging in which one has the power to escape bilingualisation, while the other cannot refuse to converge. The progressive erosion and replacement of the Catalan preeminence norm by the Castilian preeminence norm was slow enough to allow for some transgressions, according to which those lagging behind competence in Castilian were allowed not to converge, even if this meant to establish a bilingual conversation; on the other hand, in situations where Catalan speakers had the upper hand -at their own home, for instance- the Catalan subordination norm enjoyed some ampler room.

The reversing language shift efforts have challenged the Catalan subordination norm. But Catalans are no longer monolingual peasants, and they are known to switch to Castilian whenever needed. Transgression against the winning norm, non-convergence to Castilian requires an explanation. Some ideological explanations have been produced: Catalan
nationalism, everyone has the right to speak his/her language, refusing to converge helps Catalan learners, etc. A few subjects have preferred to drop ideological considerations and now claim that they feel more at ease speaking Catalan even if their interlocutor does not converge towards them. In any case, though, the evident mismatch between the scarce empirical evidence of bilingual conversations and the wide support it seems to gather among Catalan and Castilian speakers alike suggests that the so-called 'Bilingual norm' is no such norm, but the result of compromise in a situation of increased freedom for language choice.

II A tentative synthesis

Since the arrival of democracy, Catalan society has been undergoing a complex process of sociolinguistic transformation addressed at the recovery of Catalan. This process has been modellated by multiple societal pressures, among which the Generalitat's language policy.

As a combined result of autonomous societal trends and language policy actions, several researchers have pointed to a progressive -and still limited- merging of the indigenous Catalan group with the Castilian linguistic group, and to the emergence of an intermediate bilingual or mixed group. Societal images have been modified and this change has undoubtedly affected language behaviour.

After near two decades of transformations and language policy, results in the field of language use are evident but also difficult to assess. Some tentative conclusions could be:

1. Catalan has been promoted at all sociolinguistic levels, which means that the principle of a functional distribution accorded to each language has been and still is fought. **Today, Catalan is no longer a private language and Castilian is no longer the only official and/or formal language.** Both languages can be used in any domain, and their actual usage does not depend on formality or informality but rather on first language, ideological position towards language contact, situation configuration, etc.

2. Most studies concur in that ingroup communication is carried out in the ingroup language. Despite government efforts in favour of "bilingual conversation", **convergence towards Castilian is still widely prevalent in Catalonia's society** and in the whole of the Catalan Countries. Usage of Castilian is favoured due to historical factors, to linguistic groups' demolinguistic balance, and to the unequal distribution of linguistic competence.

3. Several studies call attention to the fact that at least in educational institutions and among the young, traditional patterns of convergence towards Castilian and absence of conversational code-switching are being eroded. While some of these studies suggest these transformations might overflow educational institutions, others
warn that this may happen only in contexts favourable to Catalan. There is no agreement either regarding the extent of this erosion, nor about the actual amount and meaning of this alleged 'larger freedom to code-switch'.

4. While most studies concur in saying that it constitutes the exception rather than the norm, declared data tend to overestimate the actual significance of bilingual conversation. This mismatch between declared and observed data should be taken into account when analysing surveys and questionnaires.

The Catalan subordination norm threatened the very survival of Catalan, for it prevented from learning Catalan in a context where group boundaries were doomed to be eroded sooner or later. The language policy efforts in Catalonia have been addressed at dismantling the powerful rationales behind this norm, especially by means of the educational system. The present study aims at analysing to what point this goal has been achieved.
3.4 Language and education in the Catalan Countries summary

Chapter 3 has reviewed how education has historically been used for language planning in Catalonia. Until two decades ago, and according to the Spanish government designs, the school had as one of its major goals that of promoting language shift from Catalan to Castilian. Today, the school has become one of the most relevant agencies of Catalan language spread.

I have tried to show how the Catalan Conjunction Model aspires at greater social integration and at reversing language shift by means of general bilingualisation and minority language promotion. A single model of bilingual education, based on linguistically heterogeneous classes and the preeminent use of Catalan as the means of instruction, has been adopted to achieve such goals. Nevertheless, the model has been objected to by some, and blamed for being coercitive and provoking language shift towards Castilian.

On the other hand, chapter 3 has reviewed the evolution of language norms in Catalonia during the last decades. We have seen that most authors coincide in considering language choice as addressee-oriented, and in claiming that conversational code-switching does not achieve significant proportions. I have proposed that the norms of language choice traditionally described by code-switching specialists in Catalonia be reinterpreted in terms of two norms, one deriving from the previous Catalan monolingual situation (the Catalan preeminence norm), and the other one (the Catalan subordination norm) produced by the massive arrival of monolingual Castilian speakers in a period when their linguistic integration was not sought. The Catalan subordination norm became practically universal after the Civil War. The Catalan preeminence norm, i.e., the right to use Catalan with any interlocutor in any situation in the Catalan Countries, is now claimed by Catalan nationalists. Nevertheless, Catalans are no longer monolingual, and refusing convergence has to be justified. Thus, it is in the continuum between both norms that reproduction of social practices and the efforts at reversing language shift have to be placed. The Bilingual norm, often described in the literature, is then better regarded as a compromise, which is rarely enacted in practice, between both norms in conflictual situations, and the rationales for it should be understood as ideological justifications to find a way out of contradictory trends.

Some authors have claimed that a transformation in the norms of language choice and code-switching is under way, and have pointed to the school as a main setting for such a transformation. Such a view attributes a remarkable power to language-in-education planning, for it assumes that the school may indeed modify the out-of-school practices in a significant way. Other authors have been more cautious in that respect, pointing out that Catalan language teaching has made possible greater freedom in code-switching, and that this may imply increased use of Catalan, but only under very favourable situations. In any case, it is necessary to elucidate what is the real power of language-in-education planning.
4. Hypotheses, sample and methodological procedures
Chapter 4 presents the main question that generated the present research: to what extent can language behaviour be modified by the school's choice of Catalan as the language of instruction? and breaks it into different hypotheses according to the Catalan sociolinguistic situation. This lays the basis for discussing the criteria used to select a particular research method and a given type of school in a given sociocultural setting in order to find adequate answers. After that, the locality, the school, and the informants researched are thoroughly characterized, and the different methods used to elicit information from them are discussed in detail. Finally, the procedures of data treatment are described.

4.1 Goals and hypotheses

4.1.1 General language policy, patterns of language use and school catalanisation

I Language policy and the transformation of patterns of language use

Chapters 3 has thoroughly depicted Catalonia's sociolinguistic transformation during the last twenty years. Demographic, societal, political, ideological, educational, and other trends have been reviewed in an attempt to draw a general frame of interpretation. We have learned that current language policy in Catalonia tries to combine, on the one hand, the principle that no one can be forced to use a given language, with, on the other, the promotion of Catalan, a language driven to a real threat of language shift by previous dictatorial policies and waves of immigration. Language policy has based its promotional campaigns on voluntary engagement, basically consisting of the encouragement of Catalan learning and the removal of obstacles to its free use. Today, Catalan can -at least theoretically- be spoken anywhere at any time in Catalonia if one so desires.

Our knowledge of actual patterns of language use is still clearly insufficient and remarkably biased towards a number of social groups that have been most touched by language policy (children, the young and educational settings). Nevertheless, it seems undeniable that linguistic etiquette has undergone a change from the situation in the early 80s described by Tuson, Calsamiglia and Woolard. Today, Catalan is widely used for both formal and informal functions. Some Castilian-speakers use Catalan as a second language, and thus language convergence no longer implies accommodation exclusively towards Castilian. Some Catalan-speakers refuse to converge towards Castilian even when their Castilian-speaking interlocutors have just a receptive command of Catalan; bilingual conversations are not unheard of. Finally, at least in some milieux, code-switching may have gained new, discourse-related functions apart from addressee-specification.

But, to be sure, from a quantitative point of view and with the main exception of the possibility of using Catalan in formal domains, these changes have affected only a minor part of
Catalonia's population, and an even smaller proportion of the Catalan Countries. Convergence towards Castilian is still largely predominant even in such Catalanized environments as the autonomous administration. Only a small segment of the Castilian-speaking adult population has learned Catalan and can therefore converge towards Catalan. As a consequence, convergence towards Castilian is no longer the compulsory norm, but remains the expected outcome in an intergroup encounter, and, for a majority of Catalans, Catalan retains its previous addressee-specification function.

II Education as a dependent variable

The educational arena has been a major focus of language policy. Much collective effort has been invested in the spread of Catalan as the medium of education in Catalonia, and it constitutes the spearhead of overall Catalan spread. This process has generated much hope—and considerable disenchantment also—and has provoked bitter opposition from some Catalanian and Spanish sectors, who see it as the first step to annihilate Castilian in Catalonia.

As a consequence of economic and administrative efforts invested in catalanizing the educational system, teachers' learning and active use of Catalan is well above that of the average population. This knowledge has been put to the service of a bilingual education model with Catalan as the main medium of education. Today, most schools in Catalonia are predominantly Catalan-medium. The final goal of this school model is not only to enhance language learning but to increase language use. Nevertheless, little explicit action has been taken in order to modify patterns of language use. An implicit assumption has been made that the medium of education does affect language use. This assumption contradicts the widely held hypothesis that education is an important but exclusively dependent variable in the effort of transforming sociolinguistic realities.

Little research has assessed whether a transformation in norms of language use is effectively taking place as a consequence of school catalanization. While most commentators point out that Catalan use among school children does not seem to be on the increase, and some speak of disenchantment and frustration among teachers due to this alleged failure (Woolard, 1992), others suggest that a limited transformation might be under way (Tusón, 1985a; Woolard, 1992; Boix, 1989, 1993; Mena, Serra and Vila, 1994).

4.1.2 Goals and hypotheses

The major goal of this study is to answer this question: Has school catalanization modified children's patterns of language use with regard to the overall population? And, if so, to what extent?

My hypotheses are derived from the data about language use in Catalonia's educational institutions and from the understanding of education as an important but dependent variable for
sociolinguistic transformation. Given current language policy in Catalonia, my main hypothesis is that despite the school's institutional catalanization, the predominant norm of language choice in Catalonia, i.e., the norm of Catalan subordination, will also be predominant among the pupils. This hypothesis can be further broken down into a number of subhypotheses:

1. Ingroup languages will be maintained for all communication: Catalan for Catalan speakers (and some bilinguals), Castilian for Castilian speakers.

2. Convergence towards Castilian will also be the predominant norm for intergroup exchanges. Bilingual conversations will rarely occur.

3. Language choice will be basically person-related: it will depend on speaker's and addressee's linguistic group, not on rhetorical factors or on situational factors other than participants. As a consequence, language choice between two interlocutors will be kept constant in time and space. Discourse-related code-switching will display minor relevance in quantitative terms.
4.2 Research design and data collection

4.2.1 Macro or micro? A case study

The first dilemma encountered at the beginning of this research was that of choosing between macrological and micrological approaches. Each perspective offered advantages and disadvantages on its own and with regards to the other.

A macro sociolinguistic approach would have emphasised the external validity of this research, and, therefore, results would have immediately been generalizable. Such an approach would have involved a large amount of subjects -around 600 if sociological representativeness were sought for the whole of Catalonia’s school population-, provided that the most relevant variables were taken into account (age, subjects’ first language, relevance of non-Catalan speakers in the area, degree of use of Catalan as the medium of instruction, etc.).

Unfortunately, a macro approach presented several serious inconveniences. First, direct observation of a representative sample was simply out of the question, given the sheer numbers of subjects involved. Most of the methods available for a macro approach -questionnaires, language diaries, in-depth interviews, etc.- would have yielded exclusively self-declared data, rather than actual behaviour. As research on this topic has previously made clear, observation often contradicts self-declared data; this possibility increases enormously when children are involved, for they are probably less aware of their actual behaviour, as also with teen-agers, since they often experience an acute sense of psychological insecurity which makes them greedy for social approval, which may distort their answers.

In the second place, with a macrological approach actual contact with the subjects would have inevitably been short, irrespective of the methodology eventually employed. As a consequence, a macro approach would have increased one of the major obstacles to sociolinguistic research, namely that of the observer’s paradox (Labov, 1972), and subjects would have probably refrained from interacting freely, thereby modifying their linguistic behaviour in unpredictable ways.

The other methodological possibility was that of adopting an approach which focussed on a smaller number of subjects by means of ethnographic techniques. Micro sociolinguistic approaches renounce the degree of representativeness associated with a macro survey, for they do not reach a broad sample. Such an option implies justifying the choice of a given case for study on the basis of its relevance, and arguing for the possibility of generalization, something which is not always taken into account when this approach is adopted. As has been pointed out, while macro studies usually do not take into account intra-speaker variation, in microsociolinguistic studies:

"Seldom do we find systematic information on, for example, differences and similarities in the communicative behaviour of speakers of differing age, sex and social group. This is a real methodological
problem, rather than merely a question of analytic interest or emphasis." (Milroy, Li and Moffat, 1991: 289)

As will become evident, this research attempted to overcome this methodological problem by carefully taking into consideration most relevant social factors from each subject.

On the other hand, and despite this fundamental shortcoming, micrological research offers a number of advantages. It facilitates the elicitation of truly observational data of a large number of actual situations via a variety of methods, basically (non-)participant observation and candid or unobtrusive recording. It therefore gives access to spontaneous data and permits the elicitation of those varieties which approach the vernacular. The reduction in the number of subjects makes feasible a regular contact between them and the researcher, and thus paves the way for increased familiarity and mutual confidence. As a whole, microsociolinguistic approaches enable the study to achieve a greater degree of internal validity at the expenses of external validity.

In theory, the advantages of representativeness attributed to macro approaches should be combined with the enhanced internal validity of micro approaches. In practical terms, though, a decision has to be made taking into account, not only goals, but also available budgetary and human resources. Given all these considerations, it was decided to carry out a case study dealing with language use in one school in the area of Barcelona. At the end of the day, a scientific study should not be evaluated exclusively on the basis of its crude representativeness but rather on the extent to which it helps enlarge our theoretical and practical knowledge of reality. As P. Bourdieu put it, quoting Husserl and referring to Galileo, "Un cas particulier bien construit cesse d’être particulier." (Bourdieu, 1992: 57)

4.2.2 Data collection and data treatment methods

Several methods were adopted in order to gather data so that one method could support the others and simultaneously complement the information obtained.

I Participant observation

Participant observation is a classical procedure in anthropological and social studies (cf. Russell Bernard, 1988: 148ff). At least two aspects of my participant observation are of interest here: the researcher’s role in the school and his language behaviour.

A crucial decision was that of defining a role for the researcher which integrated him into the school in the least disruptive way and allowed him to freely observe and record. The role had to take into account the most important goal for this research: gaining access to the subjects’ spontaneous behaviour both inside and outside the classrooms.
Irrespective of how modern, anti-authoritarian and progressive a school tries to be - and the school of this research indeed was such -, school as an institution confers teachers a high, dominant status. They are invested with the power of being listened to and obeyed, and have the right to modify children’s behaviour and to expect these to behave according to their own norms. It was obvious that the researcher’s role had to be maximally dissociated from that of a teacher. This goal was obviously hindered by my being a male, young adult (25 years), Catalan-native speaker (though highly proficient in Castilian and with little Catalan accent in that language). In a school with a staff predominantly young (almost all in their thirties), the researcher was to be immediately associated with teachers.

I was introduced to the staff as a student of pedagogy in practice. As such, I was entitled to move around the school with considerable freedom, and was warmly accepted in most domains of the school, could talk with teachers and the rest of the staff and ask a wide range of questions. Being introduced as a student of pedagogy instead of linguistics responded to a conscious choice: in a community where language has been invested with high symbolic values, students of Catalan linguistics are often associated with Catalan nationalist positions. Any reference to linguistics had to be carefully avoided so that behaviours were not distorted and opinions about language could be expressed at ease.

As a student of pedagogy in practice, and in order to make contact with the children, I took up two tasks which allowed closer contact with pupils in untutored domains: I acted for some weeks as a dining-room assistant, helping to serve meals, and I took charge of them in the playground and in the basement, where they could play table tennis and other games until classes were resumed in the afternoon.

Once enough confidence had been built up with both children and teachers, I dropped serving meals, which had turned out to be of little help for research purposes given the noisy environment, and started to show up at some classes. At the same time, I kept showing up in the playground during playtime. I was then given the opportunity to organize a table tennis championship for children during their sports hour, a possibility I took advantage of to carry out a naturalistic quasi-experiment (see below 4.2.2.4). All this implied my definitive integration in the school’s life: I could approach my subjects and talk to them, or simply sit around them, without their modifying their activities in any noticeable way. I accompanied my subjects on several out-of-school activities, some excursions, and even to a camp. As a student in practice, I shared some links with their own status - especially with the older students - while, as a sports monitor, I had a discernible role in the school.

In the process of my research, my true goals became progressively and naturally disclosed. When, at the end I made them public to my subjects, I had already gathered most of my material. Neither the teachers, with whom I had already established personal relationships, nor the children, who were already used to my presence and my enquiries, modified their
behaviour in any appreciable measure.

Closely interwoven with the researcher’s role was that of my language behaviour. As a balanced bilingual, I first decided to use Catalan with the teachers and both languages with the children, depending on what language they addressed me in, so that I could appear linguistically neutral to them. During the first weeks, though, I realized this behaviour was in fact anomalous in the school setting, since most children expected adults inside the school to speak to them normally in Catalan, to the point that several among the youngest would not only address me in Catalan, despite their low productive proficiency in it, but would persist in speaking Catalan even after my answers in Castilian. Besides that, it was felt that speaking Castilian to the children might not have been felt appropriate by some of the teachers. Therefore, I decided to adopt the norm of using Catalan, irrespective of the children’s first language.

II Tape-recording

The main goal of this research was that of gathering a sample of tutored and untutored linguistic behaviour of a number of subjects who had gone through an immersion and Catalan school. By untutored is meant interaction not organized as a class activity and not directly supervised by teachers, but rather produced spontaneously by children and teenagers in a variety of settings and for a number of reasons which are not directly responsive to educational practices. The logical correlate of untutored interaction is tutored interaction, i.e., interaction thought of and organized as a class activity whose first and principal addressee is the teacher. Finally, a number of subjects were also interviewed at the end of the fieldwork in order to obtain some supplementary linguistic and sociological information from the subjects (see 4.2.2.3).

The opposition between tutored and untutored behaviour proposed here does not coincide exactly with the formal vs. informal opposition. While formality is usually conceived more in terms of domain analysis, and therefore defined via sociological variables, the notion of tutorage should be regarded as an interactional notion. It rests on the particular characteristics of schools as institutions where some individuals (teachers) are explicitly responsible for the control and modification of other individuals’ (pupils) behaviours. Teachers are not only in charge of pupils’ education: They also evaluate pupils’ knowledge, behaviour and attitudes, irrespective of the setting and purpose of the interaction. Thus, while the teachers’ presence does effectively increase tutorage, it may not necessarily reinforce formality.

It is not possible to draw a clearcut line between tutored and untutored interactions. If untutored behaviour was to be described in Gregory and Carroll’s (1978) functional terms it would include practically any field -but predominantly generic-; non-prepared, spoken mode; informal tone; and predominantly interactive tenor. A paradigmatic example of a tutored
interaction for my subjects could be that of an oral exam, where the child's intervention is (in principle) under complete control of the teacher. On the other hand, a paradigmatic example of untutored interaction might be that of two teenagers smoking joints while playing truant. In between lies a continuum of interactions over which school control can be said to increase or decrease to different levels.

At first glance, the ideal setting for analysing the results of the catalanization program should be outside the school. But this possibility contained a serious danger of undervaluing the impact of school action. Schools constitute the foremost agent for Catalan language learning, while the population beyond school age experiences scarce increases in language knowledge (cf. chapter 3 and section 4.3.2). It should be kept in mind that, at the moment of field work, the school selected for research was the only one in this locality that had Catalan as the medium of education up to 8th grade, which meant that most Castilian-speaking children in this city had zero to low productive competence in Catalan (cf. 4.2.3, 4.2.4). Should mainstream norms of language use suffer modifications, there were good reasons to presume that these would take place precisely in the school, which amounted to a small-scale new bilingual island in a predominantly Castilian-speaking sea. As a consequence, it was decided to tape record the subjects not in their out-of-school interactions, but in their untutored interactions within the school-peer network. This option offered an invaluable extra advantage: most participants in the interactions could be recognized, for I knew all the children personally, so interactions could be fully analyzed in terms of participants, something which would not have been possible in out-of-school interactions.

The tape recorder employed was an Aiwa (TP-38). Two main procedures were adopted in order to record the interactions. On some occasions the tape recorder was discretely placed in a position where it could reach a number of subjects, such as a classroom chair, a table, a shelf, etc. Some times none would notice the tape recorder, while on other occasions one or more subjects would. In the latter case, reactions varied between some trifling comments to the excitement displayed by some informants who would come and speak to the microphone.

The second procedure used to record interactions was that of asking a subject to carry the tape recorder hidden in his or her clothes in the playground or during an excursion. In principle, the subject was asked not to tell classmates about the tape recorder, but in fact several children could not resist the excitement and eventually told some intimates or even everyone. This method yielded unexpected results, especially among 5th graders, since some of them came up to the researcher protesting not because they had been secretly recorded, but rather asking to carry the recorder themselves (!).

Situations to be recorded were chosen as representing a priori both tutored and untutored interactions, but their content could be anticipated in very vague terms. A main reason to select a situation was the probability of its being minimally clear to be understood and transcribed,
while the second main reason was that of containing interactions in which the core subjects (cf. 4.5.4) were involved. Once they had been recorded, they were listened to and evaluated with regards to their 'transcribability'. This led to discard most recordings in the playground, for excessive noise prevented from understanding and recognizing voices, and to prefer excursions and out-of-school visits.

The tapes eventually transcribed were randomly selected. Most of them stretch across 45 to 90 minutes (depending on the interaction, changes of situation, and other factors), although some are shorter. These were included to obtain samples of some core-subjects who rarely appeared in the rest of the interactions. Situations vary greatly (see table 4.1): From an excursion to a marionette workshop, and from the visit to an exhibition about Central America, to the preparation of marmalades for a school festival. Samples of classes were also recorded as a point of comparison. As a consequence, the presence of teachers and monitors in the recordings varies greatly, from total absence to significant presence in given fragments. This presence has obviously been taken into account in the analysis. Texts have been organized in three groups: interactions during a class, untutored interactions, and interviews; they are separated by the dashed line.

Table 4.1. Interactions tape-recorded and transcribed for analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Class assembly</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Classroom interaction</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Raffle in class</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Class debate</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Classroom interaction (+ corridor)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>MCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Preparing a poster</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>ZMR</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>Corridor (+ classroom interaction)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>FAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Sawing workshop</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>JCV</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>Visit to the <em>Poble Espanyol</em> printing workshop</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ACB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Excursion</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>EBG</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>Visit to the Poble Espanyol printing workshop</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>ESG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Excursion</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>JEO</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Visit to exhibition</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>GBG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Excursion</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>SFB</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>Preparing marmalades</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>XPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Interview (girls)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Playground interaction</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>JBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Interview (boys)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>Interview (mixed)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Interview (girls)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>z</td>
<td>Interview (boys)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R: recording. Situation: communicative situation recorded. M: minutes recorded. S: subject who carried the tape-recorder; -- means that the tape-recorder was not carried by a subject, but left on a table, chair, etc.
III Field notes, interviews and questionnaires

Not all information was gathered via candid or unobtrusive tape-recording of spontaneous interaction. Individual comments and talks yielded valuable examples and field-notes which have been used in the discussion of results.

Some subjects (see section 4.5.4) were selected to constitute a particular group of core subjects who were explicitly interviewed in order to obtain information about habits, opinions, and so on. These interviews were also used in the analysis of language contact phenomena.

Several questionnaires were designed on the basis of other existing questionnaires and used in order to elicit relevant information about subjects: the Family language use questionnaire and the Social network questionnaire (which included the Language competence questionnaire) were passed to the pupils. Questionnaires were integrated into a class activity, and were therefore written exclusively in Catalan. While the first two were distributed by the teachers so that pupils could not connect the researcher with sociolinguistics, the last one was presented by the researcher himself. Other relevant information was also obtained by interviewing teachers about their pupils. Thus, a Language Use and Competence Questionnaire was answered by some teachers. All these questionnaires are presented in the appendices and discussed in section 4.2.3.

IV Experimental procedure: the naturalistic quasi-experiment

Experimental methodologies are less common in sociolinguistic and anthropological linguistics than in other branches of language-centred disciplines, such as social psychology of language or language acquisition and teaching. Sociolinguistics share this reluctance for experiments with other related disciplines such as anthropology (Russell Bernard, 1988: 62). The advantages of experimental methodologies can be synthesised by saying that they enhance internal validity to a maximal level by a careful control of all variables. On the other hand, they often suffer from weak external validity, since the laboratory circumstances under which they are usually carried out cannot be easily transferred to naturally occurring environments.

Experimental techniques distinguish between different sorts of experiments: true experiments, quasi-experiment, and natural experiments (Russell Bernard, 1988: 63); or true experimental designs, ex-post facto designs, quasi-experimental designs, and pre-experimental designs (Hatch and Farhady, 1982: 19ff). True experiments are the most demanding designs, since they entail the existence of control groups, random assignation of subjects to either experimental or control group, and pretests previous to any treatment. Experiments not fulfilling these

44Part of the data gathered during this experiment corresponding to the core subjects were analysed in my tesi de llicenciatura or degree thesis (Vila i Moreno, 1993b).
conditions are usually attributed to the other categories.

Experiments are also classified according to their naturalness. As Russell Bernard puts it, "Natural experiments (...) are going around us all the time" (Russell Bernard, 1988: 64). They consist of already existing situations which allow for quantification and comparison between subjects or groups of subjects. By contrast, naturalistic and true experiments do not take place spontaneously, since they call for manipulation of reality. Thus, while natural experiments just happen and are evaluated, naturalistic and true experiments have to be conducted and evaluated.

I decided to complement my observational and declared data with experimental data regarding language choice and switching. As already pointed out, I took advantage of the occasion to organize an amateur table tennis championship for the school children and turned it into a small naturalistic quasi-experiment. The primary goal of this quasi-experiment was discovering what was the unmarked language of communication of a number of subjects placed in pairs or dyads. Given the fact that all pupils had known each other for years, and given the norms of language use in Catalonia described in chapter 3, it was assumed that each combination of two pupils would have an unmarked language of communication, i.e., a language they used by default when relating to each other. It was predicted that two subjects placed in a situation of free interaction (sport), some tension (due to the game) and concentration on a non-verbal activity (the game itself) would make predominant use of their unmarked language of communication. Secondly, this experiment was aimed at discovering whether the addition of a third member to the dyad implied any significant modification of the unmarked language.

The dynamics of table tennis, especially as played by amateurs, proved well suited for such an endeavour. Singles matches (the only ones taken into account for the experiment) require face-to-face interaction of two players for a sustained period. As a speech situation, it is composed of a reduced number of speech acts which can be enumerated as follows:

a. Negotiation of opponent,
b. Negotiation of start,
c. Score control,
d. Discussion of dubious rallies, scores, and even game-norms, which often include
e. Requirement for external judgment,
f. Final inscription of results on the control sheets.

It goes without saying that these are just the essential elements of a match, and that many others can take place: regular chats, insults and verbal duels, shouts of victory or rage, etc. From time to time, one or both players can be addressed by a third person asking for the score, or simply trying to chat with the opponents. Thus, while a table tennis match does not in principle invite extended conversation, it nevertheless provokes a certain amount of verbal
exchange. This verbal exchange does not offer many occasions for discourse-related code-switching, so it is reasonable to assume that the language used in the interactions can be considered the unmarked language of communication for each dyad of subjects.

Apart from the language use in these interactions, other characteristics made ping-pong especially adjusted to research requirements, to the point that it can be said that most variables were controlled. On the one hand, subject, key, genre and setting of the interaction were held constant. On the other, the game structure allowed for control of participants, since the researcher was entitled to organize the game and match the players; thus:

1. Catalan-speakers and bilingual-speakers, who were otherwise a minority (see section 4.5) in their mostly Castilian-speaking dominant classrooms, could be matched and their behaviour analysed.

2. The number of participants was limited to two, so reducing distortion caused by group interaction and facilitating role analysis in the interaction.

It goes without saying that this control of variables was by no means perfect: some subjects (especially boys) preferred to play football rather than ping-pong, while others -especially girls, and to the researchers’ despair- did not utter a single word for a whole afternoon.

The data gathering process was in itself simple. Every session was pre-arranged by the researcher so that participants did not coincide more than once and the maximum of dyads could be analysed. Around ten subjects each time were taken to the sports hall and the game started. The researcher would then walk around the hall giving advice when needed and acting as a referee if required.

Tape-recording was attempted on several occasions by both placing the tape-recorder next to one of the tables and by giving it to a subject. Unfortunately, the noise produced by the game made it completely impossible to transcribe these tapes. A manual record had then to be carried out by means of tables which clearly specified speaker, addressee, and, when needed, hearer (see appendix 4). These tables aroused initial curiosity among the subjects, who asked what they meant, but this curiosity soon faded away as they were told the tables helped the sports monitor (the researcher) to know who was playing and who was not.
4.3 Defining the sample: locality, school and subjects selection

4.3.1 Conditions for school selection

The goal of this study was not that of finding a school allegedly representative of all schools in Catalonia, but rather to discuss the results of a given policy, that of catalanizing the primary education system. Therefore, I searched what could be seen as a successful model of maximal application of this policy. The criteria adopted to choose the school were as follows.

First, it had to be officially considered as an immersion school by the Servei d’Ensenyament del català (SEDEC), the governmental office for Catalan language teaching. In practical terms, that meant that not more than 30% of the pupils had to be native Catalan-speakers. Nevertheless, it was an important condition that the school included an appreciable proportion of Catalan speakers in order to test the hypotheses that predicted different behaviours according to first language.

Regarding medium of instruction, the school had to be not only an ‘immersion’ centre in administrative terms, but also a Catalan school, i.e., all subject matters but one had to be taught exclusively by means of Catalan up to the end of primary education. At the time of school choice, the educational centres simultaneously considered as immersion and Catalan schools constituted a minority, for most immersion schools in the process of catalanization had not completed this process yet, while most Catalan schools were not regarded as immersion centres.

A supplementary criterion was quality of education as a whole, and quality of the catalanization programme in particular, a criterion not easily operationalized, since data were fragmentary and even contradictory. Only those schools where, according to the SEDEC, the immersion programme was being consistently and thoroughly applied, were considered for the sample.

Finally, the school had to be placed in the region of Barcelona, where more than 60% of Catalonia’s population currently live and most immersion schools are found (Institut d'Estadística de Catalunya, 1992 and SEDEC files).

The actual selection was done thanks to the collaboration of the SEDEC and its data base. The result was a centre which enjoyed a certain prestige, one of the first ‘immersion’ and Catalan schools in one of the mostly castilianized areas in the whole of the Catalan Countries: Santa Coloma de Gramenet.
4.3.2 The locality: Santa Coloma de Gramenet

I Brief historical outline

Santa Coloma de Gramenet, or Santa Coloma, as it is often known, is placed in the Barcelona Metropolitan Area to the north of Barcelona, across the Besòs river (see map in appendix 4). The local history can be broadly divided into three phases (Ajuntament de Santa Coloma de Gramenet, 1989):

A. The rural phase and the first factories (up to c. 1960)
B. Creation of the dormitory suburb (1960-1975),
C. Stabilization of the new city (since 1975).

A. The rural phase and the first factories. Santa Coloma was a small agricultural village until the late nineteenth century, when some small textile mills were built. It was during the last third of that century when the first Castilian-speaking immigrants coming from Teruel (a province in the neighbour region of Aragon) settled down in the village. They were known as the “picapedrers” (stonecutters) and they integrated completely into the native population (Rodríguez, 1991: 211).

At the beginning of the twentieth century, the Compañía Nacional de Tierras bought some land to the peasants and sold it to lower middle class artisans from Barcelona to create a “garden-city” based on the principle of the caseta i l’hortet (a small house and a small garden for everyone). The village started to develop under the influx of an ever-growing Barcelona. Several factories (textile, furs, and others) established in the village during the first decade, but the attempts to massively attract industry remained mostly unsuccessful (Durà, 1992: 62). In 1910 the village census included just 1,869 inhabitants. Ironic as it may seem today, at that time Santa Coloma enjoyed a certain reputation for its clean and healthy air, and it attracted a number of families (up to 100 families at a given moment) from Barcelona who used to spend their holidays there.

In 1915, some irrigated lands (regadiu Ribera) were turned into building ground and sold, first to Barcelona workers, and later to recently-arrived immigrants from Murcia, a Castilian-speaking region, especially after their massive immigration to work in the 1929 Barcelona International Exposition. As communication with Barcelona was deficient, the land was not appealing to industry and became cheap. This second immigration wave seems to have completely integrated and their descendents are currently part of Santa Coloma’s Catalan-speaking population.

Between 1920 and 1930, Santa Coloma started to transform into a slum, a process which continued until the Civil War (1936-1939). While it had 2,728 inhabitants in 1920, the figure had risen up to 12,930 by 1930 (Rodriguez-Gomez, 1993: 68). Local authorities were outraged
with such a situation, claiming that Barcelona’s city council was getting rid of poor immigrants
and throwing them away to the surrounding cities (Rodriguez-Gomez, 1993). Santa Coloma in
the 20’s and 30’s was torn apart by social, ethnic and political cleavages, where each political
party had its own meeting centre for socializing and little consensus could be built. By that
time, the original rural environment was already declining, since it represented no more than
30% of employment in the city, while industry already occupied more than 50% of workers
(Rodriguez-Gomez, 1993: 66). This world was to be turned upside down by the Civil War.
Once the Civil War ended, the population started to grow again. Its original rural character was
fading away. Santa Coloma’s population reached 15,000 in 1950. During the 50s, the rhythm
of growth progressively increased, as more and more immigrants found an affordable place in
Santa Coloma to build their make-shift dwellings.

B. The formation of the dormitory suburb. During the 60’s and up to 1975, Santa Coloma de
Gramenet received an unprecedented number of newcomers: more than 7,000 per year. Santa
Coloma’s population multiplied by four. Land-speculation and urbanistic chaos were permitted
by a local government designated by the dictatorial government. For example, in 1960 there
was just a single market (mercat Sagarra), placed next to the old urban centre, for 32,277
inhabitants.

The immigrants arriving at Santa Coloma were attracted as manpower to work in the factories
that proliferated in Catalonia. Their origin was predominantly Andalusian (Southern-Spain),
and they were monolingual in Castilian. Due to their sheer numbers, integration of the
newcomers into the original population became impossible. As a result of massive
immigration, the native community remained secluded in its own habitat, the old village, which
became the city centre, and tended to avoid the newly emerging city (Durà, 1992: 64). In fact,
due to social structure, natives and immigrants did not share many common places where to
socialise; they were nevertheless forced to interact in a few places, such as the market, de
Plaça de la Vila (central square), the local Catholic church, and the cemetery (Rodriguez-
Gomez, 1993: 121).

C. The stabilization of the new city. The 1973-1975 international oil crisis strongly hit
Catalonia’s economic growth and put an abrupt end to Santa Coloma’s demographic
development. The whole of Spain was plunged not only in an economic crisis, but in a political
transition as well. The dictatorship was being fastly transformed into a constitutional
parliamentary monarchy, and the centralist regime was mutating into the State of autonomies
which allowed for considerable regional autonomy.

Table 4.2. Santa Coloma de Gramenet’s population years 1950-1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inhab.</td>
<td>14,638</td>
<td>32,277</td>
<td>105,880</td>
<td>138,091</td>
<td>140,613</td>
<td>135,257</td>
<td>133,138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides the general political and economic crisis, Santa Coloma was experiencing its particular problems as a dormitory suburb. By 1977, its population reached 143,294 inhabitants, and the public situation was one of discontent and unrest due to the lack of essential services. There were no green areas, no public transportation, no amusement facilities. Bars were the sole meeting place. Amid a climate of socio-political pressure, the Pla General Alternatiu de Santa Coloma de Gramenet or General Alternative Plan for Santa Coloma de Gramenet, known as the Popular plan and addressed at promoting the town social and urbanistic transformation, was presented in 1978.

The first free local elections gave the majority in the city council to the Catalan communist party (PSUC, Partit Socialista Unificat de Catalunya), followed by the socialist party (PSC, Partit Socialista de Catalunya). This balance was to last until 1991, when the latter managed to capture the local government.

During this period, facilities have created by both the local and the autonomous governments (public transportation, some green areas, a bridge connecting Santa Coloma with Barcelona by road, the underground, etc.). Nevertheless, this city is still one of the most impoverished areas in Catalonia. Three key data may clarify this point:

1. The social composition is highly homogeneous and predominantly lower class. The income level is the lowest in the Barcelona Metropolitan Area, well under that of other populations in the surroundings. With Sant Adrià, Santa Coloma is one of the two cities whose incomes is not becoming homogeneous with the rest of the Metropolitan Area.

2. Around three quarters of Santa Coloma’s active population works outside the city. There is only a thin internal economic fabric.

3. The modern city has been created by speculators: there are few facilities and no available building ground.

As a consequence, the economic prospects of Santa Coloma de Gramenet are rather pessimistic. Its economic activity is based on the secondary sector, mostly industry and building (more than 52% of employed population). In 1991 the city had 46,041 active people and one of the lowest activity taxes in the Barcelona Metropolitan Area. Of those actually employed, more than 50% worked in Barcelona, and only 25% in Santa Coloma itself, while 17,930 jobs in the city were covered by non-residents. The unemployment tax was stabilized around 30% of the active population, 42% of whom are young people who had not found their first job yet. The prototypical unemployed in Santa Coloma de Gramenet was “structural” and difficult to retrain for new jobs. The educational level of two thirds of the active population is below secondary education (Institut d'Estadística de Catalunya, 1992 and
From a demographic point of view, massive immigration has stopped since the mid-70s. In 1991, the population born in Catalonia (52.35%) outnumbered those born elsewhere. The city has been consistently losing population during the last period. Between 1981 and 1986 Santa Coloma lost around 5,000 residents per year. While this move might be beneficial for an overcrowded city, it is precisely the youngest and better-educated who feel more prone to leave, while the older and/or with a lower educational level prefer to stay.

The birth rate, which used to be very high in the past (26.34 per 1,000 inhabitants in 1975), the second in the Metropolitan Area, dramatically diminished during the last period (10.99 per 1,000 in 1986) and approached the Metropolitan Area mean. Due to these factors, the population is ageing.

Rodriguez-Gomez has described Santa Coloma’s process of local identity building on the basis of a double complex: that of a victim of dictatorship, and that of a victim of capitalism. In her opinion, "Santa Coloma is then an ideological construction that fosters a corporate sense of inferiority and unfairness." (Rodriguez-Gomez, 1993: 60). This ideological construction is based on the reinterpretation of the past in the most favourable form for current interests, and on a particular history of a strong movement for social and economic rights in the face of capitalism and dictatorship. According to Rodriguez-Gomez, Santa Coloma’s intellectuals have mysticised the city’s rural, self-sufficient period previous to the last massive immigration as a means to support their claim for particular help, since their current situation would be the result not of their own faults but the consequence of unfairness and oppression, and to support their belonging to Catalonia despite their current Castilian-speaking predominance. Being Colomense (Castilian for "born in Santa Coloma") would therefore be a particular way of being Catalan.

II Sociolinguistic situation

Santa Coloma de Gramenet has in some way become a symbol of the massive, unplanned immigration and of the urbanistic disasters permitted by the Franco dictatorship. The city has attracted a comparatively high number of social researchers, including sociolinguists and anthropologists. But Santa Coloma de Gramenet is by no means an isolated case in the Catalan Countries. As a part of Barcelona’s Metropolitan Area, it shares many characteristics with other localities in its vicinity, some of which will be now reviewed.

A Knowledge of Catalan. As a heritage of the massive Castilian-speaking immigration during this century, Santa Coloma’s sociolinguistic situation still lags behind in Catalan knowledge not only from the whole of Catalonia and the Catalan Countries, but also from the Metropolitan Area. Santa Coloma de Gramenet achieves one of the lowest scores in Catalan language
knowledge in comparison with the other urban areas in Catalonia, as tables 4.3 and 4.4 make clear (see also chapter 3).

Table 4.3: Knowledge of Catalan in Catalonia's main urban centre. Percentages, 1991.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Can understand</th>
<th>Can speak</th>
<th>Can read</th>
<th>Can write</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>1,618,547</td>
<td>95.34</td>
<td>70.05</td>
<td>70.70</td>
<td>40.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badalona</td>
<td>214,636</td>
<td>88.45</td>
<td>51.04</td>
<td>53.01</td>
<td>29.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L'Hospitalet del Llobregat</td>
<td>268,485</td>
<td>87.58</td>
<td>49.35</td>
<td>52.33</td>
<td>26.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabadell</td>
<td>185,799</td>
<td>92.16</td>
<td>61.52</td>
<td>61.11</td>
<td>37.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrassa</td>
<td>154,917</td>
<td>91.86</td>
<td>60.83</td>
<td>61.94</td>
<td>35.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarragona</td>
<td>107,897</td>
<td>93.10</td>
<td>64.51</td>
<td>66.55</td>
<td>38.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lleida</td>
<td>109,781</td>
<td>96.38</td>
<td>74.48</td>
<td>71.26</td>
<td>39.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Coloma de Gramenet</td>
<td>133,138</td>
<td>83.27</td>
<td>42.43</td>
<td>46.81</td>
<td>25.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1: included in Barcelona Metropolitan Area. Percentages for people aged 2 years or more. Source: Institut d'Estadística de Catalunya, 1993.

In 1991, Santa Coloma de Gramenet was the last but one in the list of Catalan localities according to its coefficient of Catalan language knowledge (cc), an index which combines the four linguistic abilities as yielded by the census (% understanding + % speaking + % reading + % writing / 400). Its cc was 0.49, while that of the last city, Sant Adrià del Besòs, was 0.48. These figures indeed reflect a notable improvement regarding Catalan competence in Santa Coloma: five years before, the city had obtained a meagre cc= 0.36, and was not only the last in Catalonia but also the only one which remained under cc=0.40 (Reixach, 1990: 41, table 17). This evolution in figures is shown in table 4.4.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Can understand</th>
<th>Can speak</th>
<th>Can read</th>
<th>Can write</th>
<th>cc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>04.3</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>83.27</td>
<td>42.43</td>
<td>46.81</td>
<td>25.74</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Reixach, 1990: 52-56) and Institut d'Estadística de Catalunya (1993: 27). 1: 1975 percentages are calculated over the whole population; *** : not available.

Santa Coloma contains some of Catalonia’s largest "non-catalanization pockets". These are

45 My elaboration, based on census data provided by the Institut d’Estadística de Catalunya (1993: 8).
areas (municipalities or city districts) where a high percentage of residents declare not to understand Catalan; they can be very critical (gravíssima) where more than 50% declares not to understand Catalan, or critical (greu), where more than 25% says so. All these areas are placed around Barcelona but one, which is district IX in Tarragona.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Reixach (1990: 67) and Institut d'Estadística de Catalunya (1992). *1975 percentages are calculated over the whole population

The immigrant population arrived at Santa Coloma during the 50s, 60s and 70s has not massively learned Catalan, as table 4.7 clearly proves.

Table 4.7. Knowledge of Catalan among Santa Coloma de Gramenet's immigrant population. Percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% over total p.</th>
<th>Can understand</th>
<th>Can speak</th>
<th>Can read</th>
<th>Can write</th>
<th>cc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Reixach (1990: 81) and Institut d'Estadística de Catalunya (1991).

It is among children and youngsters where the knowledge of Catalan is dramatically increasing, with a rise of more than 30% in speaking abilities and more than 40% in reading and writing. This boost cannot be explained unless the school catalanization is taken into account, for no other major change has affected this population.

Table 4.8. Knowledge of Catalan among people between 10 and 14 living in Santa Coloma de Gramenet. Percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Can understand</th>
<th>Can speak</th>
<th>Can read</th>
<th>Can write</th>
<th>cc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>78.88</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Use of Catalan in Santa Coloma de Gramenet. In accordance with percentages of linguistic competence, all studies coincide in the low use of Catalan in Santa Coloma de Gramenet. Linguistic censuses in Catalonia do not include any reference to language use. Therefore, all data come from other sources, usually of a more limited scope and specifically addressed to sociolinguistic research.

In 1985, the Laboratori de Sociologia of the Institut Catòlic d’Estudis Socials (ICESB) carried out sociolinguistic research in Santa Coloma de Gramenet. The study was based on a questionnaire applied to a sample of residents in the city. According to this study, the city was clearly divided into two zones: centre and periphery (cf. map in appendix 4). In the first district, which coincided with the historic centre, where the original population was concentrated, 64.4% defined themselves as Catalan-speakers and 68.9% had been born in Catalonia. The rest of the population was overwhelmingly Castilian L1, ranging from 67.1% in District IV to 96.4% in district VI. Catalan was not even universally understood: 5.08% did not understand it at all; 9.20 understood just a little; 22.05% not much; and 63.68% understood Catalan well.

The questionnaire asked the subjects whether they heard people speaking Catalan around them. The answers were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From time to time</td>
<td>32.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>26.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>34.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ICESB (1985: 29)

A remarkable finding was that the youngest interviewees (15 to 20 years old) were the age cohort which declared to hear Catalan the least: 38% of them ‘never’ heard Catalan, and 38.5%, ‘very rarely’. That means that in 1985, 76.5% of youngsters in Santa Coloma declared only anecdotal contact with Catalan, while the mean for the total population was 38.26%. Although these figures should be taken with precaution, they suggest that Catalan was quickly receding among the young generation of colomencs.

Figures regarding active use of Catalan were also discouraging for Catalan language activists, for they reflected a large majority of people who seldom used it.
Table 4.10: Frequency of speaking Catalan among Santa Coloma de Gramenet inhabitants. Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Very rarely</th>
<th>Relatively often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.47</td>
<td>22.76</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>26.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ICESB (1985: 37)

Again, the worst results were found among the youngest group (15 to 20 years), where the ‘very often’ group diminished abruptly to only 17.3%, compared with a 26.67% mean. As the authors pointed out, the youngest were those who used least Catalan, in spite of their being the group who had studied it more. (ICESB, 1985: 37)

Castilian-speaking interviewees were asked about what their reaction would be in front of someone who asked them something in Catalan: 46.6% declared they would try to understand; 30.2% would ask him/her to speak Castilian; only 18.9 claimed they would answer back in Catalan. On their side, 67.23% of Catalan-speakers declared they would answer in Castilian to a question made in Castilian. This figure mounted to 78.6% among the youngest group.

The language used to ask for information to an unknown person on the street offered further evidence of Castilian colloquialization and adoption as the unmarked language.

Table 4.11. Catalan-speaking colomencs who always spoke Castilian to unknown people on the street. Percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>15-20</th>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
<th>51-60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always Castilian</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ICESB (1985: 68)

Leaving aside some methodological inadequacies (the study offered little methodological background information and data were self-declared), the landscape by 1985 was to be interpreted as one of language shift towards Castilian: Santa Coloma’s Catalan-speaking population was apparently adopting Castilian as the language of public interaction with unknown interlocutors, while Castilian-speakers did not seem to be either learning or using Catalan quickly enough to stop this trend. Only the fact that Catalan-speakers lived clustered in the city centre had prevented them from total dissolution in the Castilian-speaking overwhelming majority.\(^6\)

\(^6\) In 1995, a study by the Centre de Normalització Lingüística of Santa Coloma de Gramenet L’Heura concluded that the ICESB investigation had probably overestimated the knowledge of Catalan. Unfortunately, this study was still in process at the end of 1995 and could not be included in the present thesis.
Estany and Tresens (1989) carried on another study into about sociolinguistic behaviour in Santa Coloma de Gramenet. It was also based on a questionnaire, and offers a number of methodological flaws which may produce a source of bias (e.g. it was done in the underground station entrance). Therefore, their results should be taken as orientative rather than definite. Nevertheless, they confirmed ICESB’s main findings.

This study classified speakers according to first language (Catalan and Castilian), language competence (bilingual and monolingual), and whether they declared to converge linguistically (which they called active bilinguals) or not (reactive bilinguals) towards someone speaking the ‘other’ language, i.e., speaking Castilian to a Catalan speaker or Catalan to a Castilian speaker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First lang.</th>
<th>% Competence</th>
<th>% Behaviour</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>22.5 bilingual</td>
<td>22.5 diverger</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.5 converger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>77.5 bilingual</td>
<td>30.5 converger</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.5 diverger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42 monolingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>understand 31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>do not und. 10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12. Convergers and divergers in Santa Coloma de Gramenet. Percentages.

These results suggested that a great majority of bilingual colomencs claimed would accommodate to their interlocutor's language (82% of Catalan-speakers, who were 100% bilingual, and 78.7% of bilingual Castilian-speakers). Given sheer numbers of Castilian monolinguals, the figures also confirmed that convergence towards Castilian was the most common accommodation norm.

The most significant study about Santa Coloma de Gramenet's ethnic and sociolinguistic configuration is without doubt Guadalupe Rodriguez-Gomez’s (1993) doctoral dissertation. A Mexican-American anthropologist herself, she did her fieldwork in Santa Coloma between 1988 and 1990. Part of her findings, in particular those referring to the city history, have already been commented in the previous pages.

With regards to those aspects which correspond strictly to Santa Coloma de Gramenet's sociolinguistic make-up, Rodriguez-Gomez (1993, chap. 5) confirms the data obtained by the previous studies: Castilian, in a number of regional and social varieties and with the occasional

---

47The variation in totals were due to internal contradictions and unanswered questions.
presence of some Catalan loanwords, is by far the predominant language in the city for all sorts of verbal exchanges, be they written or spoken. After her participant observation in two commercial areas of the city during a two-months period, only 0.18% of people walking in Can Mariné and Santa Rosa neighbourhoods were conversing in Catalan, while 16.5% of the people walking in the city centre were talking that language. Only the central district, the one which coincides with the old village, showed an appreciable presence of Catalan in use.

“There is a proportionally inverse ratio between physical distance to Santa Coloma’s center and the use of Catalan (even with regard to the clerks). The further you are from the center the less you will hear Catalan in commercial transactions.” (Rodriguez-Gomez, 1993: 287)

Rodriguez-Gomez clearly exaggerates when she says that bartenders, clerks of grocery stores and markets "(...) address their clients in Catalan regardless of their cultural background and linguistic practices." (Rodriguez-Gomez, 1993: 287). Though by contrast with the rest of Santa Coloma their usage of Catalan is incomparably higher, they actually use both languages to address their clients. In fact, and as she immediately acknowledges, "Yet, the clerks switch to Castilian if the customer responds to them in that language." (Rodriguez-Gomez, 1993: 287).

On the whole, though, the city centre is the only area where Catalan is spoken on a regular basis. A small number of public places and organizations exist in that area where Catalan-speakers gather -such as the old church, the Puig Castellar hiking club, the Xocala bar, among others.

Other smaller studies have also dealt with the sociolinguistic situation in Santa Coloma de Gramenet. All studies agree that Castilian is predominant in all sorts of activities. The local media make scant use of Catalan: less than 15% of broadcasts in Catalan on the local public radio station and only occasional use on the free Radio Inoksidable (García, 1990), while Catalan is seldom used in local written media of any kind such as El Tot, Gramenet 2000, or Més Coloma, which claimed to publish more than 10-20,000 issues each. Only some publications by the city council oscillated between 40-80% of Catalan in their pages -especially L’Heura, the bulletin of the Catalan language local service. Some bulletins, such as the one issued by the Centre Excursionista Puig-Castellar or a teachers’ bulletin were totally or almost totally written in Catalan (Garcia, 1990).

C. Catalan Language teaching in Santa Coloma. In 1972, Omnium Cultural, a private institution created to promote the Catalan language and culture, started some Catalan language courses in Santa Coloma de Gramenet. In 1978, after the SEDEC was established, a first group of teachers specialized in Catalan language was sent to Santa Coloma’s schools. Shortly later it became evident that a handful of language lessons was clearly insufficient to learn Catalan. Three hours per week and a specialist in Catalan could not overcome its environmental absence. At the 1982 Teachers’ Summer School, a group of teachers and parents organized to demand a Catalan-medium school in Santa Coloma, where no such school existed. In 1983-84
the so-called immersion process started in the city when the local council passed a motion known as the “school by means of Catalan” (escola en català), obtained the implication of local and autonomous powers and started 12 Catalan-medium classrooms in kindergarten, plus two provisional Catalan-medium classrooms for first and second courses of primary education (cf. Lacasta, 1990; Cubilla, Espot i Ríos, 1989: 229)\(^8\).

Table 4.13. "What language would you prefer as the means of school education?" Percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Only Catalan</th>
<th>Only Castilian</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>82.81</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


At the moment of my research, the 'immersion programme' had spread to all public schools in the city but one, which was due to disappear, although this did not necessarily mean that all language-teaching was to be in Catalan; let us not forget that, at that moment, officially the 'immersion programme' did not include half of primary education, where schools freely chose the language medium. On the other hand, a single school could have two language streams (línies), i.e., a Catalan language stream where all instruction was done by means of that language, and a Castilian language stream, where Catalan was just a subject matter. Fabà and Ripollès (1991) offered a review of the process of Catalan as the language of instruction in Santa Coloma de Gramenet Regarding primary education, data were as follows:

Table 4.14. Primary school language use in Santa Coloma. Percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language used as means of instruction</th>
<th>89-90</th>
<th>90-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only Catalan</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two language streams</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two language streams; Castilian stream scheduled to disappear in a near future</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Castilian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fabà and Ripollès (1991: 211)

With regards to qualification in Catalan language teaching, 61% of teachers had already some kind of official certificate, while 16% were attending courses to obtain it. There were no data about 12% of teachers. Nevertheless, as the authors pointed out, the Catalan language teacher title did not immediately imply native-like proficiency, and it could be obtained even by speakers with a medium-low proficiency. Regarding secondary education, a poll made in

\(^8\) According to Abeyà (1985: 33), there were 19 classrooms involved. Nevertheless, Lacasta used to be a member of Santa Coloma's city council and works in the educational field, so his testimony should be more accurate.
1989-90 showed a mean of 44% of classes in Catalan in B.U.P (Baccalaureat), while only 28% in F.P. (Professional training).

What had been the result of the process of Catalan language spread in the schools? Results to hand regarding Santa Coloma de Gramenet were obviously partial. Research produced by SEDEC in 1984, after the first year of Catalan-medium school, recorded high levels of language comprehension (more than 95%) and usage of Catalan (more than 89%) in the classroom (probably in relation with the teacher) (Abeyà, 1985: 34). Some years later, results were described as good for the second year of primary education, regarding the acquisition of Catalan, according to an unpublished study realized by SEDEC and quoted by Arenas (1990: 40).

While the process of language spread has undoubtedly improved the level of communicative competence, the fact that teaching by means of Catalan did not imply the immediate adoption of this language by children as a language of informal communication first puzzled and later discouraged those who had expected a rapid process of language spread. Thus, other authors confirm Rodriguez’s (1991: 215) statement that Catalan was not being used among students:

"el català és la llengua de l'aula, però quan els nens surten al pati, quan juguen, quan parlen entre ells, al menjador o quan fan esport, ho fan en castellà." "Catalan is the language of classroom, but when children go to the yard, when they play, when they speak to each other, in the dining-room or when they do sport, they do so in Castilian." Rodriguez (1991: 215)

D. Linguistic varieties in use in Santa Coloma de Gramenet. Catalan dialects are not very different from one another, and they are all mutually intelligible. As one of the major figures in Catalan dialectology has pointed out:

"... tenim disgregació dialectal, però discreta, sense estridències, sense profunds desnivells. El panorama de la nostra llengua és acolorat amb tons suaus per dialectes hodierns..." [We Catalans] have dialectal fragmentation, but it is sober, without stridency. Our language’s outlook is couloured with soft tones by current dialects." (Veny, 1983: 12)

The geolectal variety traditionally spoken in Santa Coloma de Gramenet is usually known as català central or Central Catalan, the same dialect spoken in Barcelona. We do not have specific information about the local variety as spoken at the beginning of this century, but we can assume that it was a variety closely related to that of Barcelona and the surrounding villages.

As a result of the twentieth century immigration, Santa Coloma’s traditional population has been deeply modified in all senses. A considerable number of immigrants have learned Catalan. Some of them, especially the descendants of the first Castilian-speaking workers established in Santa Coloma before the Civil War, became completely integrated into the Catalan-speaking community, adopted Catalan as their principal language, and passed it on to their children as a first language. Among more recent immigrants, a considerable number have
learned Catalan and use it in their everyday interactions. Santa Coloma is connected to the rest of Barcelona’s metropolitan area by public transportation (bus and metro) and people commute daily in both ways. New mass media, education, etc., have all affected Santa Coloma’s Catalan to the extent that it probably makes little sense today to speak of a variety which belongs exclusively to the town, and it has to be considered in close connexion to Barcelona’s Catalan.

Taking Tusón (1985a, b) description of Barcelona Catalan as a framework, Santa Coloma native speakers’ Catalan vernacular should currently be regarded as popular Catalan (Tusón, 1985a, b: 75), a variety which forms a continuum between barceloni (which is not clearly described in the paper) and xava ("popular speech with interference from Castilian spoken by immigrants coming from the South of the [Iberian] Peninsula" (Tusón, 1985b: 75).

With regards to Castilian, there are no precise figures regarding the varieties spoken in Santa Coloma de Gramenet. According to the immigrants’ origin and to impressionistic accounts, it is logical to conclude that, apart from Castilian as a second language as spoken by the native population (and other non-Castilian groups such as Galicians), Castilian varieties include a wide array of Southern Spanish dialects. Research on the neighbour area of Sant Andreu del Palomar (Barcelona) indicates that these dialects are probably converging with each other (Moyer, 1991), a trend supported by the fact that the children researched did not retain their parents' accents.

### III A summary: Santa Coloma de Gramenet’s sociolinguistic makeup

Due to its linguistic make-up, Santa Coloma de Gramenet offered an ideal setting for this research. First, from a societal point of view, although overwhelmingly Castilian-speaking, a sizeable minority of Catalan-speakers lived there. According to all sources, this Catalan minority had preserved its language for ingroup communication, probably due to its living clustered in the city centre, and used it both for informal and formal purposes. Nevertheless, Castilian was not only the majority language, but also the language expected for intergroup exchanges. Linguistic convergence meant most of the time convergence towards Castilian. Official campaigns in support of bilingual conversation and structural changes in favour of Catalan did not seem to have recorded much success, for Catalan divergers constituted a minute minority in Santa Coloma de Gramenet. In fact, at least until the school catalanization process started to be implemented, it could be hypothesised that Castilian was gaining ground at the expense of Catalan among the young. In this context, schooling by means of Catalan appeared as the only consistent factor to counteract local societal trends.
4.4 The School: Col·Legi Públic Rosselló-Pòrcel

4.4.1 The school’s creation

Catalan was adopted as a means of instruction in Santa Coloma’s schools in 1983-84, when a majority of parents opted for that language as a medium of education. One year earlier, a group of parents who wanted to have a Catalan-medium school had requested the city council to create such a school. By that time, no school was teaching by means of Catalan in Santa Coloma de Gramenet. Public pressure succeeded in pushing the local authorities to establish a new school, named after a famous Majorcan poet, where Catalan was to be the sole means of instruction: Rosselló-Pòrcel public school. At its start it only had two kindergarten courses and the first and second years of primary education.

The school was initially located in three tiny, provisional classrooms, and without a clear methodological project beyond that of using Catalan as language of teaching. But its three newly appointed teachers felt enthusiastically engaged with the new project and were experienced in teaching Catalan to non-Catalan-speaking children. They developed a curriculum which was submitted to the parents which included the progressive learning of Catalan and Catalan traditional culture, such as feasts, geography, etc.

Some of the children who attended the school came from private schools, while others came from public schools or had not attended school yet. 76% of them were Castilian-speaking. Therefore, an effort of co-ordination was initially needed so that a degree of homogeneity was achieved.

Between 1984 and 1987 the school became established: a definitive building was obtained after several moves. By then, the school provided all courses of primary education up to grade eight. During this period, three entire class groups coming from Castilian-speaking schools were incorporated in the Rosselló-Pòrcel. These were the three upper classes.

Today, the Rosselló-Pòrcel is the oldest immersion and Catalan-medium school in the town. Placed in the avenue Rambla de sant Sebastià, its current catchment area includes several districts: City Centre, Fondo, Llatins, etc. It shares a building with another public school, the Salvat-Papasseit, which at the moment of fieldwork had two línies or parallel language groups for every school level -one in Catalan and the other in Castilian-. Both schools are connected

---

49 All the facts explained here are public and well-known among teachers and the administration in Santa Coloma de Gramenet. Therefore, it would make little sense trying to disguise the school name. On the other hand, all personal names have been modified to render personal identification impossible.

50 From the initial school, Santa Rosa, to a new building, Can Roig i Torres. From Can Roig i Torres to Salvat Papasseit school, and from there to the present building.
by corridors at every floor, and they must share some space, basically, the dining-room, the basement where the tennis-table tables are placed, and the playgrounds. In spite of their sharing these areas, contacts between children from both schools are limited inside the building, since they follow different time-tables and do not carry on mixed activities. Even in the playground they do not usually play together but in independent groups. Every floor houses a different age group: the offices are on the first floor, next to the two entrances. First, second and third courses of primary education have their classrooms on the second floor, while fourth, fifth and sixth are placed on the third floor and seventh and eighth grades occupy the fourth floor. Kindergarten classrooms are lodged on the fifth floor.

Ironically, the spread of Catalan as the language of instruction to the rest of the schools of Santa Coloma de Gramenet has blurred the initial character and distinct personality of the Rosselló-Pòrcel. It is no longer the only Catalan-medium school in the city. At its beginning, the Rosselló-Pòrcel had to be explicitly chosen, and some children came from outlying districts; today, it is becoming a regular school where proximity determines acceptance. All advantages of normality are now to be combined with their inconveniences, such as lesser parental involvement, or the presence of problem pupils from unstructured families who were previously sent to Castilian-medium schools. Simultaneously, the school staff has been partially renewed since the early seventies and the initial idealistic approach has been evolving to a more pragmatic one. This mutation was sometimes resented by some older pupils, who claimed teachers were stressing 'content', i.e. subject matter, while simultaneously paying less attention to feasts and traditional culture. Nevertheless, on the whole, the school kept an overall good reputation and it always filled its classrooms with new pupils.

4.4.2 The staff

As at any public school in Spain, the staff is principally formed of qualified teachers who have passed the official exams (oposicions) to enter the civil service. Depending on several factors, teachers who have still not passed these exams may be appointed to the school by the Department of Education for either a whole year or a shorter period for temporary functions. From time to time, student teachers carry on their practical studies at the school. As an immersion centre, the school is entitled to a Catalan language support teacher who takes care of pupils with particular language problems. The staff is completed by a number of non-teaching staff. At the time of the present research, these consisted of two male porters/caretakers, three female cooks, and two female dining-room assistants in charge of those pupils who did not go home for lunch.

Most of the permanent teaching staff are in the 30s or 40s, reflecting in some way that this is a young school, although some of them are in the 20s. Non-permanent staff is usually younger, and non-teaching staff’s ages varies greatly.
While non-teaching staff are recruited from the local population, teaching-staff shows a larger variety. Some teachers originally come from the city itself or from neighbouring Barcelona, while others were born in the rest of Catalonia or even elsewhere in Spain. Those who gain a permanent post at the school tend to settle either in Santa Coloma or in Barcelona, to take advantage of public transportation facilities.

Recruitment correlates strongly with societal and linguistic group variables. Non-teaching staff are lower class, mostly of Southern Spanish origin, with no productive abilities in Catalan and a clearly perceivable Andalusian Castilian dialect, though some Catalans may also be found among them from time to time. Teachers' linguistic configuration clearly reflect the policy of language recycling described in chapter 3. Some teachers are Catalan native speakers, but not all of them. Several are Castilian native speakers. Of these, some were early bilinguals, while others only learned Catalan after secondary school, or even after obtaining their teaching diploma. Leaving aside the youngest, who studied some Catalan language arts at school, all teachers, either native Catalan or second language speakers, had to acquire their competence in formal and written Catalan after secondary school.
4.5. Subjects selection

4.5.1 Classes chosen for research: their social make-up

The more Catalan becomes the regular language of instruction, the less the Rosselló-Pòrcel stands as a distinct alternative to Castilian-medium education, and the more its population reflects the schools' catchment area. At the time of this research, this process was still under way: higher courses reflected the parents who had originally asked to have a Catalan-medium school, with more Catalan speakers among them, while lower courses included fewer of these speakers and started to include some more pupils belonging to so-called 'risk-groups'.

Two different grades were selected as the focus of research: eighth grade of General Basic Education (13-14 years old) and fifth grade (10-11 years old). They were observed during the whole academic year 1991-92. Eighth grade was taken as it constituted the last year of primary education and language patterns would reflect the actual result of 8-10 years of schooling by means of Catalan. In this particular case, eighth-graders were the last group of those who started their education when the school was created under parental pressure to have a Catalan school in Santa Coloma. Therefore, parents' attitudes were expected to be favourable towards Catalan. For their part, fifth graders had entered the school when the catalanization process was already spreading to the other schools in the town, and they were to be regarded as closer to the mean population. The systematic analysis of these two courses was complemented with observation of subjects from other grades during playground, lunches and leisure periods, apart from excursions. During October-December 1992 unstructured participant observation and tape-recording of P4 (four year old) children provided data from the initial months of 'immersion'.

From a socio-economic point of view there was little difference among the pupils' families. They belonged mostly to working and lower-middle classes, and their parents were employed in several industries in the Barcelona Metropolitan Area or in small firms or shops in Santa Coloma itself. A number of them were unemployed. Only in some cases could their families be regarded as higher middle class -such as in the case of Ncp and Mcp, whose father held a teaching position at the university-. On the other hand, both classes included some subjects whose families were in serious economic difficulties and lived on welfare. One of the eighth grade pupils (Far) and his younger brother (Tar) had been legally aparted from their mother due to family problems and taken to a flat where they were living with a group of other children under the supervision of officials from the Generalitat's social service.

The pupils lived all around Santa Coloma de Gramenet. A handful of them (Jbc, Jms, Jcv, etc.) came at least in part from the Catalan-speaking original population, while others came from Catalan speakers from elsewhere in the Catalan Countries, including Majorca. The formers' families tended to live in the city centre or in its surroundings, and often had some links with
institutions placed in the city centre (such as the Centre Excursionista Puig-Castellar) that are well-known for their function as rallying points for the Catalan minority (cf. Rodriguez-Gomez, 1993). In several cases, their families knew each other. The latter did not maintain such connexions. Non-Catalan speaking families were predominantly first or even second generation Andalusians, although other origins, such as Galicia or La Rioja were present as well. Some of them belonged to regional cultural associations, but that was not the most common case.

According to the pupils, most families seemed to spend part or the whole of their holidays outside Santa Coloma de Gramenet. In some cases, and especially in that of some fifth-graders, this meant living for around one month in their parents' or grand-parents' villages in Andalusia or elsewhere in Spain. This circumstance probably implies the strengthening of linguistic ties with the communities of origins, and, in some cases, seems to be responsible for the knowledge of a third language (Galician in the case of Ead, French in the case of Ncp and Mcp). In other cases, children spent their holidays in the terreny (Catalan) or terreno (Castilian), i.e., a house in a popular holiday resort not far away from Santa Coloma. This is not at all a rare case among Castilian-speaking immigrant population; these houses had often been built by the parents themselves after buying some land. Other subjects spent most of their holidays at a camping site.

Males slightly outnumbered females in both classes. Neither class included any children from ethnic or racial minority groups, which in the area are basically Castilian-speaking Rom and Northern-African. Some of them, though, were present in lower courses, and they frequently attended the neighbour Salvat-Papasseit school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMP</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>JCV</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ACB</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>JEO</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCV</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>JRG</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MCG</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>JRS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DGG</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MCP</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>EAD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MMU</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBG</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MFV</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ESG</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MPF</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>NCP</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MPM</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>NMF</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBG</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>RPT</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGB</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SCP</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>JBC</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SLJ</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSG</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SFB</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>JBL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>XPR</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>VGO</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>JBR</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>XMS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>JCR</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZMR</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>JLL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.2 The classes linguistic make-up: questionnaires used

Data about the subjects were gathered by means of several procedures: (a) a number of questionnaires passed to the subjects themselves, (b) questionnaires and interviews to their teachers; (c) the school files. Declared data on language are valid and reliable only to a certain, usually unknown, extent. The very act of asking for personal opinions introduces a bias, and rests upon trust in the respondents’ willingness to participate by saying the truth, and on the hope that they are really aware of their actual behaviour. Neither can they be fully guaranteed by any researcher. In addition, several sources for bias could be anticipated in the answers to questionnaires, which should be borne in mind when reviewing the results:

- Bias produced by a need to save face towards a question judged dangerous for self-esteem. This could artificially inflate the socially desirable answers.
- Defensive contraction towards questions asking for personal, intimate aspects of one’s life.
- Answers suggested by the very questionnaire structure and interference among them.
- Defensive reaction towards the questionnaire’s goals.
- The very presence of a researcher, in principle alien to the school.

In this case, these biases might have favoured Catalan, which in the school setting stands as the socially desirable language, or bilingualism, at the expense of Castilian. In order to reduce biases and contrast results, the first questionnaire used to ascertain the pupils’ patterns of language use at home (Family Language Use Questionnaire, see appendix) was distributed by the teachers themselves as a regular class activity, while the other questionnaires were applied by the researcher at the end of the fieldwork. Results from all questionnaires were systematically compared. Moreover, three of the school’s teachers were asked to answer the questionnaires for their pupils as well. They answered a reduced version of the Family language use questionnaire and an alternative Competence questionnaire. Their answers were used to check to what extent the data provided by the children were reliable, especially in a number of cases in which there existed reasonable doubts about the pupils’ answers.
4.5.3 Family language use

Family linguistic background was defined by means of the *Family language use questionnaire* (see appendix 4), designed on the basis of other available questionnaires (cf. Bastardas, 1985, 1986). Several points are of relevance to this questionnaire. First, defining 'family' was not a simple issue, mostly taking into account that it had to be expressed in terms understandable for fifth grade children. Hence it was defined as those living in the same flat with the children (since at least one year before). On the one hand, while for a number of children the nuclear family remained united, in other cases that was no longer the case: Monoparental families, divorcees, step-parents, step-brothers, often transformed the family linguistic make-up. There were some cases of deeply unstructured families, for which one could not expect the same parent-child relationship, and, at least in one case, the children had been recently moved to a collective home where several children lived with some tutors. On the other side, my definition did not include the extended family, baby-sitters, *crèches*, etc., which in some cases might have been even equally important in language acquisition. Therefore, results from the *Family language use questionnaire* should not be regarded as absolute and conclusive as far as first language acquisition is concerned, but rather as an approximate guide.

A second point of relevance here is that the questionnaire inquired about both receptive ("what language does X speak to you?") and productive ("what language do you speak to X?") usage, assuming that there existed the possibility of differences between them (cf. Bastardas, 1985, 1986). The questionnaire focussed on the subject, i.e., it did not include any questions regarding parents-to-brothers or mother-to-father patterns of language use. In fact, it stressed the importance of output from the children and did not accurately reflect all input which could be received by the children at home. To the extent that input may facilitate language acquisition, this questionnaire slightly underscored its weight. On the other hand, it is also true that sources of linguistic input (mass-media, acquaintances, on the street, etc.) in a society as mixed as the Catalan are probably impossible to assess thoroughly.

It is undeniable that indexes grossly simplify reality, for they transform ordinal and nominal variables into interval variables, and they reduce the extraordinary complexity of patterns of language use (cf. Russell Bernard, 1988: 42; Visauta, 1989). Nevertheless, indexes have the advantage of categorizing and classifying reality in a comprehensible form and offer a global idea and a scale which is of much utility for research. Thus, answers to this questionnaires were introduced into a table according to the following criteria: Catalan = 1, Catalan and Castilian = 0.5, Castilian = 0. Three indexes were obtained for each subject. These indexes attempted to measure exposure to Catalan (*Catalan Input in the Family Index*, CIFI), productive use of Catalan (*Catalan Output in the Family Index*, COFI), and use of Catalan in

51 Unstructured families were by no means unheard of in the school, and the younger the children, the more frequent they were. This fact had obvious repercussions not only on emotional and affective aspects, but on linguistic development as well (see section 5.2.5).
the family (CUFI). They were obtained by summing up the scores yielded by the pertinent answers and dividing them by the number of family members. For instance, COFI was obtained by summing up the results obtained from the questions "what language do you speak to your mother, father, sister, brother,..." and dividing them by the number of people included in the answers. The indexes vary between 0, i.e. exclusive use of Castilian, and 1, exclusive use of Catalan. Few differences were detected between receptive and productive use of Catalan at home, and they did not have a single, clearly defined direction: in some cases COFI was lower than CIFI, while in others it was the other way round (see the rest of the indexes in appendix 4).

As expected from the literature reviewed in chapter 3, results from this questionnaire depicted not two clearcut groups but a continuum between a monolingual Catalan-speaking pole and a monolingual Castilian speaking pole. Monolingual Castilian-speaking families were clearly predominant, but a number of bilingual and monolingual Catalan-speaking families were present as well. As a whole, results were considered as fairly representative of the school population by teachers.

Subjects were classified in three groups according to their self-declared family productive use of Catalan (COFI). Among the three indexes (subjects' productive, receptive, and global use), this was the one involving the best evaluation of personal productive linguistic usage. An arbitrary decision was made to regard as coming from monolingual Castilian-speaking families those subjects whose COFI did not exceed 0.25, while those whose COFI amounted to more than 0.75 were regarded as Catalan-speaking families.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COFI</th>
<th>Family language group</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COFI ≤ 0.25</td>
<td>Castilian-speakers</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25 &gt; COFI ≤ 0.75</td>
<td>Bilingual-speakers</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COFI &gt; 0.75</td>
<td>Catalan-speakers</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results obtained from this questionnaire were nuanced in a number of cases: one subject, namely Aos clearly overestimated his use of Catalan in this questionnaire, as proven by his own answers to the Social Network Questionnaire; Jrc failed to include his Castilian monolingual father in the questionnaire, with the subsequent result of an increase in Catalan use. In both cases, the COFI scores were modified according to the other results. On the other hand, two brothers (Jce and Ice) gave totally opposed results. Jce, the youngest, declared to come from a Catalan monolingual family, while Ice came from a Castilian-monolingual home. In fact, even the language of communication between the two brothers did not coincide at all: it was Catalan -and only Catalan- for the former, and exclusively Castilian for the latter (!). Further inquiries made it clear that their parents had used Castilian as the family language until
the second brother was born, when they decided to adopt Catalan. As a result, they maintained Castilian to speak to the eldest brother but opted for Catalan with the youngest. It was decided that their COFI result were modified by considering that Ice and Jce spoke both languages to each other.

Table 4.17. Subjects’ COFI (C.) and family linguistic group (F.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMP</td>
<td>0 S</td>
<td>ZMR</td>
<td>0 S</td>
<td>ACB</td>
<td>0 S</td>
<td>JCR</td>
<td>.17 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGS</td>
<td>0 S</td>
<td>JEO</td>
<td>.10 S</td>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>0 S</td>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>.33 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJC</td>
<td>0 S</td>
<td>MFV</td>
<td>.13 S</td>
<td>DGG</td>
<td>0 S</td>
<td>GBG</td>
<td>.33 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGB</td>
<td>0 S</td>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>.17 S</td>
<td>JBL</td>
<td>0 S</td>
<td>MCP</td>
<td>.50 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSG</td>
<td>0 S</td>
<td>SFB</td>
<td>.17 S</td>
<td>JLL</td>
<td>0 S</td>
<td>XPR</td>
<td>.50 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGB</td>
<td>0 S</td>
<td>AOS</td>
<td>.25 S</td>
<td>MCG</td>
<td>0 S</td>
<td>EAD</td>
<td>.50 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAA</td>
<td>0 S</td>
<td>JRG</td>
<td>.50 B</td>
<td>MMU</td>
<td>0 S</td>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>.67 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRS</td>
<td>0 S</td>
<td>EBG</td>
<td>.50 B</td>
<td>MPM</td>
<td>0 S</td>
<td>ESG</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>0 S</td>
<td>DLA</td>
<td>.50 B</td>
<td>RPT</td>
<td>0 S</td>
<td>JBC</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMF</td>
<td>0 S</td>
<td>NCP</td>
<td>.50 B</td>
<td>SLJ</td>
<td>0 S</td>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCP</td>
<td>0 S</td>
<td>DCV</td>
<td>.75 B</td>
<td>JBR</td>
<td>.0 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGO</td>
<td>0 S</td>
<td>JCE</td>
<td>.83 C</td>
<td>MPF</td>
<td>.16 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XMS</td>
<td>0 S</td>
<td>JCV</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>.17 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S: Castilian-speaking; B: Bilingual; C: Catalan-speaking

Castilian-speaking subjects were the overwhelming majority in both grades.

Table 4.18. Classes linguistic make-up according to family language.
## Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number of subjects</th>
<th>Family Language Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between both grades is visually represented in graph 4.1, and reflects the change in the school characteristics and the increasing spread of immersion to other schools commented on above. While Catalan-speakers concentrated to a certain extent in this school and were more numerous when it was supposed to be the sole Catalan-medium school in Santa Coloma de Gramenet, their number diminished progressively as catalanization reached the other schools.

These results cannot be directly compared with other research in Santa Coloma. Nevertheless, it is worth signalling that once bilinguals are redistributed among Castilian and Catalan-speakers, percentages approach those of Estany and Tresens (1989) for the whole of Santa Coloma de Gramenet population.
A remarkable fact, not shown in the tables, is that simultaneous use of Catalan and Castilian with a single interlocutor was a rare phenomenon which surprisingly occurred only among Castilian-dominant families. This could signal a transformation in their behaviour consisting in the progressive use of Catalan, but observational data confirmed that bilingual conversations of any sort were seldom found. This result might be provoked by the desire to save face among Castilian-speaking children in front of the Catalan-school.

4.5.4 The subjects' linguistic competence

I Assessing linguistic competence

Since the very first definition of linguistic competence (Chomsky, 1965), and its transformation into the sociolinguistic construct of communicative competence, the definition, operationalization and practical analysis of competence has been of concern to many theoretical and applied (socio)linguists (cf. Hymes, 1987). The analysis of competence has shown to be a complex, controversial issue which entails the assessment of an array of related abilities. A number of models have been put forward by several authors in order to classify and organize its components. This complexity is increased in multilingual settings where languages that have coexisted for long periods have mutually influenced and modified one another (cf. Baetens Beardsmore, 1986: 85-117; Baker, 1993a: 18-33).

The sociolinguistic situation of Catalonia makes it even more difficult than in many other situations to adequately assess competence, especially when referring to Catalan, since standard spoken Catalan is a variety which is in the process of both establishment and spread. Despite the fact that little objective distance exists between Barcelona's Catalan and standard Catalan, it is a reality that most adults in Catalonia have never been trained to speak the standard variety. Instead, they use their local variety with a number of transcodic markers -not always coincidental-, and show linguistic insecurity regarding features of formal registers. The close genetic relationship between both languages, the historical exclusion of Catalan from many domains, and Catalan speakers' widespread bilingualism, have all favoured a considerable amount of borrowing between both languages' oral varieties, to the extent that tests designed to assess proficiency in the standard language may prove inadequate for everyday, informal Catalan, especially in areas of high contact.

Spolsky has defined three broad views to conceive of language competence:

"One is to consider language knowledge as forming a whole, and to speak in terms of overall or general proficiency. (...) A second is to assume that language knowledge is broken down into the individual structures -the rules and the lexical items- that make up the grammar and lexicon of a language, so that knowledge of these items and rules is what needs to be measured. The third is to assume rather that knowledge is measured in terms of the subject's ability to carry out defined linguistic functions, to use the language in specific ways in definable situations." (Spolsky, 1989: 141)
Though Catalan -and Spanish- educational systems do not enjoy a long tradition in language testing as American and British systems do, several attempts to analyse competence in Catalan and Castilian since Galí (1928) can be recorded. When analysed in Spolsky's terms, the analysis of language competence in the Catalan Countries has traditionally emphasised the first and the second perspectives, and only recently have they started evolving towards the third approach.

Researchers have made use of a wide variety of procedures in order to assess language competence. In some cases, these have been adapted from other countries, such as the Peabody Picture Vocabulary test and the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities used by Pla (1983). The official institutions charged with teaching and evaluating the knowledge of Catalan have produced several language tests. The Servei d'Ensenyament de Català has produced a whole array of tests (Alsina, Bel and Vial, 1984; Servei d'Ensenyamanent del Català 1983, 1990) designed to assess receptive and productive skills in both written and oral Catalan and Castilian for usage in Primary Education.

Most of these tests put much emphasis on accuracy and evaluation of errors (castellanismes, barbarismes, and all sorts of negative transfers, etc.); they focus on sentence-level correction, pay little attention to discourse phenomena, and pay much attention to written language. These tests share a common origin -the evaluation of Catalan language teaching at school-, and are all oriented towards the evaluation of linguistic competence in formal settings, with an emphasis on narrative and descriptive abilities over conversational, collaborative skills. They were therefore inadequate to assess the communicative ability to engage in children's informal peer-conversation.

One of the most fundamental problems posed by the objective measure of competence was the lack of actual information about the varieties of each language actually used by the subjects. A handful of examples may shed some light on the nature of doubts faced in the evaluation process: (a) as will become apparent in chapter 6, there seems to be a process of convergence in progress affecting part of the Catalan clitic pronominal system; how was this to be analysed? (b) normative evaluations penalise code-switching; section 5.3 attempts to prove that Catalan and Castilian speakers do not totally share their switching strategies; how was it to be incorporated into the assessment procedures? (c) some Catalan native speakers seem to be incorporating the aspiration of implosive /sl/, a typical Andalusian feature; what was the significance of such a phenomenon in the evaluation of competence?

---

52 Bel, Serra and Vila (1992) could not be examined in time to be included in the design of the present research.
The inadequacy of language tests based on the analysis of school-related abilities in the Catalan context has been confirmed by some macro-sociolinguistic studies that have adopted written tests in order to obtain indexes which could approach competence in Catalan and/or in Castilian. Among the best known, Bastardas (1986: 20 and 115) adapted a written word-naming process in order to obtain a bilinguality index, which was eventually taken up by Boix (1993: 151). Despite their efforts to take into account the existence of a bilingual repertoire (plus their use of an interference discrimination test (prova de discriminació d’interferències) (Boix, 1993: 25), these analyses yielded the a priori unexpected results that Catalan-speakers were more proficient in Castilian than in Catalan, despite the fact that at least a number of the subjects declared not to use Castilian at all in their daily lives, or except for a very limited range of activities. Both authors attributed these results to the procedure and the unequal bilingualization of subjects.

A more communicative, holistic perspective has been adopted by other institutions which have produced tests to assess language competence in Catalan. The Junta Permanent de Català, the office for the evaluation of Catalan dependent of the Generalitat's Department of Language Policy and the Consorci per a la Normalització Lingüística (Consorci per a la Normalització Lingüística (nd); Consorci per a la Normalització Lingüística-Direcció General de Política Lingüística, 1994a, 1994b, 1994c), have both resorted to communicative approaches for adult languages assessment, though, on the one hand, they both logically emphasise standardness and avoidance of language contact phenomena which may be widespread in everyday usage, and, on the other, they pay more attention to the initial stages of Catalan L2 adult learners than to highly developed child and adolescent bilinguals such as the object of the present research. The dilemma posed by this situation was that, on the one hand, it was necessary to classify the subjects according to their capacity to communicate spontaneously in untutored interactions by means of Catalan, and, on the other hand, the available resources had not been designed for such a purpose. In view of the existing possibilities, two different procedures were adopted to assess the subjects' competence in spoken Catalan and Castilian.

1. In the first place, a self-rating procedure was used. Each child was asked to declare his/her language competence for both Catalan and Castilian, and his/her dominant language.
2. In the second place, teachers who had recently taught or were teaching the subjects at that moment, and were therefore familiar with them, were asked to classify them on a scale for spoken Catalan and Castilian, and for language dominance, in relation with native speakers levels.
II Self-declared linguistic competence

All subjects were questioned regarding their competence in oral Catalan and Castilian by means of three questions added to the Social network questionnaire (see appendix 4). Questions were adapted from those proposed by Bastardas (1986: 127) to his subjects. The options were: (a) competence in Catalan: ‘How well do you think you can speak Catalan?’ (Com creus que saps parlar català, tu?); (b) competence in Castilian: ‘How well do you think you can speak Castilian?’ Com creus que saps parlar castellà, tu?; (c) linguistic dominance: ‘Is it better for you to speak to your friends of your age in any language? in which one?’ (Et va més bé parlar amb amics i amigues de la teva edat en alguna llengua? En quina?). Answers to the first two questions were Well (bé); Middling (regular); Bad (malament). Answers to dominance were: Both (En les dues); Catalan (català); Castilian (castellà). Subjects were told that speaking a language was intended to mean whether they managed to express what they wanted, whether they could convey their intent while speaking the language on the streets, chatting with friends. It was emphasised that speaking ‘well’ was not to be understood as speaking correctly, but rather with communicative abilities with friends and peers.

Tables 4.19 a and b show the results obtained from this questionnaire. The subjects considered both their Catalan and their Castilian to be good, with high levels of linguistic competence and predominance of self-declared balanced bilingualism, to the point that no pupil acknowledged to speak neither Catalan or Castilian ‘badly’. Results for Castilian were unanimous: all students believed they had a good level of spoken Castilian. Results for Catalan were more varied, with 14 out of 49 declaring a ‘middling’ competence in Catalan, while the rest considered their competence to be ‘good’. With regard to dominance, only one subject (Jcv) declared to be Catalan dominant; the rest said they were equally competent in both languages or dominant in Castilian.
Table 4.19a. Subjects’ self-declared linguistic competence and dominance. Fifth grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subj.</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>L.D.</th>
<th>Subj.</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>L.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMP</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>JCV</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOS</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>JEO</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCV</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>JRG</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>JRS</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBG</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>MFV</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIC</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>NCP</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NMF</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGB</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SCP</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSG</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>SFB</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>VGO</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAA</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>XMS</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCE</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>ZMR</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subj.: subject; C: Catalan; S: Castilian; DL: dominant language; W: well; M: middling; B: badly.

Table 4.19b. Subjects’ self-declared linguistic competence and dominance. Eighth grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subj.</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>DL</th>
<th>Subj.</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>DL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACB</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>JLL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGG</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>MCG</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAD</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>MCP</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESG</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>MMU</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>MPF</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBG</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>MPM</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBC</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>RPT</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>SLJ</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBR</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>XPR</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCR</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subj.: subject; C: Catalan; S: Castilian; DL: dominant language; W: well; M: middling; B: badly.

To what extent are these data reliable? This is undoubtedly a difficult question to answer,
although some comments can be made. Generally speaking, the high level of competence in Castilian seems to be fully coherent with Santa Coloma's sociolinguistic environment. Results for Catalan are perhaps less credible, for they seem suspiciously high as we will see during the data analysis, especially regarding some cases where observation showed that was not the case.

Several hypotheses could be forwarded to account for these high results regarding language competence. First, this outcome may be a consequence of the need to save face in a school where Catalan was the medium of instruction. Second, it could be attributed to the emphasis put during the test presentation on aspects related to communicative abilities in opposition to accuracy aspects. It is not impossible that the very way to explain the questions gave the idea that accuracy was marginal to self evaluation. Finally, there exists the possibility that the three options for the answers were not adequate: one of them ('badly') was perhaps too negative for the subjects' self-esteem, and probably it was systematically avoided due to this connotation.

### III Subjects' variety according to the teachers

A second way to assess the subjects' competence in Catalan and Castilian was that of having it evaluated by other independent judges. Three teachers (Mab, Eva, Cel) who had recently taught or were currently teaching the subjects, and were consequently familiar with them, were required to describe and evaluate the subjects' spoken Catalan and Castilian. One of them was very familiar with both groups, for she had taught both in the previous years, while the other two were teaching them at the time of the investigation. A number of biases are to be expected here: teachers probably knew some subjects better than others, felt pushed to overestimate their own pupils' competence, and maybe failed to distinguish between school-related and non-school-related linguistic abilities, among other factors. On the other hand, teachers possessed a knowledge of usually more than one year of daily work with the subjects, implying the direct observation of their linguistic abilities, and were used to comparative evaluations of school-age.

The interviews took place in the teachers' room and in an empty classroom. By means of individual interviews, teachers were first introduced to a number of elements judged relevant to evaluate their pupils' linguistic variety and proficiency. Among these, the degree to which the subjects' speech sounded 'native-like', mastered each language system (phonologic, lexical, morphosyntactic and discoursive levels) and were able to use each language to effectively convey their opinions, their fluency in each language, and language contact phenomena in the subjects' speech.

Each teacher was asked to successively describe each subject's Catalan and Castilian spoken variety, bearing in mind the goal of analysing communicative competence in everyday spoken Catalan and Castilian for informal conversation at the specific age. Generally speaking, these descriptions emphasised phonemic aspects, but a range of vocabulary, fluency,
morphosyntactic accuracy, and language contact phenomena (‘interference’) were often named. As expected, describing the subjects’ Catalan was a more painstaking issue than describing their Castilian, for which fewer comments were made, normally pointing to its ‘normality’. Descriptions furnished by the different teachers were combined and eventually reinterpreted as a function of the classification described below, and every child was assigned a Catalan and a Castilian variety. Once the teacher had described the subjects’ variety, they were asked whether the child was dominant in any language or rather a balanced bilingual. Dominant language was defined to teachers as that in which the child would spontaneously prefer to express himself/herself irrespective of addressee.

The classification proposed tries to capture the degree to which a speaker approaches nativeness in each language, and is thus a competence scale, but it also takes into account the fact that the two languages in a number of varieties have coexisted in Barcelona for a long time, and they have mutually influenced each other. It combines (a) the extent to which a subject masters each linguistic system in their different varieties, (b) subjects’ fluency in each language, and (c) language contact phenomena. It should be regarded as a continuum where stages are interconnected. The classification is based on (a) Teachers’ comments and appreciations, (b) The Junta Permanent de Català and the Consorci per a la Normalització Lingüística criteria to classify language competence, which make a difference between accuracy and fluency, (c) Tusón’s (1985a, b) description of linguistic repertoire in Barcelona, (d) additions felt necessary from other readings and personal experience.

Given the sociolinguistic situation in Santa Coloma de Gramenet, where Castilian is amply known by all the young population, there arose no need to describe a fourth degree for speakers with a weak competence in that language. No such speaker was described by the teachers. It should be noted that the three levels described for Castilian are not exactly equivalent to the three higher levels of Catalan, for the latter stretch across a wider variety of competence than the former. This is of course consistent with sociolinguistic reality: knowledge of Catalan in Santa Coloma ranges from native speaker to absolute ignorance, while knowledge of Castilian only varies along a short scale in the higher ranks of productive competence.

A. Catalan:
1. **Native(-like) speakers**: They master spoken everyday Catalan -at phonologic, morphosyntactic, lexical, discourse, sociolinguistic levels- (irrespective of the dialectal variety) and are able to express themselves at ease in this language for their age. They would be considered native speakers by (other) native speakers.

2. **Proficient in Catalan**: They display a high control of everyday spoken Catalan, but with some phonetic, lexical, morphosyntactic, etc., traces that make them sound different from ordinary native speakers. Nevertheless, they manage to speak the language at ease in informal
conversations. Other native speakers may regard them as either speakers of heavily Castilianized Catalan varieties or as very competent non-native speakers.

3. **Sufficient in Catalan**: They are competent speakers of Catalan as a second language, but clearly Castilian-dominant, with more, and more serious errors than those of 2 and, generally speaking, fewer linguistic resources. They are obviously non-native speakers.

4. **Deficient in Catalan**: They are clearly non-native speakers and heavily dominant in Castilian. They often experience hesitation, doubt and self-correction, which represents a difficulty to keep discourse moving on. They often switch to Castilian to express their thoughts and make themselves understood.

B. Castilian:

1. **Native(-like) speakers**: They master spoken everyday Castilian -phonologic, morphosintactic, lexical, discourse, sociolinguistic level- and are able to express themselves at ease in this language for their age (irrespective of the dialectal variety). They are native-like speakers -or they could be regarded as so- and do not need to switch to Catalan to express themselves.

2. **Proficient in Castilian**: Though they display a high control of everyday spoken Castilian, these speakers cannot get rid of a number of features (mostly phonemic) that reflect Catalan as their first language. Nevertheless, they do not need to switch to Catalan to express themselves.

3. **Sufficient in Castilian**: Despite their capacity to partake in a conversation in Castilian, they display a number of phonetic, morphosyntactic, lexical and discourse errors which go beyond (2) and are common and systematic. They experience hesitation, doubt and self-correction which represent a (small) difficulty to speak the language, and may feel pushed to switch to Catalan to make themselves understood. They are clearly non-native speakers.

There were few discrepancies between teachers’ opinions. In cases of contradictory answers, two procedures were followed: (a) if possible, the intermediate option was adopted, and (b) a third teacher was consulted for dubious cases.
Table 4.20a. Subjects linguistic competence in Catalan (C) and Castilian (S), and linguistic dominance (LD) according to their teachers, and family linguistic group (FLG). Fifth grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ss</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>FLG</th>
<th>Ss</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>FLG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>JCV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>JEO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>JRG</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>JRS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>MFV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NCP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NMF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>SCP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>SFB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>VGO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>XMS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>ZMR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.20b. Subjects linguistic competence in Catalan (C) and Castilian (S), and linguistic dominance (LD) according to their teachers, and family linguistic group (FLG). Eighth grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ss</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>FLG</th>
<th>Ss</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>FLG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>JCR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>JLL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>MCP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>MCP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>MMU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>MPF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>MPM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>RPT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>SLJ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>XPR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results do not mean that teachers considered their subjects' linguistic abilities as 'satisfactory' from the school point of view. They insisted that subjects used much slang, and even complained that this slang was almost identical in Castilian and Catalan. Teachers pointed
out that many of their subjects’ Castilian showed Andalusian features such as implosive /s/ aspiration. Some subjects (especially Ncp and Mcp, two sisters) were praised for their nice - probably meaning standard- languages.

Table 4.20 a and b yields two rather different images for Catalan and Castilian. No active monolingual in either language was detected, as expected from a Catalan school placed in Santa Coloma de Gramenet, although a number of subjects in fifth grade were described as having serious problems with their Catalan. In fact, the subjects’ Catalan stretched across a wide range of varieties where native speakers coexisted with poor L2 speakers. One of the teachers called attention to the fact that one of the classes (fifth) had had a Castilian native-speaking teacher who him/herself should be placed in stage 3 of Catalan, in their early grades, and that s/he had deeply influenced even Catalan native speakers’ speech.

In comparison to the variegated panorama offered by Catalan, Castilian offers smaller differences between subjects. Only one subject (Jcv) was pointed out as having some difficulties to express himself in this language, and these were described as minor, while all the others were either native(-like) or had ‘some accent’.

When linguistic group (FLG) is taken into account, some conclusions can be drawn: Catalan (i.e., subjects whose family language group was Catalan, or FLG = C) subjects were mostly classified as C = 1 and S = 2, although some S = 1 were recorded. Bilingual subjects (i.e., FLG = B) oscillated between C = 1, 2 and S = 1, 2. Castilian speakers (i.e., FLG = S), on their side, were predominantly C = 2, 3 -although some C = 1 did appear- and S = 1. At least for Catalan and Bilingual subjects, classification as either C = 1 or 2 was not directly connected with COFI (cf. table 4.20 a and b).
4.5.5 The self-declared overall use of bilingual repertoire: the 'Social Usage of Catalan questionnaire'

I Procedure

The *Social Usage of Catalan Questionnaire*, answered by the pupils themselves at the end of the school year, was intended to evaluate the subjects' daily usage of their bilingual repertoire from their own point of view, i.e., in the categories and terms they felt more significant. The questionnaire was distributed by the researcher and consisted of a small heading for identification followed by 8 columns and 20 rows (see appendix 4). The subjects were told to list 20 people they considered to be the most important in their daily lives because of the frequency and intensity of relationship. All domains of daily life were admitted, including family, school, out-of-school activities, week-end friends, etc. Every row was designed to contain one single person. In the first column, subjects were to write down the person's Christian name. The 4 following columns were intended to contain a categorisation of how the subjects regarded their relationship with that person: *conegut* 'acquaintance', *familiar* 'family', *amic* 'friend', and *millor amic* 'best friend'. The sixth column permitted to describe the relationship in the subject's terms (e.g. 'tae-kwon-do classmate', 'aunt', 'a friend of my parents', etc.). Finally, two columns were reserved for language use: what language the subject believed he or she spoke with that person, and what language the person used to speak to him or her. The questionnaire was answered by all subjects, although two had to be eventually discarded due to irregularities.

There existed no restriction in the sort of people who could be included in the questionnaire. This was a purposeful decision: the goal of this questionnaire was to allow the subjects to evaluate their relationships according to their significance in the subjects' life, and not in the researcher's predetermined view such as in the *Family Language Use* questionnaire. Indeed, the answers included a variegated sort of relationships. Some subjects, especially in fifth grade, included many relatives, while others, especially in eighth grade, forgot to mention even their parents and siblings and only mentioned their friends or sport-mates' friends. On some occasions, people cited did not even live in Santa Coloma but were visited in summer and seemed to play a major role in the subject's life. The school played also a variable role in the answers: for some subjects, class-mates represented most of their relationships, while for others achieved little significance. In a number of cases, teachers were included in the table.

The columns designed to classify the subjects according to the intensity of relationship were finally not included in the analyses, but deserve a special comment. These columns were intended to reflect the multiplex nature of some relationships (e.g. 'cousin' and 'best friend', opposed to simply 'cousin'; 'class-mate' and 'friend', opposed to 'street friend' and 'class-mate').

53These were Dla and Scp's questionnaires. Dla's answers were discarded because he answered by systematically attributing Catalan to one language column and Castilian to the other for the same person up to a certain point, and, then, he inverted the answers. Scp was not present during the questionnaire session and could not be reached afterwards.
The analysis of the answers proved that the subjects -especially fifth-graders- experienced difficulties in grasping these concepts and had irregularly answered them: some subjects listed up to 20 'best friends', others attributed the categories 'acquaintance' and 'best friend' to the same subject, etc. Therefore, this sort of data was finally discarded from the analysis.

The results obtained from the Social Usage of Catalan Questionnaire were introduced in a data-basis and tabulated according to the following criteria: Catalan was given a score = 1; Catalan and other languages = 0.5\textsuperscript{54}; Other languages than Catalan = 0. Results for columns 7 and 8 were summed up and divided by 20 to obtain a new index, the Social Usage of Catalan Index (SUCI), with two different versions, productive usage (SUCI-P) and receptive usage (SUCI-R).

\textbf{II \hspace{1cm} Self-declared language use: overall results}

The results from the Social Usage of Catalan Questionnaire allow to have a first idea of how the subjects see their own communicative behaviour.

\textsuperscript{54}Only three subjects included languages other than Catalan and Castilian: Ncp and Mcp, two sisters, mentioned several French-speaking relatives, while Ead indicated that she spoke Galician to some cousins.
Table 4.21. Productive Social Usage of Catalan Index.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects’ SUCI(P)</th>
<th>Subjects’ SUCI(P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fifth grade</strong></td>
<td><strong>Eighth grade</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP 0.40</td>
<td>ACB 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOS 0.05</td>
<td>ANA 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCV 0.65</td>
<td>ARC 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGS 0.08</td>
<td>DGG 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA ***</td>
<td>EAD 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBG 0.13</td>
<td>ESG 0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJC 0.30</td>
<td>FAR 0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL 0.25</td>
<td>GBG 0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGB 0.05</td>
<td>ICE 0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSG 0.00</td>
<td>JBC 0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGB 0.00</td>
<td>JBL 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAA 0.00</td>
<td>JBR 0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCE 0.35</td>
<td>JCR 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCV 1.00</td>
<td>JLL 0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEO 0.05</td>
<td>JMS 0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRG 1.00</td>
<td>MCG 0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRS 0.13</td>
<td>MCP 0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP 0.10</td>
<td>MMU 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFV 0.10</td>
<td>MPM 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCP 0.55</td>
<td>RPT 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMF 0.35</td>
<td>SLJ 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCP ****</td>
<td>XPR 0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFB 0.18</td>
<td>XPR 0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGO 0.05</td>
<td>XMS 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZMR 1.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comparison between productive and receptive usage of Catalan showed that no difference existed between both in a majority of cases, and discrepancies were small in the cases where they did exist (cf. appendix 4). For some subjects, their productive usage of Catalan was smaller than their receptive usage. They all were in 5th grade: Dgs, Fgb, Jeo, Map, Zmr. Conversely, a handful of subjects believed their productive use of Catalan was slightly over their merely receptive use: Erl, Jrs, in 5th grade, and Far, Mcp, Mp in eighth grade. In any case, differences were small and will be not taken into consideration. From now on, I will only refer to productive usage of Catalan.
Two features may well describe these results: (a) the overwhelming predominance of Castilian, and (b) its remarkable internal heterogeneity. Out of 47, 13 (27.66%) among them did not declare any relationship at all in Catalan, and for 22 (46.80%) other subjects relationships in Catalan did not achieve one third of the total. Only 12 subjects (25.31%) declared to have more than one third of their relationships in Catalan, and only 4 (8.51%) had more than two thirds of their relationships in that language.

One of these last cases, Jrg constitutes a clear case of distorted perception of one's own usage. Despite his good level of competence in Catalan, observational research showed that Jrg hardly used little Catalan with his class-mates and friends. Nevertheless, he declared to behave monolingually in Catalan with them. This seems to be a clear case of a subject trying to please the researcher and to save face.

The inclusion of teachers in some answers raised the question of to what point their presence was relevant as an encouragement to the active use of Catalan, for almost all subjects declared to speak Catalan with them. Therefore, teachers were removed from the results and a new score was obtained, the Productive Social Usage of Catalan without teachers Indexes. Table 22 and Graph 4.3 show that this was not the most common case, although some results were indeed modified.
Table 4.22: Productive Social Usage of Catalan Indexes without teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub.SUCTI(P)</th>
<th>Sub.SUCTI(P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fifth grade</td>
<td>Eighth grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP</td>
<td>ACB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOS</td>
<td>ANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCV</td>
<td>ARC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGS</td>
<td>DGG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA</td>
<td>EAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBG</td>
<td>ESG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJC</td>
<td>FAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>GBG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGB</td>
<td>ICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSG</td>
<td>JBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGB</td>
<td>JBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAA</td>
<td>JBR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCE</td>
<td>JCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCV</td>
<td>JLL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEO</td>
<td>JMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRG</td>
<td>MCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRS</td>
<td>MCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>MMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFV</td>
<td>MPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCP</td>
<td>RPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMF</td>
<td>SLJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCP</td>
<td>XPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZMR</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 14 questionnaires resulted modified by the suppression of teachers from the scores. These modifications always consisted of the reduction in the amount of Catalan being used, a result that supports the assumption that teachers promote the usage of Catalan. Nevertheless, only one subject out of these 14 experienced a very significant change (Jms, who moved down 0.45 points), while 5 lost between 0.1 and 0.2 points (Jll, Mcg, Sfb, Gbg, Jbc). All the others presented a difference of less than 0.1. Therefore, the overall weight of teachers in the subjects' linguistic behaviour does not seem to be as decisive as one could have guessed, for they do not occupy a significant space in the subjects' 20 prioritary relationships, and their suppression does not dramatically modify the general picture.
### III Monolingual and bilingual relationships

Self-declared data clearly support the assumption that subjects conceived of a majority of their relationships as taking place in a single language, for a great majority of the relationships cited by the subjects (more than 93%) used exclusively either Castilian or Catalan. Only slightly over 7% of the subjects' relationships were said not to have a single unmarked language. Table 4.23 shows the different linguistic patterns obtained by means of the Social Usage questionnaire: bilingual relationships are defined as those where more than one language is used, while monolingual relationships are those for which a single language was chosen. Bilingual conversations can be classified according to the combination of languages in use: one interlocutor speaks Catalan and the other Castilian (C-S); one interlocutor speaks Catalan and Castilian, the other only Castilian; both interlocutors speak both languages; and one interlocutor speaks Catalan and Castilian and the other interlocutor speaks just Catalan. Each subject (Sub) is classified according to Family linguistic group (FLG) as either Catalan (C), Castilian (S) or Bilingual (B). (see annexe 4.6 for the individual details).

Table 4.23. Number and sort of declared relationships in each language. Absolute and relative frequencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages used by the interlocutors</th>
<th>Number of relationships</th>
<th>Relative frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only Catalan</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>17.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Castilian</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>75.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dla and Scp excluded.

Relationships in which both subjects did not converge towards the same language (or language combination), were practically unexistent. Less than 2% of all relationships were described as following such a pattern. A larger amount of relationships were described as not having a clearly unmarked language (5.42%) for either interlocutor.
Is there any connexion between use of Catalan and an increase in the number of bilingual relationships, i.e., may we say that the more relationships one has in Catalan, the more one has simultaneously in both languages at expenses of Castilian? Is it rather the other way round? Or are bilingual relationships independent of the language(s) used for the rest of relationships?

The analysis of correlations shows that neither positive nor negative correlation can be claimed from this data, for all of them reach insignificant results

\[
\begin{align*}
C-C \text{ and } C/S-C/S: & \quad r = 0.0084 \\
S-S \text{ and } C/S-C/S: & \quad r = 0.0316
\end{align*}
\]

Therefore, no explicit connexion can be assumed between use of Catalan (or Castilian) and the existence of relationships in which no language can be said to be unmarked for one or both subjects.

4.5.6 Synthesis: the sample's self-reported sociolinguistic make-up

Results from the Social Usage of Catalan questionnare yield a general image of the subjects' linguistic behaviour. Several generalizations can be made at this point.

First, according to self-reported data, Castilian overwhelmingly dominates as the most common language of daily interaction. It is used for a majority of interactions by most subjects, and its is spoken in at least one dyadic relationship of most subjects.

Second, despite the predominance of Castilian, the sample includes a remarkable variety of linguistic behaviours, ranging from Castilian monolingual use, quite widespread among the subjects, to Catalan monolingual use, a pattern seemingly limited to one or two subjects. Between both poles, all sorts of combinations introduce several modalites of bilingual uses.

Third, this bilingual usage does not seem to imply a large amount of code-switching or bilingual conversation: only a small minority of all interactions (around 7%) are regarded by speakers themselves as not being produced in a single, unmarked language.

Finally, Catalan and bilingual speakers seem to behave in a comparable way with regard to patterns of language choice. Their behaviour is significantly different from that of Castilian speakers.
4.5.7 Core subjects

I Subjects selection

A sample of sixteen subjects was selected to form the core subjects, i.e., those who would receive preferential attention during the research. To select the core group, subjects were first distributed in different groups according to their sex, course, and family language group. Once distributed, one member of each group (two in the case of Castilian-speakers) was randomly selected. The final selection is shown in table 4.25.

Table 4.25. Initial core subjects family linguistic group, sex and school year. Ordered by grade, family linguistic group and sex.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subj</th>
<th>FLG</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Subj</th>
<th>FLG</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JCV</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ESG</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBG</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>JBC</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCV</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>GBG</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFB</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ACB</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZMR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEO</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>MCP</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No fifth grade Catalan-speaking girl was included among core-subjects, for none was present in that class. Dla was initially selected as the representative for bilingual, male fifth-graders, but he turned out to be very reluctant to collaborate and was finally replaced by Dcv.

The original purpose of having this sample selected was that of ensuring the presence of speech samples from all possible groups in the classes studied. All core-subjects were asked to carry the tape-recorder personally and none refused. Nevertheless, as will become evident during the discussion of results, this did not guarantee the core-subjects’ presence in the recordings, neither did it imply that non core-subjects were excluded from them. Presence in and absence from the recordings depended more on the subjects’ sociability, talkativeness, or even their mood the day they were assigned the tape-recorder, than in their having been selected as core-subjects. In fact, these initial core subjects acted as alternative paths to access the whole class, since recordings from quiet core-subjects usually contained more data from talkative non-core-subjects than from the former.

Thus, the subjects who appear more often in the recordings are not necessarily those selected in the first place. Here I offer a short description of the most frequent subjects irrespective of their being initially considered core-subjects or not. Some of the data come from direct observation.
and personal conversation with each subject, sometimes recorded, sometimes not. Others were obtained through talks with teachers; these were not usually recorded. Finally, a short number of interviews were held with some subjects’ parents in order to gather extra data about their children.

II The subjects’ main features

A relevant point regarding all subjects is that despite the fact that these children had been educated in a progressive school, they nevertheless reflected their rather low original sociocultural milieu and often displayed patterns of behaviour which, though expected within their out-of-school social context, became discouraging for their teachers. Male-chauvinistic behaviour is an excellent example here. The school teachers, most of whom were especially sensitive against gender-discrimination, invested much effort in fighting sexist prejudices and insisted on equality between genders both as a theoretical concept and in practical terms. As an example, teachers insisted on combining boys and girls both in classroom and sports activities. Nevertheless, pupils’ spontaneous behaviour was unmistakably tinged by the male-chauvinistic values which predominated in their out-of-school environment. Several instances are at hand here, as the joking comments made by some fifth-grade boys regarding the possibility that they should go on a trip with girls sitting on their laps (text d); the story about peering into women's showers explained by Far and Jll (text n); or Jbc's spontaneous reference to gays by using the derogatory term marica ‘queer’ in text (text n) in front of Eva, a feminist teacher. Male and female roles were clearly established by the mainstream society, and school action could do little to modify it. It is not by chance that martial arts were astonishingly popular among male pupils: not less than a dozen subjects practised or had practised tae-kwon-do in the past, and the pupils in general seemed acquainted with the vocabulary of some martial arts. On the other hand, girls practised other sports, such as swimming and ballet.

a. Fifth-grade: Fifth-graders were between 10-11 years old at the time of the fieldwork. As a group, they were seen as rather noisy but still docile, and not at all problematic. As far as association goes, they were not definitely divided along gender lines, although they showed a clear preference for peers of the same sex and often argued when forced to play together in the physical education class. Girls formed closely knit groups, sitting together whenever possible in class and gathering in leisure time, for they shared the same interests: chatting about their own secrets and playing "girls’ games" such as volleyball, while boys preferred playing football. In fact, different preferences were a major subject of dispute, for their teacher insisted in their playing together, while girls, who were in the minority, complained that it was always boys who decided the games. Two major groups could be distinguished among girls, while groups were not as clearly defined among boys. These groups, especially in the girls' case,  

55It is also true that one of the girls wanted to play such a 'male sport' as football; nevertheless, they constituted a small minority in front of the great majority of female mates who rejected that sport.
exerted considerable peer-pressure in order to attain conformity to the group, sometimes even in overt terms. As an instance, peer-pressure between girls managed to impose the choice of Castilian as the language of interaction during the interview with the researcher on a hesitant Erl despite the fact that he stuck to Catalan (cf. section 5.3.7).

The first group was formed by Zmr, Sfb, Map and Ncp; Erl often joined them. They were intensely linked to each other, to the point that they used some terms of kinship to express themselves: they called each other 'tata', a childish term for 'sister', and also managed to declare their younger brothers and sisters novios (boyfriend and girlfriend), so that they could consider themselves sisters-in-laws with each other. This was a definitely close-knit, multiplex network. The second major group was formed by Ead, Map, Vgo, Nmf, Scp. As a group, they were more mature and their links were looser.

Boys did not gather in comparably close-knit groups, but in looser networks, such as that formed by Dcv, Fsg, Jaa, Jeo, Xms, in the centre and Amp, Aos, Dla, Igs, Jrs at its periphery.

A slight but growing difference between boys and girls was already detectable: boys were 'children' and naive in most senses, although they pretended on occasions to be fully grown-up. A number of girls (e.g. Ead, Mfv or Ncp) were remarkably more mature, both physically and intellectually. These girls contrasted with some other, still immature girls such as Map, Sfb or Zmr.

From an academic point of view, some of their previous teachers seemed not to have been as demanding as their current instructor. Pupils were said to be lagging behind their expected level by the teacher, and they complained about the homework they had to do. In fact, children were more probably resenting the change which the increasing burden of intermediate and higher school cycles represented.

Some of the most frequently recorded fifth-graders are:

**DCV:** a native bilingual, he was a smart, talkative boy, bright and impulsive at school. His family owned a small apartment in a colònia obrera, an abandoned village created in the nineteenth century for textile workers, in the Bergadà, a heavily Catalan dominant comarca (county) in central Catalonia. His parents were personally rearranging the apartment to make it inhabitable again, and they spent many week-ends and holidays there.

**EBG:** a rather talkative girl, she came from a bilingual family according to her self-declared behaviour; in fact, her parents were both Castilian-native speakers, although her father, who worked at a small stationery store close to the city centre, seemed to address her in Catalan with some frequency. She expressed strong sentimental links with her mother's family in the Castilian-speaking region of La Rioja, which she visited in summer.
ERL: one of the brightest pupils in fifth-grade, she had been transferred from another school some years ago and was therefore not eligible for the sample. A quiet, reflexive girl, she spoke Catalan with reasonable fluidity and made frequent use of it.

JCV: a Catalan speaker, Jcv was considered lazy and slow in reflexes by his teachers. Slightly fat, he associated mostly with Fgb and Jce. Although he seemed to be on good terms with Dcv, he did not associate with Dcv's group on a regular basis. He had relatives in the countryside and visited them very often.

JEO: a native Castilian speaker, very dominant in this language and with a strong Andalusian accent. He seemed to be quite at ease in Santa Coloma's streets, where he spent part of his leisure time with friends. Although lively and vivacious, this did not become apparent until some months of observation had passed, for he was shy in front of adults. He spent part of his holidays in Andalusia and part in a camping site in Catalonia.

MAP: a strongly Castilian dominant subject, she was skinny but extremely vivacious. Her closest friends were Zmr and Ebg. She used to go on holidays to her terreno, i.e., a house or apartment in the countryside in Catalonia itself, but she did not seem to associate with Catalan-speaking children there.

SFB: an active and cheerful girl, Scb was the most Andalusian of all subjects. Her parents had been born in the same Andalusian village in Seville, where she spent most of her holidays. She was able to switch back and forth from a heavily Andalusian accented variety, which she spoke quite often for fun with remarkable success, to the more standard Castilian variety which was her customary language. She liked sports and went regularly to the swimming-pool with Ebg.

XMS: a Castilian native speaker, dominant in this language and with serious weaknesses in his Catalan competence, from time to time he had to ask his friends for translation of rather common words (e.g. on one occasion he did not understand *hi vas* 'you go there' -cf. French *tu y vas*). He was witty and mischievous, with little interest in anything but having a good time, which he seemed to manage both at school and outside. He spent part of his holidays in his terreny in Hostalric, a city in the heavily Catalan-dominant province of Girona.

ZMR: a Castilian dominant subject, she avoided speaking Catalan by all means, to the extent that it was impossible to make her say a whole utterance in that language. A rather bossy character, she enjoyed a certain leadership among friends and class-mates, especially among her circle of girl friends. Notwithstanding her reluctance to speak Catalan, she was one of the brightest pupils in class, and she managed to get the highest marks with the minimal verbal exchange with the teachers.
b. Eighth grade: Eighth-graders were in their teens (13-14) and were in the final grade in the school system; some of them (Jbc, Ice, Mpf, etc.) reacted by patronizing attitudes towards the rest of pupils in the school. Eighth-graders formed different groups that often ignored and despised each other. These groups were not divided along gender or linguistic lines; rather, personal affinity seemed to be more important. A number of them were in couples. The principal groups could be described as follows:

The group comprised of Far, Jbc, Jbl and Jll was that of the outcasts, the 'outlaws', as Jbc himself put it. They were frequently involved with minor hooliganism. Mostly of a working class origin, these boys were failing in their studies and had already decided to either repeat eighth grade in a different school or to go for vocational education. While they were not necessarily violent, their verbal interaction was often loaded with aggressive comments.

A second group was formed by a number of girls who were very bright but kept a low profile in class, avoiding being noticed; these being Esg, Mcp, Ead, Gbg. They hardly spoke in class, not even to each other, and when they did, it was usually in a very low voice. They did not explicitly avoid boys, and were on good terms with some of them, but male class-mates were clearly not their preferred companions, although exceptions existed: Esg sympathised strongly with Ice, and both spent some time together. These girls were lower-middle class or middle class, and desired to pursue their studies up to university.

A third group was formed by a number of male and female pupils: Ana, Dgg, Ice, Jbr, Jms and Mcg, among others. They formed a loose network which could either incorporate new elements from other groups, such as Mcp, Esg, or just dissolve into other smaller units. They strongly disliked Acb, whom they regarded as foolish, presumptuous and 'easy' with boys.

The fact that groups were looser than in fifth grade does by no means imply that subjects did not exert peer-pressure. When deemed necessary, subjects enforced common norms by means of covert or even overt reference to aspects seen as inappropriate. Two examples are linked with physical appearance and presentation of self. The first one involves Jll, a subject with a rather careless appearance who was often made fun of by his classmates, especially Jbc and Ice. They referred to him as the miserable 'miserable', and reproached his dirtiness and lack of variety in dressing, although chances are that these were caused by sheer economic precarity. Another example proves how strict normative criteria were imposed by peer-group pressure. One day in May, Ana showed up in class wearing a black, translucent shirt and white bra. This was becoming fashionable among young girls in some metropolitan peripheral areas by that time, and girls dressed in such a way were rather common, but Ana's classmates' reaction was almost furious. They surrounded her in the playground and, vociferating, called her a whore with a rich variety of synonyms for her being dressed in such a way. After that, and visibly shocked, Ana went to pick up her jacket and wore it during the rest of the day.
The most commonly recorded subjects in eighth grade were:

**ANA**: a family bilingual, Ana was one of the most convivial pupils in eighth grade. She not only associated with most class-mates, but was also on excellent terms with most staff, with whom she allowed herself to joke. A responsible character, her bossy ways made other class-mates sometimes call her 'mum' and 'sergent'.

**ACB**: a Castilian-speaking female pupil, she liked associating with male class-mates and she presumed to be extremely pretty. Talkative and open, she associated with Slj.

**ESG**: a Catalan-speaker, she was very tall, shy, and extremely reluctant to talk. In fact, she only spoke with a small number of friends, and even with them she preferred not to lead the conversation. She associated especially with some other girls (Gbg, Mcp, Ead) and was a close friend of Ice. She was the child of a separated couple and lived with her mother in Santa Coloma, while her father lived in Barcelona.

**FAR**: the child of a linguistically mixed couple which had split some years before, Far and his brother -who attended the same school- had been taken away from their mother and enrolled in a public institution for abandoned children, where they were living at the moment of this research, and which according to several sources was (almost) completely Castilian-speaking in its composition. Far had surprisingly maintained Catalan as the language of interaction with his brother, though all his friends seemed to be Castilian speakers. He nevertheless defined himself as a Catalan. Far was very short, physically underdeveloped for his age, but an experienced knower of Santa Coloma street life, where he seemed to have spent many hours hanging around with a number of friends. He was seen as a disruptive element in the class.

**GBG**: bilingual, talkative and still childish for her age in her behaviour at the time of the fieldwork, Gbg was one of the most open girls in the classroom. She looked fragile and wore braces. Gbg practiced ballet and declared that she adored all sorts of dancing.

**ICE**: a native Castilian speaker himself, Ice’s family came from Valencia. This family seemed to have shifted from Castilian to Catalan as the family language between Ice's birth and that of Jce, his younger brother. Ice declared himself strongly Catalan nationalist and independentist, and he resented the fact that so many ‘Andalusians’ came and took jobs from ‘us, Catalans’. His derogatory comments about ‘Andalusians’ were extended to other ethnic groups such as French, which he insisted in calling by means of the derogatory term ‘gavatxo’.

**JBC**: A Catalan-speaker and child of a linguistically mixed couple formed by a member of the original community (his grand-father was employed in agriculture in Santa Coloma de Gramenet) and an Andalusian immigrant who had integrated linguistically and culturally into Santa Coloma's Catalan-speaking population. Jbc defined himself as a Catalan, but this fact
seemed to be a given more than a problem of any sort. According to his mother, he sometimes claimed they should all leave Santa Coloma de Gramenet and move somewhere else, for the city is 'full of Castilians'. Nevertheless, this seemed to be more in relation to his own personal problems at school than with any strong ethnic identity, since most of his closest friends were Castilian speakers, and he kept strong links with his Castilian-speaking relatives (grand-parents, aunts, uncles and cousins in Igualada, a not too distant city). Jbc was considered a trouble-maker by the teaching staff, and often punished for his behaviour. He was said to control and dominate some of his class-mates to the point of using them as his personal servants, especially Jcr (called esclavo 'slave' from time to time). One teacher described him as a guy who would 'throw the stone and hide the hand', as the saying goes. Jbc was accused of repeated misbehaviour during the year and the school board denied him permission to go with his class-mates to Majorca on a final term trip.

**JCR**: a Castilian-speaker, he was the class lame. Overweight, clumsy, and not especially brilliant from an intellectual point of view, he was overtly despised even by the shiest girls. His Catalan was surprisingly deficient, with occasional elementary mistakes and abnormal language mixtures (e.g., use of sacar, quitar-se instead of Cat. sortir 'to quit, to leave') which gave his class-mates extra ammunition to ridicule him. Nevertheless, he endured his disadvantaged role and struggled to be accepted.

**JMS**: a native Catalan speaker and descendental of the autochtonous inhabitants of Santa Coloma despite the fact that, from a physical point of view, he fitted the Southern Spanish stereotype (dark skin, dark hair). He did not share his friend Ice’s strong xenophobic opinions, although he did share his political views about the necessity that the Catalan Countries became an independent, sovereign nation-state. Jms was one the brightest students in the class.

**MCG**: A Castilian-speaker, he was an intelligent but reserved pupil who kept a distance with the researcher during most of the field-work. Although very short and childish in his appearance for his age, Mcg was witty and intellectually more mature than the average. His family came originally from Andalusia.

**MCP**: the child of a Catalan-French mixed couple who spoke Castilian among themselves, and Catalan and French respectively to the children, Mcp felt uncertain about her personal identity. Together with her parents and sister (Ncp, in fifth grade), she spent long periods in France with her grand-mother and other relatives and was conversant in French. She declared to feel Catalan rather than French, since she was living in Catalonia. Her parents were probably the ones with the highest social status in the class, for he hold a job at the university, although it never became clear what sort of job exactly. They were comparatively demanding with their children, and, probably trying to preserve them from unsavory foreign influences, did not allow them to go out with their class mates but on rare occasions. Both Mcp and Ncp were extremely talented in their classes, and they by far used the most standard variety of Catalan.
4.6 Data treatment

4.6.1 Transcribing data: general aspects

Tapes were transcribed according to a simplified version of the system proposed by Payrató (n.d.) and followed the same treatment as the texts included in the Corpus de Català de la Universitat de Barcelona (CUB). Transcription was normally done in three phases: First, tapes were transcribed on a word processor (WP 5.2) and a preliminary, coarse version was elaborated which included the easiest aspects to transcribe. This version was then corrected and supplemented during a second phase which included a revision of transcribing symbols and conventions.

At this stage, the texts were transformed into a data-base (Fox-Pro) thanks to a programme produced by Dr. De Yzaguirre for the CUB project. This programme breaks down each text into independent records -in this case, one record for every utterance-, and attributes each sort of information -basically, speaker and text- to different fields.

A third, final revision of accuracy was carried out simultaneously with the codification of texts. Codification consisted in the incorporation of codes for each phenomenon I wanted to analyse for every utterance (i.e., each record). A second transcriber helped me in this phase. Codes were added for language of the utterance, presence of transcodic markers and sort of marker, addressee, etc.

The Transcription System of the Department of Catalan Philology, Universitat de Barcelona (Payrató, n.d.) which, in a simplified and slightly modified version, was used here, is largely based on the criteria presented by Du Bois et al. (1991). Its major advantages are simplicity and the possibility to (a) exchange my data and (b) analyse data at the computer center. The most important conventions one needs to know to read these transcriptions are:

1. Each line contains an utterance,
2. Each subject is coded with three letters; there are codes for unidentified speakers as well (those containing 'k', such as Nkuk, Nka, etc.). Speakers are coded in the first column. When considered necessary, addressees are listed in a second column.
3. The basic codes for transcription are:
   a. Final intonation: \_ / (raising, falling, maintained)
   b. Incomprehensible fragments: x per syllable
   xXx uncouned
   c. Best guess: {(??) word}
   d. Pitch: {(F) word} forte, {(FF) fortissimo}
   {(P) word} piano, {(PP) pianissimo}
   e. Voice modified (ironical) {(EV) word}
   f. Sung fragment {(CAN) word}
g. Overlapping fragments:  
   Abc: word word [word]  
   Jbc: [word] word

h. Pauses:  
   (...)one to two seconds.  
   (...)two to three seconds  
   (4), (19), (23) more than 3".

i. Lengthening:  
   word: wo:rd wo::rd

j. Laughing:  
   @ @@ @@@

k. Split conversation  
   (two simultaneous conversations)  
   "<2>

l. Aspiration or assimilation of /s/  
   (s')

4. Comments are always bracketed: if phonemic transcriptions, they are transcribed as (/xxxx/). If just contextual or other comments, they are transcribed between double brackets.

5. Languages are distinguished by means of letters: bold for Catalan, standard for Castilian, italics for fragments of dubious attribution, underlined for English.

4.6.2 Defining transcription units

Conversation is by no means a hazardous juxtaposition of syntactic units, but rather a highly organized communicative activity structured on a number of units.

"One of the most striking, if elusive, features of conversation is its division into recognizable units at various levels." (Du Bois et al., 1991: 17)

The choice for a given unit as the basis for a transcription must primordially rest upon research goals, and should thus combine theoretical and practical considerations (Du Bois et al., 1991: 12-15). A minimum of three major linguistic units above the word level are available for the transcription of spoken discourse: intonation units, utterances and speech-turns.

Intonation unit is the smallest division proposed, and it is widely used in studies concerned with the study of interaction from an ethnomethodological or conversational standpoint.

"Roughly speaking, an intonation unit is a stretch of speech uttered under a single coherent intonation contour. It tends to be marked by cues such as a pause and a shift upward in overall pitch level at its beginning, and a lengthening of its final syllable." (Du Bois et al., 1991: 17)

Intonation units were judged inadequate for this research due to a number of reasons. First, no overall conversational analysis was intended. Second, intonation units may turn out relevant in communities where rapid intrasentential code-switching is a common feature. In the present case, identification would have been excessively time-consuming and would have reported little benefit, for, as will become evident during the data analysis, the subjects produced very few intrasentential code-switches. As a consequence, there existed little need to descend to
such a narrow degree of transcription. Hence intonation units were only distinguished in broad terms by means of final intonational symbols (i.e., \_/ \_).

On the other hand, speech turn proved too broad a unit for my purposes. A significant percentage of the transcribed interactions included more than two participants, often in vivid discussion, which means that a single speech turn frequently consists of utterances addressed to different people (e.g., the teacher and a class-mate). In a speech community where language choice and code-switching often function as addressee-specification, this constituted a fundamental disadvantage of speech turn as an analytical tool, for it would have jumbled together a number of linguistic units clearly addressed to different people, increasing the difficulty to study patterns of code-switching. Speech turns offered practical disadvantages as well. Contrary to studies exclusively based on interviews, the interactions transcribed for this study ranged from spontaneous conversation to semi-directed interviews, and included a variety of speech acts: joke telling, cooperation at work, class explanations, etc. Speech turns thus go from monosyllabic back-channels and short utterances made up of not more than three words, to lengthy narrations and explanations of more than one hundred words. Such big differences seem to advise against straight comparisons between one sort of turn and the other. Moreover, frequent overlap and mutual interruptions would have made it often laborious to interpret the transcriptions. As a consequence, turns were discarded as too broad a category.

An intermediate unit was thus needed. Utterance, defined as the "issuance of a sentence, a sentence-analogue, or sentence-fragment, in actual context" (Levinson, 1983: 18) offered a number of advantages with respect to both intonation units and speech turns. It was not such a narrow unit as the former, and thus demanded less effort to be codified, while simultaneously reduced the disparity between speech turns from different speech events (e.g. only a handful of utterances went beyond 150 letters). Therefore, conversation units became more comparable across speech events. Utterance as a unit favoured interpretation of spontaneous conversation and long descriptions alike, and could be attributed a single addressee in many cases. Therefore, utterance was selected as the basic unit for transcription.

While its advantages were diverse, the actual operationalization of the utterance concept becomes strenuous and the object of much controversy, since several criteria such as meaning, syntax, intonation, pauses, etc., may be simultaneously applied with contradictory results (cf. Payrató, 1990: 100; Badia, 1994: 105ff). What constitutes an utterance in practice? In the terms Levinson uses, an utterance is the oral equivalent of a sentence, be it formed by a whole sentence, a sentence fragment or any combination of linguistic units (Levinson, 1983: 18). A problem arises when one has to define what a "sentence-analogue" is, for multiple phenomena may be classified as one or more utterances depending on the criteria adopted. As expected from the analysis of a spoken corpus, my segmentation has been primarily based on discourse and pragmatic reasoning, although other, mostly syntactic criteria, were also considered, and some conventions were also adopted for purely practical reasons. Two principal thumbnail
criteria were taken up in this classification: (a) try to preserve the equivalence 1
sentence(-analogue) = 1 utterance, and (b) not to multiply the number of utterances unnecessarily. Each
utterance was given a record in the data basis. In the examples and transcriptions in the
annexes, each utterance is preceded by its speaker’s acronym.

I  Coordinate and subordinate clauses

The problem posed by coordination and subordination of sentences can be resumed as follows:
while most subordinate clauses do not seem to create serious problems to the identification of
utterances, for they are usually included from all points of view in a common utterance with
their main clause, coordinate complex sentences do pose a number of problems. To what
extent shall we consider that lengthy verbal strings formed by sentences connected by means of
coordinative conjunctions may constitute a single utterance, or should we rather regard them as
successive utterances? Spoken discourse makes much use of these resources in order to
structure conversation, to the point that on some occasions a speech turn can be started with
"and" (see ex. 4.1). The reliance on this syntactic and discursive structure was further increased
by the age of my subjects and the fact that a number of utterances in this study were produced
in their L2 by imbalanced bilinguals who did not fully master discourse connectors in that
language; in these cases, recourse to the simplest strategies, such as systematic coordination,
were even more frequent.

(1)  Dla is given the turn in a debate.
DLA (..) que les nenes sempre juguen a lo que elles volen_
DLA i que a més a més es posaven al mig del camp a a x- a xerrar_
DLA i si li donaven cops de cops de pilota_ i se qu(e)xaven\nDLA (..) nosaltres li diem que per què estaven al mig del camp_
DLA i deien perquè volien_

DLA (..) that girls always play what they want_
DLA And moreover they placed themselves in the middle of the playground to to ch- to chat_
DLA And if someone hit them with a ball_ and they complained_
DLA And they said because they wanted\
(a 117)

(2)  Nmf is given the turn is the debate.
NMF [que: que la Erl ha dit que:::] que mai li passaven li passaven la pilota_
NMF pero a mi tampoc_
NMF i l’he intentat agafar unes quantes vegades_
NMF i la he agafat\nNMF pero si tu no (la) intentes agafar_no pots agafar-la_

NMF [that: that Erl said that:::] that they never passed passed the ball to her_
NMF but neither to me_
NMF and I tried to catch it several times_
NMF and I did catch it\nNMF but if you don’t try to catch (it)_ you can’t catch it\n(a 127)

56Catalan in bold, Castilian in standard characters; see section 4.6.3 for more details.
These and other examples of apparent coordination show to what extent copulative and adversative conjunctions are used for a variety of discourse purposes which make the classification of their functions highly problematic. In order to reduce discrepancies and enhance data comparability, and as a general rule, it was decided that coordinate sentences were to be attributed to different utterances. Subordinate clauses, on the other hand, were not granted independent utterance status.

Limits between coordination and subordination in Catalan and Castilian (as well as in purely theoretical terms) are still not clearly understood (cf. Cuenca, 1988, 1991) and sometimes even denied existence (Badia, 1994: 337). This is further complicated due to the fact that a characteristic of spontaneous spoken language is the frequent resource to juxtaposition. Given the scope of this work, I have opted for a practical operationalization of both concepts on the line suggested by Cuenca (1988, 1991): copulative, disjunctive and adversative relationships have been considered to belong to coordination and therefore deserving independent utterance status, while circumstantial adverbial, substantive and adjective clauses have been attributed to subordination. Non-circumstantial adverbial clauses remain between both poles. They have finally been attributed to subordination and added to their matrix clauses.

Juxtaposed sentences and fragments without a personal verb have been dealt with in the same line: a single utterance for "simple" fragments and whenever a relationship of subordination could be detected, and independent utterances when the relation was one of coordination (cf. Cuenca, 1988: 36ff).

Connected to the distinction between coordination and subordination, there is a frequent feature of spoken Catalan and Castilian, especially when a certain amount of formality comes into play: the juxtaposition of several noun phrases acting as the direct object of a single verb

(3) Preparing an interview.
XVM\textit{Mi m'a\textipa{`}gradaria saber quina és la visió que en teniu}
XVM\textit{que us agrada}
XVM\textit{Mi què no us agra\textipa{`}da de l'escola}

XVM\textit{I'd like to know what's your view on it}
XVM\textit{what you like}
XVM\textit{what you don't like from the school} (w 97)

(4) Laughing at a teachers.
JMS[\textit{5 ara diu} \textit{] que no li agra\textipa{`}da [?? gaire] el fútbol\]
JMS[\textit{[..] que li agra\textipa{`}da molt més} [6 el bàsquet]]

JMS[\textit{5 now he's saying} \textit{he doesn't like football much}\]
JMS[\textit{[..] that he likes [6 basketball] much more}\]
(u 8301)

Contradictory criteria could be forwarded for them to be considered as a single utterances (e.g.
syntactic structure, semantic) or as independent utterances (pauses, intonation). I have dealt with them as if they were coordinate sentences and, therefore, have attributed them to different utterances.

A common construction in both Catalan and Castilian is that of yes/no questions (total interrogative) formulated as the combination of an open question (partial interrogative; e.g. *what do you think?*) and a subordinated clause giving the favoured answer (e.g. *that we should go there*), as in ex. 5; an alternative construction is that of confirmation tags (ex. 6). Both have been considered to belong to a single utterance, for they form a single syntactic, pragmatic and intonation unit.

(5) Discussing about sports in a class debate.
   DCV: Mcv_ tu què creus_ que el futbol el futbol només és de nens/
   DCV: Mcv_ what do you think_ that football is only for boys/
   (a 211)

(6) Asking for information about how to make a puppet.
   JCV: Vosaltres feu el nus_ oí/
   JCV: you boys do the knot_ don’t you/
   (e 3042)

Finally, quotations and fragments of indirect speech may often be seen as direct objects from a syntactic point of view. Nevertheless, their intonational patterns and discursive functions usually cut them off from the verb which introduces them (cf. Badia, 1994: 125). Thus, they have been attributed to an independent utterance.

(7) Explaining how to select a class-mate for doing homework
   JEO: And since: Montse_: (...) is always doing ((sic)) good marks to Amp_ 
   JEO: hey_ this is my opportunity/
   (j 2900)

II Repetitions and self-repairs

A second source of conflict in utterance delimitation was offered by repetitions and self-repairs. It was decided that unless a significant change in meaning (i.e., the production of a significant new "sentence-analogue") was operated, a single utterance should be maintained. Therefore, self-repetitions of fragments of utterances have been included in the complete utterance.

(8) Explaining why Acb had to wear a coat.
   ACB_: I must wear_ I must wear it/
   (r 350)
On the contrary, self-repetitions of whole, complete "sentence-analogues" have been attributed to independent lines.

(9) Trying to know what her classmates are talking about.
NMF de quin tema_
NMF de quin tema_
NMF what topic_
NMF what topic_
(a 367)

(10) Xvm, angry with one of the children.
XVM prou\ mira_ s'ha acabat\nXVM s'ha acabat\nXVM stop\ look_ that's enough\nXVM that's enough\n(j 2734)

**Self-repairs** imply the reformulation of some elements. They may take place at any site in the utterance and be caused by various reasons. When they appear at the beginning of the utterance, they usually imply its abandonment and complete reformulation. In these cases two different utterances have been counted.

(11) Describing their activities during the interview.
SFB XVM cuando vamos_\nSFB XVMcuando jugamos en el fútbol hacemos(s') un grupo\nSFB XVM when we go_\nSFB XVM when we play football we form a group\n(i 895)

Self-repair may also occur in the middle of the utterance. When it does not provoke a new start (in syntactic, intonation, and other terms) this self-repair has been maintained in the same utterance, for no new sentence-analogue has been created.

(12) Describing a popular feast.
DCV:(..) perquè com que només estan els del poble_ si: caus te fan una ro(t)llana més gro- una: rodo- una ro(t)llana més [fins que t'aixeques]\nDCV:(..) because since it is only the villagers who are there_ if you fall down they make a bigger ring_ a circ- a more ring [until you get up]\n(j 2053)

On the contrary, when self-repair implies the creation of a new sentence-analogue, two different utterances have been proposed, even in cases when the interrupted utterance was resumed and finished after the second one, when three utterances were counted.

(13) Preparing class activities.
EMP:a mi lo que m'interessa que veieu vosaltres_\nEMP:com a grup xxx no treba- no treballaran ni els inques ni ni els maies ni gaires pobles_
Self-repetition and self-repair often occur because of **overlaps**. When two speakers’ speech overlaps, one of the speakers may eventually give the floor to the other, be it for a micro-pause or for a longer period. Once the *winner* has finished his/her turn, the other speaker may resume his/her turn by repeating the previous utterance. I have considered these repetitions to form different utterances.

---

(14) Discussing in class about sports.

ERL  pero io [dic e-]
JCV  [els de l’equip] no l’hi treuen
ERL  io dic el meu equip_
ERL  io dic el meu equip_

ERL  but I [mean m-]
JCV  [those in the team] do not steal it from her\nERL  I mean my team_
ERL  I mean my team_

---

In other cases, the speaker may not give the floor and simply insist with his utterance, often by means of repeating it completely to the point of the interruption or just the last fragment. In this case, I have considered that only a single utterance has been produced.

---

(15) Ice is speaking and is suddenly interrupted by Jms.

ICE  doncs: la tenim quasi tots_ no/
ICE  bueno quasi tots_
JMS:[la majoria]!
ICE:[molts_] molts nois\n
ICE  then: almost all of us have it
ICE  well almost all_
JMS:[most of them]\nICE:[many_] many boys\n
(2273 )

---

(16) Describing the changes experienced by the school.

ANA  mira_ ens han tret el Carnestoltes\[1 la cas-] la castanyada:_
JMS  [si_]

ANA  look_ they suppressed Carnival\[1 the ’Cas-] the Castanyada:57 _
JCR  [1 yes_] 

(w 118)
### III One-word units

In spoken language there occur many instances of one-word units which may be considered as single utterances, since they stand for sentence-analogues. These units are affirmative / negative adverbs, such as sí, 'yes', no 'no', discourse markers such as bueno, a ve(u)re, 'well'; vale, 'all right', etc. These one-word units may appear alone, as the only item in the whole speech turn of a given speaker, and may also precede a longer intervention.

(17) Asking to be given an object.

**JRS** trae
**ERL** sí
**JRS** cómo estamos

(18) Chatting with a friend

**ZMR** lo sabías/
**NMF** no
**ZMR** no_ pues anda\ que xx iba yo con una cara de sonrisas/

**ZMR** did you know it/
**NMF** no
**ZMR** no_ well\ was I xx showing a smiling face/

In the first case, these one-word units have been attributed an independent utterance status. In the latter, this could have been the case, but this option implied their analysis in terms of semantic, pragmatic and intonational characteristics, for in some cases they might be regarded as whole utterances while in others they could be seen as only intonation units which form part of larger utterances. For practical reasons, and when appearing followed by an utterance produced by the same speaker, these one-word units have been systematically treated as non-independent intonation units forming part of that utterance. The units involved have been:

(a) Affirmative and negative particles (sí 'yes'; no 'no').

(19) **DCV** no_ ens ho han dit ara\
**DCV** no_ they've just told us\

(j 3038)

(b) Discourse markers such as bueno, a ve(u)re, 'well'; vale, 'all right'; mira 'look', oye 'listen', escolta 'listen', toma! 'there! fancy that!'; oi, èh, ëh, and other related confirmation tags.

(20) **JEÖ vale_ no me tires_**
**JEÖOOK_ don’t push me_**

(g 7185)
This very principle was also applied to these particles when they appear repeated on their own: they have been included in a single utterance unless pauses or intonation made it necessary to distinguish them.

4.6.3 Classifying the utterances according to language

Although closely related from a genetic point of view, Catalan and Castilian as linguistic systems are distinct enough to prevent confusion between them (see annexe 3). Nevertheless, they have not remained totally isolated from each other. Some Catalan varieties have been described as heavily Castilianized (xava or xave, pijo or apijat, cf. López del Castillo, 1976, Tuson, 1985a, b), while Catalonia's Castilian includes a number of Catalan transcodic markers. But it is a fact that, to date, no intermediate variety has ever appeared which can considered equally distant from both languages, as seems to be the case with urban Frisian with regards to Frisian and Dutch (Jonkman, 1991), and code-switching is by far much lower than in other mixed varieties such as Philippine's Mix-mix (Marasigan, 1983).

While a proportion of the utterances transcribed do contain some transcodic markers, in their vast majority, these do not represent an obstacle for the assignation to a language, for they are widespread, non-normative loanwords, syntactic calques or isolated phonemic features. Utterances containing such markers were classified as either Catalan or Castilian and received a code for transcodic markers in the data basis. Transcodic markers will be analysed from a structural perspective in chapter 6.

These considerations do not mean that problems were totally absent during classification. A percentage of utterances did offer some difficulties, that can be summarised in three groups:

1. **Proper names**: utterances formed exclusively by proper names.
2. **Switched utterances**: utterances for which the juxtaposition of Catalan and Castilian, and/or the combination of features from both languages, raise doubts regarding their assignment to one language or the other.
3. **Homophonous utterances**: utterances which formally coincide in both languages and could therefore be attributed to either Catalan or Castilian.
I  Proper names

A fair percentage of all utterances (3.32% of classroom and untutored interaction) are made up of one or more proper names, or by proper names and nonverbal discourse markers.

(23)  Introducing oneself to the researcher.
XVM: com te dius_
JCV: Joan
XVM: (...) què més/
JCV: ((cognoms))

XVM: what’s your name_
JCV: Joan
XVM: (...) what else/
JCV: ((family names)) (e 2363)

Though Catalan and Castilian names share common origins most of the time, their present forms are often quite different, due to their adaptation to different morphophonemic systems:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.26 Some names in Catalan and Castilian.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catalan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercè</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a subordinate language, Catalan has traditionally borrowed many names from Castilian, to the point that, at a given moment and for certain areas -especially in Valencia- the Castilian version of the name was prevalent among Catalan-speakers themselves. Adaptations of Castilian names such as Fernando [fəɾ'ɾandu], Javier [χaɾβiɾe] were and are widespread.

On the other hand, some Catalan names have been readily adopted by many Castilian-speaking families living in the Catalan Countries, such as Jordi (Cast. Jorge); Roser (Cast. Rosario); Montserrat and Montse (Catalan name for which no Castilian equivalent exists).

Some speakers use both versions of a name depending on the language they are using (therefore, they are Xavier in Catalan and Javier in Castilian). Others insist on their being referred to exclusively by means of one of them; the preferred name does not necessarily index first language. I witnessed a fierce fighting between two Castilian-speaking children caused by the insistence of one of them in calling the other by means of the Castilian version of the latter’s name (e 765ff).

Finally, there exists a strong trend in a number of Catalan kindergartens and primary schools to
use the Catalan name irrespective of children's first language. Thus, a Castilian-speaking José Antonio may become Josep Anton in class not only for the teacher but for all or part of his class-mates as well. If necessary, as for instance in the case of name coincidence in a classroom, one of them may be known by the Catalan version and the other by the Castilian version, irrespective of their both being Castilian-speaking.

On the whole, the presence of a name in an utterance is no guarantee of that utterance being produced in either language. Therefore, utterances formed exclusively by proper names (plus non-verbal markers) have not been assigned to any language, but rather classified as an independent group (coded as DN in the databasis) and discarded from analysis.

II Borrowing and switching

Loanwords and calques in the corpus corresponded mostly to items that were well-established in the recipient language (see chapter 6). Thus, utterances containing such units were classified as belonging to either Catalan or Castilian on the basis of the rest of the utterance.

While intersentential code-switching abounds in our corpus, intrasentential switching has turned out to be extremely scarce, as proved by chapter 6. Cases of intrasentential code-switching could not be regarded as entirely in either language, and were therefore included among 'dubious linguistic assignment' utterances containing switches and mixes. In the data basis, these utterances have been coded as D-TA and D-M respectively.

III Homophonous utterances

Although Catalan and Castilian are genetically and typologically close, they remain distinct enough to be readily distinguished in most cases. Some of the main reasons for the lack of coincidence between Catalan and Castilian are (a) the two distinct phonological systems, and (b) Catalan rules of vocalic 'neutralization' and deletion (cf. appendix 3). These rules are not shared with Castilian, and their high frequency of application makes spoken Catalan and Castilian different in spite of apparent homography. Thus, Standard Catalan and Standard Castilian only share a small number of frequently used words which are practically identical, basically monosyllables, such as adverbs: sí 'yes', no 'no, not'; personal pronouns: tu 'you', mi 'me'; verbs sé 'I know', és 'is'; conjunctions: Cat: i, o, Cast. y, o ('and', 'or'), etc58. Only very short utterances (usually between one to three words) including these or other homophonous elements can create ambiguity regarding their linguistic affiliation.

Spoken varieties of both languages have some extra points in common, due to their history of

---

58Even in these cases minor articulatory features which cannot be considered here may set both laguages apart.
contact and mutual exchanges (cf. Payrató, 1985a). In the present corpus, the only significant language contact phenomenon that increased coincidences to the point of turning language assignment a difficult task was the reduction of the Catalan phonological system. Probably under the influence of Castilian, Barcelona's Catalan has significantly reduced the opposition between /a/ and /ə/, especially among young speakers (see Pla, 1995), and presents some oscillation in the opposition between /e/ /ɛ/ and /o/ /ɔ/. This implies that a number of items which according to the standard languages are clearly distinct from a phonological point of view, may now cast doubt when appearing on their own:

Table 4.27. Some homophonous utterances in Barcelona spoken Catalan and Castilian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Standard Catalan</th>
<th>Standard Castilian</th>
<th>Dubious</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mira</td>
<td>[ˈmiɾə]</td>
<td>[ˈmiɾa]</td>
<td>[ˈmiɾa]</td>
<td>'look'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>para</td>
<td>[ˈpara]</td>
<td>[ˈpara]</td>
<td>[ˈpara]</td>
<td>'stop'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hola</td>
<td>[ˈɔla]</td>
<td>[ˈɔla]</td>
<td>[ˈɔla]</td>
<td>'hello'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be remarked that all these (fragments of) utterances could be both (Barcelona's) Catalan and Castilian. Their appearance in the frame of a longer utterance does not imply a switch from one language to the other. As an instance, mira qué bonito 'look how nice'; para ya de una vez 'stop it now'; and hola, cómo va eso 'hi, how're you doing' constitute perfect Castilian utterances, while their Catalan equivalents mira que bonic; para d'una vegada; and hola, com anem constitute Catalan utterances.

The problem only arises when these features appear in contexts where other distinctive elements of any linguistic level (phonetic, morphologic, lexical, syntactic) are lacking, such as in the following example:

(24)  SFBa la banyera\  
      SFBto the bath\  
      (i 844)

In such cases, utterances per se were missing distinctive features, could not be assigned to a given language on purely systemic criteria, and were initially considered as of 'dubious assignment'.

Apart from the confusion between /a/ and /ə/, widespread in Barcelona, other language contact contact

59The converse phenomenon, i.e. transference to Castilian of Catalan phonological items such as [ɛ], [ɔ] or [ɔ] also occurred in a number of occasions, but never in a context such that language assignment was in doubt. Therefore, it is not considered here.
phenomena of more limited extension were detected in the corpus which sometimes compromised language assignment. Some family bilinguals, and even some of the Catalan native speakers included in my corpus, show occasional or even frequent vacillation between /e/ and /ɛ/, /o/ and /ɔ/, /ʃ/ and /ʒ/, /j/ and /ʎ/ and other.

(25) GBG mira qué guay [ˈmiɾa ke ˈɣwaʝ] GBG look how nice (t 4741)


Again, these phenomena did not usually compromise language assignment; nevertheless, this circumstance was taken into account in those cases where lack of other distinctive features might have made it difficult. These cases were also considered of dubious assignment and lately reanalysed.

IV Criteria for classifying homophonous utterances

We have seen that, in a reduced number of cases, linguistic elements alone may be not enough for discerning if an utterance has been produced in either Catalan or Castilian, and leave us with a percentage of utterances which can be considered of 'dubious' assignment. All of them were coded 'D'. The issue here is whether the existence of these utterances which offer resistance to straight classification according to language constitute a problem and, if so, whether there exists any way to solve it.

Utterances of dubious assignment were not mixed or switched utterances; rather, they happened to coincide, i.e., they showed the same form in both languages due to phonetic, lexical, morphological, syntactic resemblance, and could thus be classified as either Catalan or Castilian precisely because of their lack of distinctive features. Some of them include old, well-established borrowings in Catalan such as vale 'OK', but most of them are just combinations of lexical items which due to genetic proximity are shared by both languages and are homophonous. But apart from this 'coincidence', nothing sets them apart from the rest of Catalan or Castilian utterances. There exists no evidence that these utterances form a particular set with a given number of exclusive characteristics. There exist no linguistic, social or psychological reasons to consider them as an independent category different from Catalan and Castilian; rather, their components should be classified by means of additional criteria to either one or the other. It is not a third, 'Catalan and Castilian' category which is required for coincidental utterances, but rather better criteria to classify them.

What are these extralinguistic criteria which may help us attribute coincidental utterances? A main argument has been employed: that of coherent behaviour. There is nothing that separates
these Catalan homophonous utterances from the the non-coincidental Catalan utterances, and the same could be said about Castilian homophonous utterances. Therefore, I have assumed that they are used in accordance with overall patterns, for they are not different entities but a group of utterances that happen to look alike in both languages. As a consequence, a number of dubious utterances were reinterpreted as 'dubious attributed to Catalan' or 'dubious attributed to Castilian' (in the data basis, DC and DS).

Two main criteria have been used (a) personal and (b) situational criteria.

a. **Personal criteria**: language attribution should be coherent with the subject patterns of language use; homophonous utterances said by subjects who only spoke one language have been attributed to this language. It would have made little sense to hypothesise that these utterances constituted a code-switch from their customary language to the other one. It runs against logic to claim that these subjects only stopped talking their customary language when they were producing a few utterances formally coincident in both languages.

b. **Situational criteria**: homophonous utterances produced by subjects who usually speak more than one language have been referred both to sequential analysis and to the analysis of the scene and the interlocutors' characteristics:

b.1. **Sequential analysis**: homophonous utterances produced in the middle of monolingual stretches of interaction have been attributed to this language unless other factors (such as the possibility of rhetoric usage of code-switching, subjects’ heavy linguistic dominance, etc.) have called into question such an affiliation. In example 27, Nku starts an utterance and then reformulates it. His first attempt is homophonous in Catalan and Castilian, so it is an a priori dubious utterance (fragment).

(27) Discussing during the assembly

DCV MFV Mfy_  
NKU MAB no és que ella_  
NKU MAB el(s) a- els altres [1 xXXx]  
MAB DIV [1 éreu nou nenes i [2 nou nens\]]  
DGS MAB [2 érem nou] i nou\  
MAB DIV [3 éreu nou i nou\]  
JEO MAB [3 iguals] érem iguals_  

DCV MFV Mfy_  
NKU MAB but she_  
NKU MAB the o- the others [1 xXXx]  
MAB DIV [1 you were nine girls and [2 nine boys\]]  
DGS MAB [2 we were nine] and nine\  
MAB DIV [3 you were nine and nine\]  
JEO MAB [3 equal] we were equal_  

(a 239)
Nevertheless, this utterance fragment is produced in the middle of a discussion that takes place in Catalan and is preceded and followed by Catalan utterances. It would make little sense to suggest that this is not Catalan just by the fact that it happens to be homophonous with Castilian.

b.2. **Situational analysis**: all relevant situational factors have been taken into account in the analysis, with special attention to audience and scene.

(28) Preparing a poster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAB</th>
<th>DIV</th>
<th>[emmarqueu els departaments]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>ZMR</td>
<td>[miro los departamentos]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZMR</td>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>vale. sí</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAB DIV [draw a frame for the departments]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ERL</th>
<th>ZMR</th>
<th>[I have a look at the departments]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZMR</td>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>OK. that's it. (d 56)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In extract 28, Mab is giving instructions in Catalan to the group, and, simultaneously, Erl is talking in Castilian with Zmr. Zmr answers to Erl with an utterance coincidental in both languages, but we know that Zmr and Erl are Castilian dominant, always talk Castilian to each other, and have been chatting for a while in that language. There is little doubt that this is Castilian, although, in another context, it could have been regarded a Catalan utterance including an old loanword (vale).

All these criteria inevitably ask for a degree of interpretation, and they have been applied with extreme moderation, so that in case of contradiction between criteria or hesitation no affiliation was posited. Thus, at the end of the process, only 7.50% of all Catalan utterances, and 8.51% of all Castilian utterances were formed by homophonous utterances reinterpreted on the aforementioned criteria. Many other remained as simply 'dubious'. For instance, in the following example, Zmr's utterance might be regarded as either Catalan or Castilian:

(29) Answering to the researcher's questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVM</th>
<th>(...) que et vagi bé</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XVM</td>
<td>(...) vigila que xXXx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZMR</td>
<td>(...) ya está/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVM</th>
<th>(...) good luck</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XVM</td>
<td>(...) take care that xXXx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZMR</td>
<td>(...) is that all/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d 22)

Xvm has been talking in Catalan to Zmr, and she is answering with monosyllables and homophonous utterances. Zmr's utterance could well be Catalan, but we know that she is very reluctant to speak that language, so she could be answering in Castilian and using monosyllables to avoid linguistic definition. Both options were feasible and reasonably possible; therefore, the utterance remained dubious (D).
4.6.4 Recapitulation: transcription and language assignment criteria

Most utterances do not offer any problem to be classified as either Catalan or Castilian. Some of them may include transcodic markers of a variegated nature that do not call into question language assignment. There are also some cases of intrasentential code-switching that are analysed in chapter 6.

The corpus contains a proportion of utterances formally coincidental in Catalan and Castilian. This homophony may be so in the standard languages or may originate from language contact phenomena. Proper names form a subgroup of these utterances of dubious assignment. Utterances formed exclusively by proper names have not been assigned to any language, but rather classified as an independent group and discarded from the analysis. Regarding the other dubious and coincidental utterances, some of them have been assigned to Catalan or Castilian on the basis of individual or situational criteria, while the rest have remained as utterances of dubious assignment. It should be borne in mind that these utterances do not constitute a linguistic variety on their own.

All these possibilities are summarised in table 4.28.

Table 4.28: Language attribution possibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Characters used and example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Bold: <strong>com anem</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Standard: vámonos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubious</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Italic: <em>para_ va_</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubious due to code switching</td>
<td>D/TA</td>
<td>Bold, standard and italics: este <em>ha dit que</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubious to Catalan</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Bold: <strong>ia està</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubious to Castilian</td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>Standard: ya va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper names</td>
<td>DN</td>
<td>Standard and acronym: Esg_ Esg_</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.7 Methodological procedures: synthesis

Chapter 4 has tried to describe and discuss the methodological choices made for this research: the methods of gathering data, the sample, and the criteria used to transcribe and codify the tape-recordings.

The first sections have argued for a micrological, ethnographic approach to linguistic behaviour, not as a replacement for macrological analysis but as a reasonable tool to access alternative, complementary data. The researcher's role as a participant observer has been discussed, and the various sources of information presented: observation and field-notes, tape-recordings, questionnaires and interviews, and a naturalistic quasi-experiment.

The sample and the arguments for its choice have been thoroughly discussed in the following sections. First, the most relevant aspects of Santa Coloma de Gramenet’s social, historical and sociolinguistic situation as an overwhelming working class, Castilian-speaking dormitory city in the vicinity of Barcelona, created as the result of continuous immigration, especially since the 50’s, from southern Spain, and with a small Catalan-speaking minority living in the city centre. In this context, use of Catalan in the 80s seemed to be receding as the language of everyday interaction in the light of generational transformations. The establishment of a Catalan-medium school in order to help maintain and restore Catalan as a language of use constitutes an excellent occasion to explore the actual capacities of school as a social institution to modify pre-existing patterns of language use. The classes selected for this research and the core subjects have been described in terms of their family linguistic group, their linguistic variety and competence in Catalan and Castilian, their declared overall patterns of language use and their personal characteristics. Castilian has been found to predominate both in terms of family language and in terms of the subjects' social networks. Nevertheless, a significant presence of Catalan has been also found, and a number of bilingual patterns of language choice detected.

Finally, I have also discussed the conventions used for transcription and data codification. Emphasis has been put on dealing explicitly with issues that may affect data comparability, such as those affecting the units' delimitation, and on criteria to distinguish between Catalan and Castilian utterances in cases of formal coincidence. In the next chapters I will turn to data analysis.
5. Data analysis: language choice and code-switching
This chapter deals with the norms of language choice and code-switching applied by the subjects of the present research. Two different, complementary perspectives are employed to analyse these language contact phenomena.

Section 5.1 adopts a multivariate, quantitative perspective to analyse the norms of language choice. This section focusses on the most regular aspects of linguistic behaviour, and assesses the significance of a number of variables in the establishment of language choice norms. Two sorts of data are combined: on the one hand, observational data and first-hand knowledge of the school. On the other hand, a multivariate statistical quantitative analysis of the corpus.

The section proceeds as follows: first, a broad overview of the subjects' written and spoken linguistic behaviour is presented which confirms the existence of both significant regularity and internal variation. To understand both phenomena, several social variables (namely, the participants in the interaction, their linguistic affiliation, and the domain of interaction) are reviewed in order to weigh their influence on language choice. Observational, tape-recorded and experimental data are employed to clarify the patterns of language choice among the subjects. Finally, conclusions are drawn from the analysis regarding the maintenance and transformation of norms of language choice in the school.

Section 5.2 explores from a more qualitative standpoint how the norms of language choice are manipulated by the informants in order to serve particular communicative and interactional purposes. Norm transgressions are analysed, paying attention to social and discourse functions of code-switching.

The section starts by analysing how the traditional patterns of code-switching in the Catalan-speaking community are retained by the pupils. Next, the section explores the impact on the pupils' linguistic behaviour of the Catalan preeminence norm as practised by the teachers, and the choice transgressions this norm allows. There follows a brief comment on how language norms are learned and taught at the school. Finally, the process of norms negotiation and enforcement displayed by the subjects during the interviews is described.
5.1 The quantitative analysis of norms of language choice

5.1.1 Written language

Although written practices are by no means the focus of research, it may be of help to give a broad picture of language choice for written purposes in the school. Thus, a brief overview of language distribution for written purposes will be offered here.

The dominant written language at all levels in the school is Catalan. It is the language of all internal and external written communication, both in the classrooms and outside, for teachers and pupils alike. In the classrooms, Catalan is the language used by default. Children are introduced to reading and writing in Catalan, and this is their basic language during the whole process of education. According with the school's language principles, most material used in the classes, such as textbooks and photocopies, is written in Catalan, although some materials in Castilian are also used as well when felt pertinent by the teachers. Catalan is the language normally used when writing on the blackboard or when dictating, and it is also the expected language of homework and class activities. Catalan seems to be also the language of pupils' class notes irrespective of their first language, although this point was not systematically checked. The only significant exception to this use is the Castilian language course, when Castilian is used by teachers and pupils alike.

The school's written administration functions entirely in Catalan. This is the language chosen for all purposes, including those involving the parents and the community. In the school's early years, Castilian used to appear next to Catalan for a number of written functions such as the children's report cards, but, at the time of the fieldwork, written communication with the parents was taking place exclusively in Catalan.

The school's public image is unequivocally Catalan, and it stands out in an area where Castilian predominates. Two examples may be of use here. In Spring 1994 an exhibition was set up to celebrate the first decade of existence, and the school was decorated with posters, banners and other graphic material. Some months later (June 1994), when it was known that the school would not be granted a budget to pay a P-3 teacher (for 3 year-old children), a protest placard was attached to the main entrance to attract public attention on the school's demands. In both cases, all texts were exclusively written in Catalan.

Although it holds a secondary place, written Castilian is not totally absent from the school. First, and most significantly, all children take Castilian language classes for 3-4 hours per week from 3rd grade on, and this language is actively learned as part of the regular curriculum. Second, Castilian enters the classes through auxiliary material such as maps, posters or newspapers, brought both by the teachers and by the pupils themselves.
In order to give Castilian an extra-academic role which is felt to be compatible with the school's overall philosophy, the school has engaged in a collaboration project with a school in Guatemala. The pupils are actively encouraged to write to their Guatemalan peers, and a number of events, such as organizing public exhibitions and fund-raising, take place on a regular basis. This institutional commitment eventually led to more individual involvement: some teachers belong to solidarity committees with Guatemalan refugees, and personal exchanges have been realized, with Guatemalan teachers visiting the Rosselló-Pòrce school, and Catalan teachers travelling to Guatemala. It goes without saying that spoken and written relationships with Guatemala take place exclusively in Castilian.

While class writing is homogeneously in Catalan, spontaneous graffitti on tables, walls and toilets (not common, indeed) by the children often appear written in Castilian; one can even find graffittis in Castilian on the blackboard produced during playtime, usually of a derogatory or insulting nature such as X es una guarra 'X is a pig', or Mierda para X, 'Shit for X', apart from varied messages of love.

Written Castilian is also present in the school by other indirect means. For instance, some of the teachers buy and read Castilian-written newspapers such as La Vanguardia, el Periódico de Catalunya and El País, as well as magazines and books, and take them into the classrooms. The teachers, therefore, are known to read Castilian.

It should be noted that despite the existence of Castilian language courses, concern is sometimes expressed by some parents that their children might not be learning written Castilian properly. Whether this concern is actually founded was not researched; nevertheless, at least during fieldwork this concern did not seem to be widespread.

5.1.2 Spoken uses: overall view

Both Catalan and Castilian are present in the daily school life at all levels, although in very different proportions according to personal, situational and other variables. These factors influence the extent to which each member of the school population utilizes Catalan or Castilian at a given moment. This internal variety constitutes a fundamental challenge in obtaining a sample of speech interactions which can be regarded as representative of school life. The daily environment of a Catalan-speaking pupil with mostly Catalan and bilingual friends is significantly different from that of, let's say, a Castilian-dominant, introverted class-mate. What is truly representative for a number of subjects might not be representative at all for another group. Simply stated, there are too many different variables to be taken into account as to claim that a given sample obtained in an exploratory study such as this one represented the school's overall language use. As a consequence, the corpus studied is only a sample of several situations, as varied as possible, of school interactions (see section 4.2.2.2). Recordings were made at random: the researcher did not know beforehand what a class interaction
would be like, and even less could he predict how untutored interactions would develop.

Overall figures are shown in table 5.1. Utterances formed by proper names, non-verbal material and incomprehensible utterances have been removed from the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Relative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>16286</td>
<td>48.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubious</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>16008</td>
<td>47.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other lang.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33879</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A glimpse at table 5.1 confirms that the school records a significant presence of only two languages, Catalan and Castilian. The category others, including utterances from any language but Catalan and Castilian only attains an irrelevant percentage. Once the criteria regarding language assignment discussed in section 4.6.3 had been applied, the amount of dubious utterances is relatively small: less that 5% of all utterances could not be clearly assigned to either language. In a majority of cases, 'dubious' only means 'formally coincident', 'homophonous', in Catalan and Castilian (cf. section 4.6.3). It should be remembered here that while all utterances containing intrasentential code-switches were automatically classified as dubious, utterances including established loanwords (see chapter 6 for the distinction) were attributed to either Catalan or Castilian. As will become clear in chapter 6, intrasentential code-switching does not reach significant proportions.

It would be difficult to argue whether the overall proportions of Catalan and Castilian use represent overall use in the school, since no external points of comparison exist, and it is debatable whether they may actually exist. Irrespective of the exact proportions, though, these figures agree with the general view of language use in schools such as Rosselló-Pörce: there is much use of Catalan -after all, it is the official language and the language used in class activities between teachers and pupils-, and there is abundant use of Castilian -which is the first language of the majority of children and a language with many informal and some formal uses in the school. The overall pattern of language use at this school can therefore be defined as fundamentally bilingual on the basis of monolingual Catalan and Castilian utterances.

5.1.3 Age and status: the adult speakers in the school life

The apparent freedom of language choice suggested by the extensive use of spoken Catalan and Castilian has to be clearly nuanced by a number of considerations. The first one is that it is necessary to distinguish between the pupils' behaviour and that of other people involved in the school life, teachers and non-teaching staff. In the corpus analysed, the number of utterances produced by adults constitutes a little bit more than one fifth of the whole corpus (see table 5.2)
Table 5.2. Number of utterances per age and language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Catalan</th>
<th>Dubious</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Castilian</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>6932</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>7346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>8846</td>
<td>1461</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15360</td>
<td>25690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15778</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15720</td>
<td>33036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 shows the number of utterances produced by all adults (i.e., including non-teaching staff, monitors from outside the school, and even some adults who addressed the children on the streets) and by all pupils (i.e., including children from all grades, not only from fifth and eighth grade). This data shows a remarkable disagreement between pupils and adults' behaviour: while most of pupils' verbal interaction takes place in Castilian, adults choose Catalan almost exclusively. Despite their representing one fifth of all utterances gathered, the adults' share approaches half of all Catalan utterances in the corpus, while they only contribute a minor number to Castilian utterances. In fact, it should be taken into account that most of these Castilian utterances were produced during a workshop by a Castilian monolingual monitor who did not belong to the school. In any case, these results should come as no surprise where adults are concerned, as far as most of them work for a Catalan school where the use of Catalan is supposed to be the norm.

A clear difference exists in the school's adult population between teaching and non-teaching staff. The distinction has its roots in their professional relationship with the institution and is shown in socioeconomic, sociocultural, linguistic, and other terms. The teaching staff is actively involved in an educational process that implies education by means of what in many cases corresponds to the pupils' second language. Teachers have been especially trained for such purposes, and usually agree, with varied degrees of personal commitment, with the goal of "linguistic normalization" at school. All of this is shown by their language choices as recorded in the corpus (see graph 5.1).

---

60Numeric differences between totals in tables 5.1 and 5.2 are due to the fact that table 5.2 does not include a number of utterances produced by radios, TV sets, vending machines, etc., which appeared in table 5.1.
On the other hand, non-teaching staff and the other adults that come in contact with the pupils during the day, both inside the school and during school-related activities, have not been trained where language use issues is concerned. They do not have the same linguistic knowledge as teaching staff, fulfill functions quite distinct from those of teachers, and are often quite separate from children. Therefore, their behaviour is less predictable with the information at our disposal.

During the field-work period, two patterns of language choice were observed when teachers interacted with each other. The first, overwhelmingly predominant pattern of language choice consisted of using Catalan as the sole language of communication, and included some rather scarce code-switches to Castilian for discourse-related purposes such as citations, or mot juste. This is the unmarked mode of communication for the Catalan-speaking community. In fact, teachers’ speech is relatively freer of unnoticed transcodic markers due to their superior knowledge of the standard language.

A second pattern of language use was detected among some teachers, consisting of rapid intersentential / inter-speech turn switching. This pattern is not widespread, and was seldom recorded in the corpus: it is not employed in front of pupils, it hardly shows up on formal occasions, and it serves evident rhetorical purposes, for it is used to create a humorous environment and to reprehend each other in a friendly manner (cf. example 26 in section 5.2). This pattern is displayed by a very reduced number of closely related teachers (3 or 4, in fact), most of whom share many years of work history. Importantly, not all of them share the same linguistic background: three are native Catalan, but one is a Castilian-speaker, and their committment to linguistic normalization at school varies from enthusiastic to rather critical. Unfortunately, and due to scarcity of empirical data, the analysis of this speech pattern cannot go beyond this point.

Patterns of language use between teaching and non-teaching staff stand somewhat in between those applied with parents and those prevalent with teachers. Catalan is used with native Catalans, and Castilian may be used depending on who the interlocutors are. Frequent Catalan-Castilian code-switching is detected in some interactions between
teachers and members of staff, but probably as an idiosyncratic behaviour. Non-teaching personnel has not received linguistic instructions as far as their sociolinguistic behaviour is concerned. In the school researched here, they reproduce entirely traditional out-of-school language patterns, i.e., Catalan native speakers speak Catalan to those which they identify as Catalans, and Castilian to the others. Due to the demolinguistic balance, children are more often than not considered Castilian speakers and addressed in that language, irrespective of their actual group affiliation and language competence. Interactions among members of non-teaching staff tends to be in Castilian, since monolinguals outnumber bilinguals. On the other hand, Catalan-speaking members of the staff usually address teachers in Catalan, notwithstanding teachers' personal affiliation.

The staff's language choices (including both teachers and other staff) when relating with non-school members at school varies according to personal preferences and links. Language choices during the interactions with parents are heterogeneous. On several occasions, I witnessed the enrollment of new children for the following year. According to these observations and to discussion with individual teachers, when parents can speak Catalan, it is the regular language of communication. But this is the exception rather than the rule in Santa Coloma de Gramenet. Thus, a practical dilemma often arises between adopting Castilian, felt by many as an undue concession, and actual communicative needs with Castilian monolingual parents. The conflict is solved in different ways. Some teachers stick to Catalan unless the parents clearly show they do not understand it, while others start in Catalan only to converge towards Castilian during the conversation. A third group of teachers selects Spanish without much doubt. A somewhat startling consequence of this situation was faced by some of the children of monolingual Castilian-speaking families: during one single interview, the very same teacher accommodated to the parents' Castilian but used Catalan to address the future pupil.

A particular case of interaction is that between teachers and representatives from other schools, or officials from either local or autonomous government. These relationships develop predominantly in Catalan, though occasional use of Castilian may take place, especially when there exists a personal relationship dating back to a former period, when teaching was not so closely associated with Catalan, and when one of the interlocutors is a native Castilian speaker.

Despite their monolingual use at school, most of the teachers make some use of Castilian to adult Castilian speakers on the streets and in their private life. When one of these persons enters the school environment, teachers seem to maintain their previous choices. Teachers consulted on this particular declared not to pay much attention to their private language usage, and took it as a matter of fact that they also spoke Spanish outside the school. Nevertheless, I detected a vague feeling of uneasiness, expressed in hesitations and grinning, when I found by chance a teacher known to be strongly supportive of Catalan talking Castilian on the telephone at school with a friend of hers. When this reaction was later commented with her, she expressed that she felt as being like she had been "caught" breaking the rules.
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Catalan is the expected language for interaction between teachers and children, both inside and outside the classroom, except for Castilian language courses. It is important to point out that, in sharp contrast with other experiences (e.g. French Canadian minority schools described in Heller, 1994), the choice of Catalan is never forced upon the pupils, i.e., children are allowed to speak whatever language they prefer at any time (cf. section 3.2). This freedom of language choice derives from the assumption that Catalan will only be picked up by Castilian-speaking children through a process based on their genuine interest in communicating with the teacher. Imposition would not only be useless in many cases (especially in the early courses, when the children cannot speak Catalan), but also counterproductive. Teachers therefore have to rely on social and psychological trends towards linguistic convergence and wait until the children feel confident enough to use their new language (cf. Artigal, 1989a).

The fact is that although the norm of selecting Catalan for teacher-pupil interaction is sometimes broken by children, teachers adhere to it thoroughly. It is obvious that this pattern of language use derives from teacher commitment to the school's language-use principles, and to their teaching ethos in general. Their remarkable consistency in language choice (cf. graph 5.1) was aided by two factors: first, both teachers’ and children's bilingualism prevent misunderstanding, since everything can be understood by everyone; second, teachers' higher status from the perspective of the children encourages the latter to converge towards the first. In fact, exclusive use of Catalan with pupils is considered compulsory by teachers themselves as part of their educational task, to the extent that the anecdotal case of a young teacher who had been driven to utter some words in Castilian by a particularly rebellious teenager during a heated argument was deplored by fellow-teachers, and discretely criticised as proof of his inexperience and/or lack of commitment to the school.

Although it may now be regarded by most as a trivial transformation, the practically exclusive use of Catalan with children still represents a dramatic departure from the norms applied by the broader society, where accommodation to Castilian is still the prevalent norm. It also constitutes a major move away from the ideological positions favouring 'mother tongue education', so popular in Catalonia only one decade ago among teachers and pedagogues (see section 3.2.5.2).

5.1.4 Pupils' language choice: overall perspective

In comparison with adults, pupils' use of Catalan appears significantly lower (see table 5.2 above and graph 5.2 below). Exposure to Catalan seems to be much larger than active use of it. Nevertheless, the situation according to these figures still suggests a considerable active use of both languages, although with clear predominance of Castilian.
The analysis of language use by individuals unveils significant differences between speakers regarding use of either language. Graph 5.3 shows the number of utterances produced in each language (C = Catalan; D = dubious; O = Others; S = Castilian) by each subject of fifth and eighth grades, both in class and during untutored interactions. Interviews have not been included in these graphs, for they represent an artificial language situation alien to everyday school life.

It is relevant to point out that almost all those subjects for whom interactions have been recorded and transcribed show at least some minimal use of Catalan. Therefore, it can be stated with a fair degree of confidence that most, if not all, subjects at the school do speak some Catalan almost every day. Conversely, all subjects make at least some active use of Castilian, and most of them use it very extensively. Thus, and beyond any analysis of linguistic competence, we can claim that, according to this data, the school as a whole constitutes a bilingual setting. Not only more than one language is taught and used in
instruction, but a majority of its members actively speaks both languages in one way or another.

Although it seems undeniable that Castilian is the predominant language for a majority of the pupils, internal variation is remarkable: striking as it may seem, some subjects (Jcv, Ncp and Xpr) were recorded as speaking more Catalan than Castilian, while others, such as Aos, Ana, Dev, Dgs, Dla, Jce or Scp, made abundant use of Catalan. It should be noted that while Jcv and Jce were Catalan speakers, Ncp, Ana, Dev and Dla were family bilinguals, whereas Xpr, Dgs and Scp were Castilian speakers. On the other hand, some Catalan (e.g. Jbc) and bilingual speakers (e.g. Ead, Far) chose Catalan in a much lower proportion than Castilian.

Thus, at first sight, language choice seems no longer associated to first language in a systematic way. If such a result were to be confirmed, this would imply a significant departure from the traditional norms of language choice in Catalonia, which are mostly based on linguistic groups and addressee-identification function.

The possibility exists that pupils have developed a language domain distribution according to which Catalan, the language of instruction, would be used in class, and Castilian in untutored interaction. Table 5.3 clearly disconfirms such a hypothesis.

Table 5.3. Number of utterances in each language according to domain. Absolute frequencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Catalan</th>
<th>Dubious</th>
<th>Other Castilian</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untutored</td>
<td>2716</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>4134</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8404</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results may be surprising for a number of reasons. First, contrary to many opinions, Catalan is widely used in untutored interactions, i.e., in interactions which are neither teacher-centred nor academically oriented. Second, Castilian turns out to be the language most often used by subjects in class activities, i.e., in those activities primarily oriented towards school-related ends and with some teacher control. It is also striking that Castilian achieves such a remarkable presence during the interviews with the researcher, for these speech events were initially designed to elicit samples of Catalan on the assumption that pupils would use Catalan. Graph 5.4 may clarify the pupils’ relative use of each language in each domain.

---

61 Table 5.3 only includes data from subjects in fifth and eighth grade. From now on, and unless explicitly said, data provided by pupils from other grades will not be included in the analysis.
To summarise, this overview of language use in the school has allowed us to discover several significant facts. In spite of the large predominance of Castilian speakers, the school researched here appears to be a bilingual setting where two languages, Catalan and Castilian, are used side by side. Utterances are basically monolingual, and can be attributed to either Catalan or Castilian without much trouble, although a small percentage remains dubious due mostly to homophony or to intrasentential code-switching. Language choice is clearly predictable for a category of individuals: irrespective of what they do in their private lives, at school, teachers speak Catalan. Other languages do not go beyond 3% and can be considered heavily marked from a purely quantitative point of view. On the contrary, pupils show greater variation in language choice. Neither personal nor situational variables on their own serve the purpose of predicting language choice. More sophisticated systems will have to be tried out.

5.1.5 The quantitative identification of the unmarked choices

I Operationalising the factors

I have claimed in section 2.4 that unmarked varieties may be identified on the basis of their frequency of appearance. In this section, the language choices encountered in the corpus were quantitatively analysed.

Several statistical tests were employed in order to ascertain the significance of each factor in predicting what language would be used at any time by a given subject according to a number of factors. Chapters 2 and 3 have shown that a number of factors have repeatedly been held responsible for language choice in Catalonia. Two of them appear to be especially significant: participants in the interactions and language domain. On the one hand, it is commonly assumed that language choice in Catalonia is primarily
governed by the speaker and the addressees' linguistic background. On the other hand, language domain has often been pointed as requiring particular language choices irrespective of participants. Both factors have been retained in the quantitative analysis of language choice, operationalized to undergo statistical analysis. Both the operationalization process and the results obtained are explained in the following sections.

II The identification of the participants

Identifying the participants in each interaction was facilitated by the one-year participant observation carried out in this research. The ethnographic approach adopted resulted in my becoming well acquainted with the two whole classes of fifth and eighth grade, and with a number of pupils from other grades as well.

The need to classify the role adopted by each participant in an interaction in relation with a given utterance posed a number of problems, of both a theoretical and a practical nature. While the speakers were easy to identify, classifying the other participants required a longer process. Not all messages had a clearly defined addressee: there were utterances which constituted talk to oneself in a loud voice, utterances not addressed to anyone in particular, such as shouting and singing. But a majority of utterances could be said to be addressed to someone with a fair degree of confidence. Bell's (1984) audience design model was adapted for classificatory purposes. Bell distinguishes between several members of the audience and establishes a scale in their participation in the interactions according to their being (a) directly addressed; (b) ratified, i.e. acknowledged as a participant in the interaction; and (c) being known to hear the interaction although not explicitly allowed to partake in it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Known</th>
<th>Ratified</th>
<th>Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addressee</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearer</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhearer</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eavesdropper</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bell, 1984: 160.

Bell's classification furnishes a model that fits with most ethnographic accounts of modern language choice in Catalonia, as well as and with my personal experience as a native member of the speech community. Indeed, rapid code-switching between Catalan and Castilian is very frequent in speech turns addressed to audiences formed of at least a Catalan and a Castilian speaker, and this switching clearly rests on addressee-specification purposes. The rest of the audience plays a minor role in language choice. This pattern contrasts vividly with other language contact situations where the hearer (as used to be the case under the Francoist regime, see chapter 3) and even the overhearer (as
was the case among the Hungarian minority studied by Gal, 1979) may provoke a switch to the dominant language.

In order to detect to what extent code-switching was based on addressee-specification, addressees had to be identified. Bell's model was obviously difficult to operationalize for spontaneous interaction, for how could addressees be distinguished from the rest of the participants? Although subjects' identification was easier when I had been present in the interaction, a significant proportion of recordings were done away from the researcher, so that I could neither see nor control the interaction. Quite often, while listening to the tapes I could only guess at the participants' sex, but on other occasions even this was impossible. But even if participants were identified, their role was not necessarily evident. Subjects physically moved and passed from one speech act to the following one, taking on new roles and modifying the audience composition. An addressee could become the speaker and then the hearer after a couple of utterances.

The attribution of role to participants required much conversational interpretation, but interpretation carried a serious danger of circular reasoning. Language choice functions as a contextualization cue, which are "(...) all the form-related means by which participants contextualize language." (Auer, 1992: 24). It not only obeys contextual factors but collaborates to define context (Auer, 1992; Gumperz, 1982, 1992). In Catalonia, language choice is often the main (linguistic) cue, or even the exclusive cue that signals a shift from one addressee to another one. In such a context, a given language choice may signal that interlocutor 2, and not interlocutor 3 or 4, is the intended addressee. This circumstance creates a vicious circle: the researcher may be sure that a switch implied the shift from a given interlocutor to another yet with no other cues available to support this statement. Obviously, one could not use language choice as an index of addressee-specification, only to discover later on that language choice and addressee were consistent.

Therefore, a decision was made so that addressee identification was restricted to those cases where other cues were available. I have therefore refrained from attributing an utterance to a given addressee on the sole basis of language choice, although in a number of occasions language choice made evident who the addressee was.

The main criteria used to identify addressees rely mostly on conversational structure and explicit contextualization cues - understood in a broad sense; cf. Auer (1992: 24) - , which means that they include referential, lexical contextualization cues, and cannot be regarded as absolute rules, but rather as approximative guides for attributing roles during the interaction. Non-referential, non-lexical cues such as prosody, backchannels, gesture/posture, gaze (if remembered) were also used as secondary tools to (dis)confirm

---

62 Of course, video-tapes would have helped in overcoming this paradox, but then untutored interaction would have been probably out of the researcher's reach.
the former. Some of the most useful cues are commented upon below.

Deictics and vocatives often explicitly signalled the addressee. They are of a varied nature: among others, personal pronouns, verbal inflection, spatial deictic adverbs, participants' proper names and nicknames (in lower case in the text).

(1) Scolding a class-mate.
ZMR JRS* tú te callas\)
ZMR JRS te callas\ ét/ Jrs/
ZMR JRS hey_ you shut up\)
ZMR JRS shut up\ O.K./ Jrs/
(d 40)

(2) Claiming to be the first to speak.
JCE XVM Xvm_ a que he parlat io primer\)
XVM JCE sí\)
JCE XVM Xvm_ I was the first one to speak_ wasn't I\)
XVM JCE yes\)
(d 3)

Comments referring to or making fun of a member of the recognized audience were considered to address this interlocutor, as in the following example:

(3) Verbal duelling.
RPT ICE [hala_] Ice se hace la permanente en el coño\)
ICE RPT [(@) no tengo coño_ gilipollas\)
RPT ICE [waugh_] Ice has his cunt's hair permed\)
ICE RPT [(@) I've got no cunt_ you asshole\)
(s 402)

Dialogues usually indicated an alternation in the roles of speaker and addressee, but in some cases it was difficult to identify the addressee. For instance, questions could often not be assigned to a given interlocutor; on the contrary, answers were regarded as addressed to the subject who had asked the question. In some cases, when more than two people were directly involved in the conversation and the interaction suggested a multiple addresse, up to three subjects could be included64.

(4) ZMR el diez lo tenemos\)
JCE ZMR el diez/
JCE ZMR no tengo ni la menor idea\)
JCE ZMR (...) el trece sí\)
ZMR JCE el diez sí que lo te[nemos\)
FSG JCE ZMR [el_] trece sí\)
ZMR have we got number ten/
JCE ZMR number ten/

63The first column of acronyms includes the speaker; the second one, the addressee(s).

64 When the utterance had more than one addressee, they were listed in alphabetical order. The statistical analyses took only the first subjects into account.
Multiple addressees were an especially relevant issue for interactions with a clear presence of teachers and the researcher, such as class debates and interviews. On these occasions, the pupils addressed most of their utterances to the adult speaker, the one who was the ultimate person responsible for the interaction taking place.

In the last example, Xms is directing a public debate in the classroom and gives the floor to Scp, a girl. She does not address Xms but the whole group, and very specifically, she addresses Mab, the teacher, the supreme judge in this interaction.

Negations of previous statements were usually considered to be addressed to the previous speaker:

Finally, incomprehensible fragments, nonverbal utterances, shouting and singing were not attributed to any specific addressee.

The participants' language background was operationalized on the basis of the subjects' answers to the Family Language Use Questionnaire (see chapter 4). Speakers were classified into Catalan speakers, bilingual speakers and Castilian speakers. Addressees were classified into more groups: Catalan-speaking addressees, bilingual addressees, Castilian-speaking addressees, other pupils (i.e., other classmates whose identity could not be clearly established), teachers and monitors, and unknown addressees.
III The domain of interaction

Previous research on bilingual education in Catalonia and anecdotal comments from teachers suggest that the choice of Catalan as the medium of education might lead to a new functional distribution of languages, according to which Catalan would be the language spoken in class, while Castilian would be the language used ‘among children’ in their out-of-class activities, in the halls, and in the playground. The underlying assumption of these opinions is that a diglossic configuration might be arising which would make Catalan the formal language and Castilian the informal one. In order to check the domain-configuration hypothesis, the data from the corpus were organized in three different domains according to the conditions in which they were produced (cf. section 4.2.2.2).

a) **Classes**, i.e., activities developed in the classroom under the direct supervision of the teacher and with clear pedagogical goals; this is the equivalent to a formal domain in classic formal-informal oppositions.

b) **Untutored interactions**, i.e., interactional activities carried on without teacher supervision and whose goals were less pedagogical in nature; this is the equivalent to the informal domain, although it should not be forgotten, that all interactions in the corpus were in one way or another linked to the school as an institution. Untutored interactions could take place in the classroom before or after the classes, but they were primordially out-of-classroom activities.

c) **Interviews**, i.e., interactions produced by a small number of subjects and the researcher at the latter's request, with the clear goal of eliciting information by means of a semi-structured script.

Only class and untutored interaction were used during the quantitative analysis. Interviews were not included for they do not constitute regular school activities. Despite their theoretical differentiation, the border between classes and untutored interactions is anything but self-evident: on the one hand, especially in the eighth graders, classes were not teacher-centred activities, and a considerable degree of group work was systematically promoted. On the other hand, untutored interaction included interchanges during which one or even two teachers would join the children in chatting, joking, or even arguing with them (cf. section 4.2).

IV The multivariate analysis of language choice: the repeated measures method

Probably due to its humanistic tradition, and despite the significant exception represented by the variationist approaches, linguistic research as a whole is still lagging well behind other social and human sciences in incorporating statistical tools into its analyses. Thus,
language choice and code-switching studies have often made only a limited use of the analytical possibilities offered by mathematical methods, mostly restricting their exploitation to simple, bivariate methods. These procedures usually take two variables at a time—e.g., language choice and another variable such as the speakers’ first language—and assess the degree of correlation between them.

Bivariate analyses, though, may give a distorted view of reality, for they isolate two factors from the other variables, assuming that the factors discarded from each analysis do not intervene in the results; unfortunately, this is seldom the case in real life, where all factors simultaneously carry out their roles, and interact in highly complex ways so that simple correlations between two factors are rarely the norm. A metaphor may be of help here: applying bivariate tests to social life may be compared to analyzing a regular football match by studying the moves of just two players at a time. Few conclusions will be achieved by analyzing the behavior of the goalkeeper and player number 3 if the other 20 players are not taken into account at the same time, for the first two subjects act in response to the whole interaction. What we need is a method that allows us to evaluate the relative weight of each factor in relation with the others, not independently.

In this research, several multivariate procedures were used to explore the data: regression analysis, the linear logarithmic, and the repeated measures method. Only the results from the last one will be commented upon. The method is briefly described in the statistical appendix (appendix 5).

The four variables selected for the analysis and their respective categories are shown in table 5.5: the speaker’s family language group, the language domain, the addressee, and language choice. For calculation purposes, 'unknown addressees' had to be rejected, and 'monitor' and 'teachers' were added to form a single group.

---

65 I owe this inspired metaphor to Dr. Jaume Llopis (U.B.).
In order to calculate the impact of each factor on language choice, several steps were taken.

1. A table was elaborated containing the number of utterances produced by each speaker with each addressee type in each domain. Thus, we could compare the number of, let's say, Catalan utterances produced by Jcv to his Castilian-speaking class-mates, or to the teachers and monitors, both in Catalan and in Castilian.

2. The percentage of Catalan and Castilian utterances produced by each speaker with each addressee type in each domain was calculated. Thus, we could analyse the relative frequency of use of each language by every speaker in both domains with each sort of addressee irrespective of the number of utterances actually produced. Working with percentages was important, for it standardised the results and avoided the biases produced by the fact that some speakers had been recorded more often than others.

3. The last table underwent a multivariate analysis of variance test based on repeated measures (Hand and Taylor, 1987). This is a relatively new, extremely powerful statistical multivariate procedure which allows us to evaluate the interaction between all factors investigated. The advantage of this test is that it analyses the interaction of each factor simultaneously and taking all possible combinations of factors into account. In other words, it offers a holistic view of the interaction, or, in yet another metaphor, it tells us about the behaviour of all football players individually, in small groups, as a team, and as a match. A multivariate procedure such as this becomes essential when the variables are thought to be interdependent.

In the data analysis, the first step is that of considering whether any factor on its own interacts to provoke the results under study. This we call a 'first level analysis'. Once this is finished, we move to the combination of two or three factors (second and third level). It should be remembered that even when one factor is found to be significant, this is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers' Family Language Group</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Castilian-speaker</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>Catalan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bilingual speaker</td>
<td>Untutored</td>
<td>Catalan-speaking</td>
<td>Castilian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Catalan-speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pupil*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Castilian-speaking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor / Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The term 'pupil' is intended to include all class-mates whose voices could not be clearly identified.
always aserted after taking the whole set of factors into account, and not irrespective of them as in a traditional bivariate analysis.

Two different goals are to be pursued with this analysis. The first is to discover what factors end up significantly interacting in the production of the results, i.e., to identify the factors and factor combination that intervene in language choice. The repeated measures tests evaluates the probability (usually referred to as $p$) that the influence of each factor or factor combination on the results is statistically significant, i.e., not random. When this probability exceeds a given level of significance (in this case, 0.05), the influence of the factor is considered not significant for the analysis.

The second goal of this test is to offer an estimate of the interaction between factors in numerical terms. Only the factors or factor interactions which turn out to be significant are included in this second phase. Although a given factor is deemed significant, not all of its categories need be significant. For instance, while the speaker's family language group by language may turn out statistically significant, some category combination (e.g. bilingual speaker by Catalan / Castilian language) may appear non-significant. In any case, these results have to be interpreted; the researcher has to give a logical reading to the numeric trends uncovered by the analysis according to a theoretical model. It should be pointed out now that the higher the level studied, the more difficult interpretation becomes, to the point that third and even second level interactions are often left uninterpreted.

V  Repeated measures analysis: the results

In the present study, the test concluded that the model that best explained the results obtained was formed by the addressee factor ($p < 0.001$) and the factor interactions speaker's FLG by language ($p = 0.002$), language domain by language ($p = 0.024$), addressee by language ($p < 0.001$), and speaker's FLG by addressee by language ($p = 0.001$). It should be noted that the domain by language interaction is by far the weakest of those found to be significant. The other factors and factor interactions were not found to be significant to explain language choice (see appendix 5 for the tables).

First level interactions: The only factor which turns out to be significant for language choice on its own is that of the addressee. It should be remembered here that we are not interested in knowing what factors predict frequencies of appearance per se. Rather, our purpose is to understand what factors explain language choice. Therefore, our interest should focus on those factor interactions including language. On its own, addressee only accounts for the difference in utterance frequency obtained by some addressees is significantly different from the number obtained by other addressees, and is therefore irrelevant to our analysis.

Second level interactions: three factor combinations are significant in explaining the
percentages of utterances obtained, namely (a) speaker’s FLG by language, (b) language domain by language, and (c) addressee by language.

a. Speaker’s FLG by language: the speaker’s family language group and the language used help predict the number of utterances produced. In other words, there is a significant relationship between the speaker’s first language and his or her trend to produce more utterances in Catalan or in Castilian.

Regarding the trend indicated by these associations, Castilian speakers appeared to significantly interact with Castilian (coefficient = 55.62363)\(^66\), while Catalans interacted with Catalan (coefficient = 58.36841). Bilinguals were not significantly related to any language, i.e., their language choices were placed between those of Catalan speakers and those of Castilian speakers.

b. Language domain by language: the domain of interaction turns out to significantly interact with language in the production of more utterances in one language or in the other. There is a significant relationship between each domain and the subjects’ trend to use more Catalan or more Castilian.

Not surprisingly, it was the interactions between class domain and Catalan (21.73877), and between untutored domain and Castilian (21.73877) that turned out to be positive, in that class usage favours the production of Catalan utterances, while Castilian utterances are favoured by the untutored domain.

c. Addressee by language: the addressee factor positively interacts with the language chosen to predict the number of utterances produced, proving that there is a significant relationship between language choice and the addressee.

All addressee categories but one turn out to be significantly addressed in Castilian. The exception is the teachers and monitors category, which interacts very strongly with Catalan (190.86886). All the other categories are significantly linked to Castilian, which means that they are mostly addressed in that language. Given the numbers of Catalan, bilingual and Castilian speakers involved in this research, this result comes as no surprise. It nevertheless confirms the fact that school policy on language norms has only achieved one single transformation on the out-of-school language choice norms: being a teacher or a monitor now implies being primarily addressed in Catalan. All the others are addressed mostly in Castilian.

Differences between addressees exist, though. Non-identified pupil\(^67\) addressees are very

\(^{66}\)See intervals in appendix 5.

\(^{67}\)Remember that these were pupils whose voice was not clearly identified by the researcher.
strongly linked to Castilian (62.72196), and they are followed by bilingual (54.59959) and Castilian-speaking addressees (53.68305). Catalan-speaking addressees, on the contrary, show a weaker association with Castilian (19.86426), showing that they are more often addressed in Catalan than the other subjects.

Thus, three factors (speaker's FLG, language domain and addressee) may be considered to be significantly related with language choice. According to the data, Catalan-speaking informants are strongly associated with Catalan as speakers, while Castilian-speaking informants are strongly associated with Castilian. Everybody in the school is primarily addressed in Castilian except teachers and monitors, with whom Catalan is overwhelmingly used. Catalan speakers are addressed in Catalan more often than the other subjects, but they constitute a tiny minority in a Castilian-speaking majority, and the overall balance is still favourable to Castilian. Finally, classes significantly promote the use of Catalan in comparison with untutored interaction, where more Castilian is used. It is now time to turn to higher level interactions.

**Third and fourth level interactions:** the only significant third level interaction is the one between speaker's FLG by addressee by language. Domain does not interact significantly with two other variables. This result is remarkable in many senses, but its most important consequence is that of reducing the importance of language domain for language choice. Indeed, language choice becomes a matter of speakers and addressees, a result congruous with the language norms prevalent in Catalonia. This is not at all surprising when one takes into account the fact that domain by language was the weakest interaction detected by the test.

How can this result be combined with those of second level, where domain played a significant role in language choice? I would argue that the domain by language significant interaction is a by-product of the audiences involved in each domain, rather than an independent reason for language choice. It should be remembered that more subjects interact with teachers and monitors in class than outside class. It is my contention that it is the over-abundance of utterances addressed -almost all of them in Catalan- to the teachers, and the latter's frequent presence as overhearers, that creates the appearance that a difference in domain, understood in contextual terms such as setting or scene, does exist. The truth is that although more Catalan is spoken in class than outside it, more Castilian than Catalan is used in the classroom. This proves that domain per se does not determine language choice at all. It is clearly another factor that produces the Catalan surplus: the fact that classes are more teacher-centred.

This interpretation is further supported by the fact that fourth level interactions (i.e., the speaker's FLG by language domain by addressee by language interaction) turned out not to be significant at all. In other words, the inclusion of domain into the model did not necessarily imply the enhancement of its predictive value.
Those estimates found to be significant deriving from this interaction of factors have been simplified in the table 5.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker's FLG</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Language favoured</th>
<th>Estimated interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>19.24870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>19.10681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>29.12209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>Pupil</td>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>25.28198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A conservative approach was adopted, and only those clearly significant (in this case, with a coefficient higher than 14) were considered. These results coincide with the previous ones, for they link Castilian speakers with the Castilian language, and reserve Catalan for Catalan-bilingual interactions.

In conclusion, the repeated measures test is congruous with observational data (see section 5.2) and the relevant literature on language choice in Catalonia claiming that the norms of language choice in Catalonia have a personal basis: Castilian speakers address everybody (except for teachers and monitors) in Castilian, while Catalan speakers seem to reserve Catalan for ingroup purposes and use Castilian for outgroup communication. Bilinguals appear between Catalan and Castilian speakers. Thus, the hypothesis that the Catalan subordination norm is maintained seems to be verified, although with a minor modification: teachers and monitors are primarily addressed in Catalan (and therefore also by Castilian speakers). My findings here confirm that language choice among the subjects studied is primarily based on a combination of the speakers and the addressees' sociolinguistic characteristics, and the domain influence receives only limited empirical support.

### 5.1.6 Norms of language choice: experimental and observational data

#### I The need for experimental data

In order to assess to what extent the school had transformed the norms of language use among the students, two main questions should be posed: first, is Castilian still the only language used by Castilian speakers and the one used for outgroup communication? and second, are Catalan speakers still using Catalan for in-group interaction?

In order to strengthen the approach to the subjects’ behaviour, a small naturalistic quasi-experiment was designed to observe a large number of interactions. The quasi-experiment, described in section 4.2.2.4, consisted basically in the successive combination of the maximal number of subject pairs or dyads in a natural environment where they could be led to speak spontaneously to each other. This spontaneity was
guaranteed by the dynamic, action-focussed interaction on which they had to concentrate: a table tennis match (see chapter 4). Dyads remained rather isolated from each other by the relative distance between tables, and by the game itself, which required maximal concentration on the opponent and the action.

Part of the results of this quasi-experiment were analysed as the author's *tesi de licenciatura* (Vila i Moreno, 1993b). On that occasion, a sample of subjects (the *core subjects*) was selected and their language choices with the rest of participants were analysed in terms of three variables: family language group, grade and sex. The results confirmed that while there was no significant difference in the choice of Catalan as the unmarked language of the dyads due to sex or grade, family linguistic group was significant in that Catalan speakers tended to use Catalan more often than bilinguals, and these spoke Catalan more often than Castilian speakers.

In this section I will review the significance of FLG for the *totality* -rather than the small sample formed by core subjects- of pupils involved in the quasi-experiment in the choice of Catalan as the unmarked language of interaction. Each subject was observed in one or more table tennis matches playing with other school mates. Language choices can be divided into (a) subjects observed always or almost always speaking Catalan with a given interlocutor, with only occasional switches to Castilian, coded as C; (b) subjects observed speaking both languages without a clear predominance of either; coded as C/S in the tables; (c) subjects using only Castilian, or Castilian with occasional switches to Catalan, coded as S.

The results of this observation are exhibited in tables 5.7, 5.8 and 5.9 below. Each subject has been attributed a number of dyads in each language according to the language he or she spoke with the other subject during the experiment. Obviously, each subject represents only half of the dyad; his or her interlocutors, who represent the other half of the dyad, are other subjects in one of the tables. That means that, for instance, Esg (in table 5.9) was observed interacting with nine different subjects on a number of occasions, i.e., Esg was observed as a member of nine dyads. In three of these dyads she was seen speaking only Catalan, or Catalan with occasional switches to Castilian, with her interlocutor, in one case both Catalan and Castilian, and in five dyads only Castilian or Castilian with occasional switches to Catalan. The language of the interlocutors is not noted in Esg row, but forms part of other subjects' score. Therefore, the totals do not account for the number of dyads observed, but rather the number of dyads of which each subject formed part. The tables do not include as speakers some subjects from other grades who sometimes joined the game; nevertheless, they were included as interlocutors. Besides that, some subjects (especially some of the girls) simply did not speak during the matches, hence their choices could not be deduced.

The results from the quasi-experiment coincide with those from the corpus and with observational data. Castilian speakers remain fundamentally alien to the use of Catalan in
these untutored interactions, while Catalan-speaking and bilingual subjects make considerable, although not exclusive, use of Catalan.

Table 5.7 shows the language choice made by Castilian speakers during the table tennis quasi-experiment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C/S</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C/S</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>JRS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MCG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MFV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>MMU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>MPF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MPM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NMF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>RPT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SCP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SFB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SLJ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>VGO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>XMS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ZMR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JLL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C: Catalan; C/S: Catalan and Castilian; S: Castilian

Castilian is clearly predominant. Only three Castilian speakers form part of a dyad which seemed to have Catalan as the unmarked language of communication, and three other speakers are recorded as forming part of one or two dyads in which Catalan and Castilian were frequently used. Only 8 dyads out of 137 (5.83%) include Catalan as the predominant or at least equally important language of interaction, i.e., in less than 6% of the observed interactions did Castilian speakers make more than occasional use of Catalan. It can be argued with much confidence that the school has not represented a fundamental modification in the language norms in untutored interaction with regard to Castilian speakers: Castilian remains the language most used by Castilian speakers, for they behave almost as Castilian monolinguals in peer interaction when language choices are analysed.

Both Catalan and bilingual speakers show an appreciable presence of both languages in their dyads during the quasi-experiment (see tables 5.8 and 5.9). All Catalan subjects have at least one dyad in Catalan, but only a small amount of bilinguals have some dyads in Catalan. Surprisingly enough, Catalan is the language most used for at least one Catalan and one bilingual speaker: Jcv and Xpr.
Table 5.8. Number of dyads in Catalan, Catalan/Castilian, and Castilian established by Catalan-speaking pupils with school-mates during the quasi-experiment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C/S</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C: Catalan; C/S: Catalan and Castilian; S: Castilian.

Table 5.9. Number of dyads in Catalan, Catalan/Castilian, and Castilian established by bilingual pupils with school-mates during the quasi-experiment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C/S</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XPR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C: Catalan; C/S: Catalan and Castilian; S: Castilian.

Now the question is by whom these dyads choosing Catalan or Catalan and Castilian are formed. Table 5.10 and section 5.1.6.2 try to answer this question.

Table 5.10 shows the interlocutors of those dyads including at least one Castilian speaker who made considerable use of Catalan, the language chosen by the Castilian speaker, and their interlocutor's family language group (cf. table 5.7).

Table 5.10. Dyads including Castilian speakers with a significant presence of Catalan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Speaker's choice</th>
<th>Addressee's choice</th>
<th>Addressee FLG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>XPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>XPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCG</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>XPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCG</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>JCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEO</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>JRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEO</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>SFB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAA</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>DCV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSG</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>JCV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In five out of eight cases, the interlocutors are either Catalan or bilingual speakers who belong to the Catalan-speaking core and have the same language choice as their Castilian interlocutors (see next section). With regard to the other three dyads, further observation confirmed that Castilian was their unmarked language and that the presence of Catalan, although not rare, may had been overestimated during the quasi-experiment. It is also relevant here that Far (a bilingual) used Catalan with Mar, a Castilian-speaking sixth-grader, but this choice seems to be due to the fact that they had just met and probably did not know their linguistic preferences yet. In the case of Castilian speakers, thus, the (indeed rare) choice of Catalan seems to be derived from the fact that their interlocutors are Catalan or bilingual speakers. Catalan is practically never used for Castilian ingroup interaction.

Catalan and bilingual speakers converge with their interlocutors' language choice in the majority of cases. Leaving aside the rare cases where Castilian speakers chose Catalan, Jcv was recorded as maintaining Catalan when interacting with Zmr and Esg used Catalan with Mcg, in spite of his maintaining Castilian.

To synthesise, the Catalan subordination norm is amply respected by a majority of subjects for peer interaction. On the one hand, Castilian speakers hardly use Catalan as the unmarked language of communication in any dyad. In the scarce cases they do, it is with Catalan and bilingual speakers who show a high preference for Catalan, as we will see in the next section. On the other hand, and as expected due to the practical non-existence of bilingual conversations, i.e., nonconvergent dyads in which each subject uses his or her preferred language, Catalan and bilingual speakers usually adopt Castilian in their dyads with Castilian speakers.

All these results confirm that active use of Catalan in peer interaction is mostly confined to Catalan and bilingual speakers. As a rule, Castilian speakers seldom use Catalan with their peers. It remains to be seen whether Catalan resists as the ingroup language for Catalan speakers even in a situation where these are a small minority.
II Maintenance of Catalan as an ingroup language

Focussing on untutored interaction, I have tried to prove that Castilian remains the language of peer outgroup interaction, and that Catalan is hardly used by Castilian speakers. On the contrary, due to the low number of Catalan speakers present in the school, we still do not know to what extent Catalan is being retained as the Catalan speakers’ ingroup language. To answer this question, all data had to be combined: results from the quasi-experiment were added to those arising from the recordings and complemented with observational notes so that the unmarked language of communication for a maximum of dyads formed by Catalan and bilingual pupils could be identified. A Catalan for Ingroup Relations Index (CIRI) was produced to measure the degree of maintenance of Catalan as the language of ingroup communication by assigning 1 point to each dyad with Catalan as the usual language, 0.75 to Catalan with occasional switching, 0.5 to Catalan and Castilian, 0.25 to Castilian with occasional switching and 0 to Castilian; the scores were summed for each individual, and his/her result divided by the number of dyads.

Tables 5.11 and 5.12 below show the result of this operation. Rows refer to speakers, while columns refer to addressees. Asterisks indicate the logically impossible combinations (one subject cannot speak to him/herself), while double hyphens mean that the unmarked language for the dyad in question could not be properly checked.
When Catalan and bilingual speakers are analysed together, a slow transition appears between those who use more Catalan with Catalan and Bilingual speakers, and those who seem to prefer Castilian. Both tables make it clear that Catalan remains the language of ingroup communication not only for Catalan speakers (see especially the table for eighth grade) but also for a good deal of bilinguals. Catalan speakers preserve Catalan as the language of ingroup communication without exception, and use Catalan with a majority of bilinguals. Bilinguals are not so consistent in their maintenance of Catalan.

Tables 5.10 and 5.11 reflect the minimal difference existing in language choice between the two members of each dyad. Indeed, only in a few cases is language choice not totally coincidental, and in those cases discrepancies amount only to a matter of degree rather than categorical differences (e.g. Jcv speaks only Catalan to Dla, while the latter switches from time to time to Castilian when addressing Jcv). As a consequence of this fact, both tables can be read as an implicational scale: the more one subject uses Catalan to address his or her classmates, the more this subject is expected to be addressed in Catalan by the others.

In order to analyse whether coherent subgroups could be identified, a Cluster Test was
applied to the data. This test compares the subjects with one another according to the factors researched, and classifies those subjects which are more similar with one another into a number of subgroups (clusters) previously determined by the researcher. The test gives the mean score for each cluster, and the distance between each subject and his or her cluster mean. Thus, it describes the data in terms of similarities and differences.

Three variables were used to establish the clusters: (a) the use of Catalan in the subject's family (Cofi), (see section 4.5); (b) the use of Catalan in the subject's social network excluding the teachers (Sucti) (see section 4.5); and (c) the use of Catalan for relationships in Catalan and bilingual peers (Ciri) (see above). In all three cases we are dealing with indexes, so the results should be handled with a certain reserve, although they are quite illustrative.

The most accurate description of the data was yielded by an analysis of six clusters, and can be seen in table 5.12 below. The table includes the mean obtained by the subjects from each group for Catalan family use (Cofi), Social use (Sucti), and Catalan maintenance for ingroup interactions (Ciri).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Cofi</th>
<th>Sucti</th>
<th>Ciri</th>
<th>Subjects included in each cluster</th>
<th>N. of subj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5875</td>
<td>.6957</td>
<td>.9679</td>
<td>Dcv, Ncp, Xpr</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>Jcv</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4788</td>
<td>.0271</td>
<td>.0699</td>
<td>Ead, Ebg, Gbg</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.9807</td>
<td>.1516</td>
<td>.8242</td>
<td>Esg, Jbc, Jce, Jms</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.5000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>Jrg</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.5298</td>
<td>.3772</td>
<td>.4807</td>
<td>Ana, Far, Mcp</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Catalan-speaking core can be distinguished, formed by those clusters (clusters 1, 2 and 4) including a number of Catalan and bilingual subjects, all of whom interact with each other in Catalan. These clusters show remarkable differences: cluster 1 is formed by bilinguals who make a significant use of Catalan outside the school; cluster 2 only includes one subject, Jcv, whose preference for Catalan seems quite explicit; finally, cluster 4 contains all the other Catalan speakers; it is noticeable that these subjects hardly make use of Catalan in their networks; nevertheless, they seem to retain Catalan for ingroup purposes.

The other clusters include subjects who do not fully retain Catalan to interact with Catalan and bilingual speakers. Cluster 5 should be discarded from analysis, for the contradiction between declared data (Cofi and Sucti) and observed data (Ciri) simply confirms that Jrg's self-declared data were not completely reliable. Cluster 6 points to subjects who only maintain Catalan as the language of interaction with Catalan speakers in part of their relationships, but not in all. Finally, cluster 3 includes those individuals...
coming from bilingual families who do not make productive use of Catalan.

According to these results, Catalan and bilingual subjects may be classified as follows: first, there exists a Catalan-speaking core, formed by all Catalan speakers and a number of bilinguals. Catalan speakers maintain their ingroup language even when they make little use of this language as a whole. Bilinguals, on the contrary, seem more dependent on their social networks: some are conspicuous members of the Catalan-speaking core, for they use Catalan more than most Catalan speakers; in fact, only those who make use of Catalan in their social networks seem to retain Catalan for ingroup purposes with classmates. Bilinguals who do not make much use of Catalan seem not to retain it consistently for peer interaction. Finally, there are a number of bilinguals who seem to have assimilated to Castilian speakers: they do not use Catalan either in their networks or in with class-mates.

These data may suggest some general trends, but they cannot establish causal relationships. We do not know to what extent the language-in-education policy followed at the present school has aided to retain Catalan for ingroup purposes, and whether the school's language choice has avoided further assimilation towards Castilian. In fact, we ignore whether cluster 3 is formed by 'lost bilinguals', i.e., subjects from bilingual families who assimilated to their Castilian peers' monolingual behaviour, or rather 'new bilinguals', i.e., informants who somewhat overestimated their family use of Catalan and have retained a mostly monolingual behaviour with their class-mates. In any case, though, the present analysis can only point to a number of correlations between factors. I do not intend to solve here the problem of cause-effect relationship posed by this data, for there is no way to solve it with the information at our disposal.

To summarise, the answer to the question of whether Catalan is preserved as the language of Catalan-speakers' ingroup communication is moderately positive. No dyad formed by two Catalan speakers was detected in which the unmarked language of communication was Castilian. Even more: a good deal of bilinguals behave as Catalan native speakers in the sense that they use Catalan exclusively to interact with Catalan speakers and other bilinguals. Together with the Catalan speakers, they form the Catalan-speaking. On the other hand, a number of bilinguals make extensive, even exclusive use of Castilian to interact with Catalan and bilingual speakers. If these subjects are regarded as Catalan speakers, they would be seriously violating the ingroup norm which requires Catalan; if they are regarded as something different from traditional Catalan speakers, new norms should be defined to characterize their behaviour.

5.1.7 Norms of language choice: summary

The present chapter has allowed us to confirm that, in spite of the predominance of Catalan as the institutional language, the Catalan subordination norm remains fully active among our subjects. This norm favours monolingual utterances and organizes code choice on the basis of the participants' linguistic affiliation. According to this norm,
Castilian speakers do not have to choose any other language than their own first 
language, while Catalan and most bilingual speakers opt for Catalan or Castilian as a 
function of their addressees' linguistic group. Teachers and monitors are the only group 
with whom Castilian speakers make predominant use of Catalan, for they are often 
addressed in this language by the former. Not surprisingly, class interaction, a teacher-
controlled situation, weakens the application of the Catalan subordination norm: more 
Catalan is used during the classes, although Castilian still remains the language most 
used with classmates during class-interaction. Thus, only in the relationships between 
teachers and pupils has the Catalan subordination norm been thoroughly challenged: 
teachers speak Catalan almost exclusively to their pupils, and pupils speak mostly 
Catalan to their teachers as well. I propose to term this behaviour the *school version of 
the Catalan subordination norm*. Only a handful of Catalan-speaking and bilingual 
subjects seem not to apply this norm and display a behaviour closer to that identified as 
the Catalan preeminence norm.

Special attention has been paid in this section to untutored interaction, which is to say, 
those situations where teachers' supervision is absent or loosened and subjects interact 
more or less freely. Some relevant phenomena have been underlined by observation and 
the quasi-experiment which was carried on.

Catalan shows a remarkable vitality among its speakers in the school studied. There 
seems to exist what I have called a Catalan-speaking core, that is, a (small) number of 
Catalan and bilingual speakers who maintain Catalan as the exclusive language of 
intercommunication among themselves. This core includes all Catalan speakers and most 
bilinguals, but several bilinguals remain out of it. In several cases, the core members do 
not limit their use of Catalan to the core, but rather *spill* it over the core's borders to reach 
the other bilinguals and even some Castilian speakers, to the point that some core 
members seem to live almost exclusively in Catalan.

The Catalan-speaking core is surrounded by a *fringe* of -usually family bilingual-
subjects who make some use of Catalan in untutored interaction, either as the unmarked 
language of some dyads, or as a language into which to code-switch from time to time. 
They may use Catalan (with or without Castilian) with some of the Catalan core 
members, and Castilian with the others, but they can also use Catalan with some other 
subjects who do not belong to the core.

Finally, beyond this fringe lay the majority of subjects, for whom Catalan represents a 
scarcely used resource in untutored situations; except in their interactions with teachers, 
they behave as traditional Castilian monolinguals. Theses subjects include practically all 
Castilian-speaking subjects, and also some bilinguals.

Section 5.1 has confirmed that it is possible to predict the unmarked choice for a vast 
majority of interactions on the basis of social factors which, in this case, basically
concern the participants in the speech event. In other words, the participants constellation permits to foretell with a high degree of accuracy the language which will be selected for each interaction. It is indeed remarkable that norms of language choice can be said to be fairly established in a situation which *a priori* looked favourable for instability in language choice. In the next section, I will explore how these norms have been brought about and how these norms are transgressed by the speakers to their own benefit.
5.2 Qualitative analysis: the management of code-switching

5.2.1 Unmarked choices and choice transgressions

According to the previous section, and given the clear preference for monolingual choices for each dyad existing in Catalonia, any switch to the non customary language with the same interlocutor constitutes a choice transgression. Only in a very limited number of cases in which this customary language seems more difficult to determine might code-switching be regarded as unmarked. Some of these transgressions, such as switching to Castilian for citation purposes in an otherwise Catalan ingroup interaction, have already been described by other researchers, and may even be considered as expected in the traditional normative framework in Catalonia. Others, such as switching to Catalan for quotation purposes in an otherwise Castilian ingroup interaction or the reluctance to converge towards Castilian displayed by some Catalan and bilingual subjects, seem relatively newer in the Catalan context.

In the following sections, I will analyse the uses of code-switching in the school. I will start by reviewing code-switching functions in untutored contexts in section 5.2.2, where quantitative evidence makes it clear that the Catalan subordination norm remains amply predominant. In section 5.2.3, I will move to analyse the only area in which the Catalan preeminence norm seems to have made some inroads, that is in teachers-students interaction. The interaction between both norms in the subjects’ behaviour in comparison to that of the broader society will occupy the following section. It would be undoubtedly tempting to attribute all changes in the Catalan subordination norm to the pressure in favour of Catalan exerted by the school. This is, nevertheless, a causal link which is not necessarily true in all cases, and which will deserve some discussion in section 5.2.5. An analysis of how norms are learned and imposed will be developed in section 5.2.6. Finally, the review of how language norms competed during the interviews will be attempted in section 5.2.7.

5.2.2 Peer untutored interaction: maintenance of the 'Catalan subordination norm'

1 Code-switching basic function: switching for addresse-identification

The Catalan subordination norm is the dominant norm governing the subjects' language use. Castilian is the language of communication for Castilian speakers' ingroup dyads and for outgroup communication, while Catalan is the Catalan speakers' ingroup language. The norm favours monolingual utterances in whatever language. Therefore, long stretches of monolingual Castilian interaction may take place without a single switch to Catalan, as in the following excerpt.

(1) Speaking about holidays.
NMF FSG claro.
FSG tú tienes...
Castilian is also the language chosen by most bilinguals and Catalan speakers when addressing Castilian speakers. See how Jce (Catalan speaker) speaks Castilian with Zmr.
Preparing a poster

ZMR
el diez lo tenemos/

JCE
el diez/

JCE
no tengo ni la menor idea/

JCE
(...) el trece sí_

ZMR
el diez sí que lo tenemos

JCE
number ten/

JCE
I haven't got a clue/

JCE
(...) we do have number thirteen_

ZMR
we do have number [ten]

Catalan is preserved as the language of communication of Catalan and most bilingual speakers, as shown in the following example:

Looking for a glass workshop.

GBG
és aquí lo del vidre/

ESG
éh/

GBG
on van_

GBG
(...) és aquí lo del vidre/

ESG
quim vidre_

GBG
a veure com fan vidre

ESG
ah_anem_corre_

ESG
{"@ potser_si no x tornem_}

ESG
on s'acaba el xxx\x

GBG
xxx ho posa_

GBG
pero xxxx allá\x

IKU
{"??? si que s'acabà\x {(DL)}}

ANA
(...) ai_mira_

FAR
esto es lo_lo de estam-

FAR
onde estampán lo(s) dibujo(s) en la(s) camisetas\x

ESG
(...) hala mira_ qué guay\x

ESG
t'imagina que això_ tot això és de coses de per xx\èh/

ESG
èh_ xx\x ((seems like to start eating a sandwich))

GBG
(...) de qué_

GBG
is that the place of crystal \x

ESG
èh/

GBG
where are they going_

GBG
(...) is that the crystal place_

ESG
what crystal_

GBG
to watch how they make crystal\x

ESG
ah_ let's go_ run_

ESG
{"@} perhaps_if we don't x go back_

ESG
(...) where does the xxxx end\x

GBG
xxx says it_

GBG
pero xxxx allà\x

IKU
{"??? it does end\x {(DL)}}

ANA
(...) ai_ look_

FAR
this is that place where they_ where they st-

FAR
where they stamp pictures on T-shirts\x

ESG
(...) wuaw_look how nice\x

GBG
can you imagine that this_ all this is made of things for xx\x can't you\x

ESG
èh_ xx\x ((she seems to start eating a sandwich))

GBG
(...) of what_

As a result of the Catalan subordination norm, the first and most evident function of code-switching is that of managing interaction in mixed groups: Catalan and (most) bilingual
speakers are led to switch to and fro between Catalan and Castilian according to the interlocutor(s). Rapid intersentential code-switching is the habitual result of such heterogeneous situations. Of course, the abundance of such fragments of interaction remains linked to the abundance of dyads having Catalan as their unmarked language, and, in consequence, to the presence of Catalan and bilingual speakers. In the following example, Catalan is the unmarked language of communication between Jcv and Jce, and between Jcv and Fgb. Castilian is the unmarked language of communication between Jce and Fgb.

(4) Preparing puppets.

FGB JCE
(...) a(ho)ra qué hay que hacer_ (..) subir/ Jce/
JCV FGB no:_. quan acabes tallar_
FGB JCV qué/
*aJCE JBG JCV no:_. li dónes un par de puntades_
JCV JCE (..) com es fa_
FGB xXXx_
JCE FGB (..) no_ pero ahora subes_
FGB JCE ah_, claro_
JCV JCE (..) io no sé fer puntades_

FGB JCE (..) what must we do_ (..) move it up/ Jce/
JCV FGB no:_. when you finish cutting_
FGB JCV what/
*aJCE FGB JCV no:_. you put a couple of stitches_
JCV JCE (..) how do you do it_
FGB xXXx_
JCE FGB (..) no_ but now you move it up_
FGB JCE oh_, I see_
JCV JCE (..) I can’t stitch_

Notice that Jce’s first answer to Fgb (marked with *) takes place in Catalan, probably due to the fact that he is answering to Fgb with what can possibly be regarded as a correction of Jcv’s statement. He nevertheless switches to Castilian as soon as possible. In fact, failure to adopt the right choice is resented as a mistake and quickly repaired by most speakers. See for instance how Ana transforms her Castilian utterance into a Catalan one, for Jbc is the main addressor of her message now.

(5) Talking in the playground.

JBC [xXXx]
ANA JBC RPT [para mi_] és que {(??) no hi ha color_ en aquest problema_}

JBC [xXXx]
ANA JBC RPT [to me_] the issue is absolutely clear_}

Pressure towards the adoption of the unmarked language for each dyad goes beyond individual moves. See how Rpt tries to converge -rather unsuccessfully in linguistic terms- with Ana and Jbc, who are talking Catalan, and how Ana switches to Castilian, her unmarked language with Rpt, to answer.
Castilian is so predominant in the environment that it keeps its role as the language to address groups and unknown people. Thus, usage of Castilian as a group language is frequent even in those cases in which Catalans and bilinguals form part of the audience. See in the following example, for instance, how Jce, a bilingual, resorts to Castilian to communicate with his classmates as a whole:

(7) Preparing puppets.

FSG AOS (...) tú vas siempre a po(r') la pelota

JCE DIV (...) alguien ha acabado/ ya casi/ ((DL))

NKU JCE io_ ((DL))

FSG AOS (...) you always go after the ball

JCE DIV (...) has anyone finished/ almost/ ((DL))

NKU JCE I have_ ((DL))

(n 3022)

II. Traditional choice transgressions

For Catalan speakers, switching between Catalan and Castilian according to the interlocutors' linguistic identity is mandatory according to the Catalan subordination norm. It cannot be regarded as a choice transgression, but rather as a compulsory choice. In other words, switching makes the right choice possible at every moment. It is, therefore, the failure to switch adequately which constitutes a marked behaviour, as in examples 4 and 5. Other forms of code-switching do constitute a transgression of the unmarked choice: they are, therefore, marked switches. Some of them, which can be regarded as 'licit', or traditionally frequent transgressions, can be grossly classified in three groups:

a. Code-switching as a discourse device for expressing a second voice,
b. Code-switching for language deficits and for mot juste function,

To be true, and in a comparative perspective, this possibility continues not to attract much exploitation among our subjects, as Woolard (1989) pointed out for the Catalan society one decade ago.

a. Code-switching as a second voice: The Catalan subordination norm includes the possibility of switching from Catalan to Castilian in a restricted number of cases in order to adopt a
different identity. The most frequently used function of marked code-switching is that of quotation, which includes different variants. On the one hand, interventions produced in Castilian are usually quoted in that language even by the most Catalan-dominant speaker:

(8) Quoting Jce’s words.
   JCV (... diu_
   JCV le he pillat(d)o_
   JCV le he pillat(d)o_
   JCV i di_
   JCV qui_
   JCV i dic_
   JCV a qui has pillat_
   JCV i di_
   JCV no_ el fil_
   JCV (... he says_
   JCV I got it_
   JCV I got it_
   JCV and I say_
   JCV what_
   JCV I say_
   JCV whom did you get_
   JCV and he says_
   JCV no_ the thread_
   (e 2723)

In spite of Catalan’s status as the institutional language in the school, Castilian still evokes a feeling of officiality for some speakers, which favours its adoption as the language of public messages. In the following example, two teachers (Jof and Eva) had just announced that those who had failed the exam should attend a new exam; in the middle of the noise, a voice launches a message to the class in Castilian:

(9) Speaking to the class.
   JBC{\(\{F\}\) quedan convocados para xXXx el otro día\}
   JBC{\(\{F\}\) they are summoned for xXXx another day\}
   (q 180)

Use of Castilian is also deeply associated with mass-media. Films, music and other mass media products are usually cited in their Castilian, more widely available form, even though they have been dubbed into Catalan and broadcast as well.

(10) Talking about films.
   NCP  <2> has vist Mira quién habla/
   NCP  <2> have you seen Look who's talking/
   (d 2187)

This association is carried over to other contexts. See, for instance, how Ana switches to Castilian to address the tape-recorder microphone and announce their next subject of talk in a TV presenter way:

(11) Talking in secret to the tape-recorder.
   ANA  {\(\{P\}\) espera espera_ \{(??) a\}nem a} fer una cosa\}
   ANA  (... \{(() \) vamos a hablar de to(dos') lo(s') profesores aquí en la grabadora\}
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Dialect or accent switching may serve the same second-voice functions as Catalan-Castilian switching. See how Ana and Jbr imitate Andalusian accents they never use otherwise:

(12)  ANA  {((EV) vamo(s') a ver!)}  ANA  {((EV) let's see!)}  (q 1406)

(13)  JBR  {((EV) vamo(s') a ampliar(lo)}  JBR  {((EV) we're gonna enlarge it)}  (q 1519)

Jms and his class-mates make it plain that an Andalusian accent is lowly regarded in the following excerpt including a joke. In the joke, a gorgeous girl who is the object of desire of a man arouses public laughter when she opens her mouth and speaks with a marked Andalusian accent:

(14)  Telling a joke.
    JMS  XVM  el el Llo que hi havia una tia que estava com un: com un tren_
    JMS  XVM  i va i li pregunta_
    JMS  XVM  cómo te llamas_
    JMS  XVM  {((EV) yo Raquel) [j, o ra'ke]}
    DIV  @ @ @
    JMS  XVM  {((@) i ia la caga_ no/ perquè:}  
    DIV  @ @ @
    JMS  XVM  [llo that there was this gorgeous_
    JMS  XVM  and he goes and asks_
    JMS  XVM  what's your name_
    JMS  XVM  {((EV) i Raquel) [j, o ra'ke]}
    DIV  @ @ @
    JMS  XVM  {((@) and he fucks it up_ you know_ because:}  
    DIV  @ @ @
    (w 2100)

These very connotations are carried over to Catalan in a number of cases. For instance, see how the Andalusian features are imported into Catalan, with the result that the latter is pronounced in a highly Castilianised variety, in an attempt to mimic the allegedly-Andalusian followers of the R.C.D. Espanyol, Barcelona's second football team:

(15)  Conversation about football teams.
    ARC   {((F) xXXx del E(s')pañol)}  [ep'pa'nl]
    ARC   {((F) porque yo no soy del E(s')pañol)}  [ep'pa'nl]
    FAR   {((CAN)(F) E(s')panyol_}  ((pica de mans))  [ap'pa'nl]
    DIV   {((CAN)(F) E(s')panyol_}  ((pica de mans))  [ap'pa'nl]
    DIV   {((CAN)(F) E(s')panyol_}  ((pica de mans))  [ap'pa'nl]
    ARC   {((F) xXXx of the E(s')pañol football club_}
    ARC   {((F) because I am not a supporter of the E(s')pañol}  
    FAR   {((CAN)(F) E(s')panyol_}  ((clapping hands))  
    FAR   {((CAN)(F) E(s')panyol_}  ((clapping hands))  
    DIV   {((CAN)(F) E(s')panyol_}  ((clapping hands))
In all these cases the use of the marked language deactivates the expectations regarding rights and obligations and places the listener on a different, fictitious, and often humorous level. In this sense, quotations are fundamentally different from addressee-specification, when no modification in the social relationship is expected and where precisely the failure to choose the right language -the failure to switch- is to be interpreted as the marked behaviour.

b. Competence related - mot juste: In some (rather rare) cases, the switching to Catalan is provoked by the inability to find the right term in Castilian. In such cases, though, immediate comprehension is not assured. See how Jms and Ice try to explain the meaning of a switch to Acb.

(16) Describing an accident.

JMS ACB (se) le cayó la llave_
JMS ACB y (se) le cayó en la cabeza_
JMS ACB y se hizo un(...) un sangtraït
JMS ACB (...) tenía todo esto morado_
JMS ACB [parecía xXx]
ACB JMS [un qué se hizo_
ICE ACB un sangtraït_
ACB ICE [un sangtraït/]
JMS ICE un morado/
ICE JMS no es una especie de morado_
ICE JMS no bien un morado/
JMS ICE [sí] la sangre acumulada_
JMS ACB he dropped the key_
JMS ACB and it fell on his head_
JMS ACB and it got a(...) a bruise/
JMS ACB (...) he had all this in blue/
JMS ACB [he looked like xXx]
ACB JMS [a what did he get_
ICE ACB a bruise_
ACB ICE [a bruise/]
JMS ICE a bruise/
ICE JMS no es una especie de bruise_
ICE JMS it's not [exactly] a bruise_
JMS ICE [sí] the accumulated blood_
(u 6948)

While Catalan transcodic markers in Castilian do appear in the data (see chapter 6), competence-related code-switches from Castilian to Catalan are extremely rare. This may be due to the high level of Castilian competence displayed by the Catalan-speaking subjects.

c. Verbal games: Some subjects seem to enjoy verbal games of different nature which entail language manipulation. This manipulation often affects two languages. Verbal games are by no means dependent on frozen expressions. Rather, productive bilinguals activate completely their second language:
These verbal games deactivate the expected social relationships in cases such as the one just presented, where a Catalan-speaking dyad switches to Castilian for the sake of the game. Nevertheless, this seems to be a secondary, ancilliary effect of the game. In fact, the choice of Castilian as the game language is produced by its ritualistic formulation and by the overwhelming environmental majority of Castilian speakers, as witnessed by the fact that these do not need to switch to Catalan to play.

5.2.3 Pupil-teacher interaction: the effects of the 'Catalan preeminence norm'

I Catalan as the unmarked choice

I have shown in section 5.1 that Catalan is the unmarked choice for pupil-teacher in-class relationships: all subjects seem to use this language for this sort of interaction in the majority of cases.

Explaining the subjects' own behaviour during a class debate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAB</th>
<th>DIV</th>
<th>[a veure_] em sembla que si no callem no sentim el que diuen els que tenen la mà la mà aixecada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAB</td>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>(...) xt:;_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>MAB</td>
<td>(...) que io una que io una estona (hi) he jugat_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>MAB</td>
<td>p(e)rò després ia m’a- ia m’avorria perquè ia no em passaven la pilota_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>MAB</td>
<td>i m’ (en) he anat_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMF</td>
<td>MAB</td>
<td>sí: Mab per (ai)xò no (hi) jugàvem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAB</td>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>[let’s see_] it seems that unless we shut up we can't hear what those who are raising their hands say_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAB</td>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>(...) sht:;_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>MAB</td>
<td>(...) that I played I played for a while_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>MAB</td>
<td>but later on I g- I got bored because no one passed me the ball_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>MAB</td>
<td>and I left_</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Several subjects are discussing the girls' lack of interest in sports and their refusal to participate. The interaction takes place as a class activity in which the pupils are expected to debate the class problems, suggest improvements, and praise/criticize their class-mates on the grounds of their behaviour. In this excerpt, Erl and Nmf are defending their behaviour of quitting their teams during a football match, on the grounds that they felt excluded from the game by their male classmates. They are trying to convince the ultimate referee of the whole interaction, the teacher (Mab), and therefore address her by choosing Catalan. Later on during the same discussion, Mfv insists on trying to convince Mab in Catalan:

(19) Explaining the subjects' own behaviour during a class debate.
Mab I didn't say that
Mab I didn't say that
Mab I didn't say that
Mab I didn't say that
Mab I didn't say that

Language choice in teacher-pupil interaction does not seem to experience significant changes between in-class and out-of-class contexts. In the following example, see how Nku (probably a fourth-grader) reformulates his own utterances in Catalan so that he gains the attention of a monitor:

(20) In the queue.
Hey, I made a fuss with it
Hey, I made a fuss with it
Hey, I made a fuss with it
Hey, I made a fuss with it

In the following example, note first how pupils (Jaa, Ebg, Jeo) address Mab consistently in Catalan, in spite of their being on an excursion and in the middle of the mountain.

(21) Talking about the landscape.
Mab has counted how many... (sic)
The final fragments confirms Jeo's poor competence in Catalan, for he is unable to construct a simple sentence such as quin escorpí, 'what scorpion'. Despite his limitations, Jeo persists in trying to speak Catalan to the teacher. Notice that Jeo -a Castilian-dominant speaker- answers in Catalan to a question originally addressed to Mab, his teacher, in an attempt to show off his knowledge of natural science to her. It is only a matter of bad luck to him that his limited command of Catalan leads him to say sacar, the Castilian verb for 'get', 'obtain', instead of Cat. treure.

The need to address teachers in Catalan was occasionally overapplied by some subjects. In the following example, Jcr complains in Catalan to Mrd, a female monitor who was teaching the subjects how to dye paper. This time, though, the choice was simply wrong, for Mrd was a Castilian speaker who hardly uttered a single word in Catalan in front of the subjects.

(22) Explaining how to dye paper.
MRD hombre_ lo mejor e:s hacerlo con: con con cariño [pero:_]
JCR MRD [és que no surt_]
JCR MRD no surt_
FAR JCR pues ponle má(s') pintura\
NAK no sale_
NAK dice\
MRD well_ the best thing is to do it with with with affection [but_]
JCR MRD [but it doesn't work_] 
JCR MRD it doesn't work_
FAR JCR put some more paint on it then\
NAK it doesn't work_
NAK he says\ 
(s 3342)

This was an error which was rarely made. In general terms, subjects were perfectly able to choose Castilian to interact with Mrd.

II Teachers’ in-class transgressions of the Catalan choice

Although extremely rare from a quantitative point of view, teachers may transgress the choice of Catalan as the unmarked language of interaction for a number of reasons. As in section 2,
these can be synthesised as:

a. Discourse-related switching, mostly related with second voices,

b. Competence related and *mot juste*

No verbal games were recorded in this case.

**a. Discourse-related switching**: Despite their active position in favour of the Catalan preeminence norm, the teachers themselves switch to Castilian from time to time for discourse-related functions. *Quotation* is probably the most common function for code-switching. In the following excerpt, fifth grade pupils had inquired about people’s reasons for voting by means of a short questionnaire passed to adults on the street. Once in class, they organized the multiple answers according to a short number of categories written on the blackboard. The excerpt shows the moment of classifying some of the answers, with pupils providing their results and Mab trying to lead the classificatory task.

(23) Giving the answers obtained on a questionnaire administered to people on the streets

MAB DIV  *anoteu_*
MAB MAP  *Map_(..) feu’se una creu conforme ia està controlada_
SCP MAB  *porque hay que votar_
NKU MAB  *a mi també_
DLA MAB  *a mi també_
MAB DIV  *porque hay que votar_
MAB DIV  *porque es_*
MAB DIV  *perqué és: [una obligació]*
NKU MAB  *[para votar]*
MAB DIV  *porque hay que votar és una obligació_no/

MAB DIV  *write_*
MAB MAP  *Map_(..) cross it to mean that it’s already been controlled*
SCP MAB  *because we must vote_
NKU MAB  *mine too_
DLA MAB  *mine too_*
MAB DIV  *because we must vote_
MAB DIV  *because it’s_*
MAB DIV  *because it’s: [an obligation]*
NKU MAB  *[for voting]*
MAB DIV  *because we must vote is an obligation isn’t it/
(b 1897)

Scp provides an answer in Castilian and Mab repeats it in the same language. In spite of the use of Castilian for almost exclusively quotation purposes, two lines below Mab self-corrects herself and tries to repress the switch to Castilian. In fact, quotation accounts for almost all Mab’s uses of Castilian.

Other teachers made ampler use of code-switching for discourse-related purposes. In the following example, Eva is scolding her pupils for their laziness at work and switches to Castilian in order to quote an imaginary label she would give them if they do not work properly:

(24) Scolding eighth-graders.
In the following example, the teacher (Eva) attempts to impose silence on the class by switching to Castilian. Once silence is achieved, she resumes her explanation in Catalan.

(25)  Trying to impose silence.
DIV  xXXx
EVA DIV  {{??) quieto:s_}
EVA DIV  bè\ després queda_
EVA DIV  [l'entrada]

(26)  Pretending to be a policeman.
VIC  XVM  yo creo que esto no puede ser\
VIC  XVM  perdone que se lo diga\
VIC  XVM  I believe this cannot be that way, sir\
VIC  XVM  I am afraid to tell you\
(h 7944)

It is highly possible that this simple switch hides the different perceptions Eva and the pupils have of what each language indexes. While for Eva's generation Castilian still keeps some flavour of authority -"quietos" in this contexts might be reminiscent of, for instance, cow-boy films where this instruction was given to horses-, this is no longer the case for her young students, for whom Catalan is the school, institutional language. It comes as little surprise that adults retain some old associations between Castilian and public authority. See for instance how Vic, a teacher, switches to Castilian -and simultaneously adopts the 'Vous' person- to scold Xvm, in a humorous attempt to evoke the police:

Some discourse routines from Castilian are introduced into Catalan by teachers. Observe Eva’s switch to Castilian y punto, a formula which conveys the right connotation of ruling out any discussion.

(27)  Explaining the conquest of America.
EVA DIV  {(pica de mans per fer callar els murmurs)}
EVA DIV  (e)rò sí vaig dir que us quedés clar que quan van arribar els diguem- ne que els_
EVA DIV  (..) diuen els conqueridors_
EVA DIV  io diria que quan van arribar allà: {(AC) els invasors_}
JBL  \(\text{<2>}\) invasores\(\text{(referint-se a una sèrie de TV)}\)
IKU  \(\text{<2>}\) \text{xt}_
EVA DIV  perquè no tenen_no crec que es_\text{xx un altre nom}\
Notice how Jbl plays with his bilingual repertoire: Cat. **invasors** has no association with the TV series broadcast dubbed in Castilian by the Spanish TV "Los invasores".

Eva furnishes another example of discourse related code-switching which is heavily loaded with social meaning in the following excerpt. She is trying to combine the pupils in several groups so that they make a class activity, and asks Mcg to join a given group:

(28)  Calling Mcg.

EVA MCG (..) Mcg _per què no vénis aquí_

MCG {([EV](P) xxx\}]

EVA MCG por-fa\ JMS MCG <2> {([EV](P) po(r) favo(r)\}[

EVA MCG (..) Mcg _why don’t you come here\}

MCG {([EV](P) xxx\}]

EVA MCG please\ JMS MCG <2> {([EV](P) please\}[

(n 600)

Surprisingly enough, Eva switches to a childish Castilian variant *por-fa* instead of the expected Cat. *sisplau* or *per favor*, or even Cast. *por favor*. The teacher, who has a friendly relationship with her pupils, is trying to convince Mcg rather than imposing her opinion. This recourse to a childish variant -which has no counterpart in Catalan- reduces the amount of authority conveyed by Eva’s request. See that her strategy is followed by Jms, who uses another childish pronunciation of the same item.

b. **Linguistic deficits-mot juste**: It should be borne in mind that many teachers in Catalonia who are currently teaching by means of Catalan are not native speakers. Some may at times intersperse a Castilian word in Catalan speech due to no other apparent reason than linguistic errors. In the following example, Eva substitutes Cast. *más* for Cat. *més*.

(29)  Describing pictures from Guatemala.

EVA _io sempre penso que és el mài(s) maco que he vist\}

EVA _I always think ((sic)) that’s the most beautiful I’ve ever seen\}

(n 531)

More frequent than linguistic deficits *per se* are switches to Castilian due to the *mot juste* or right word function. See the following example:

(30)  Talking about racism in Guatemala:
In this context, ladinos constitutes the sole alternative to refer to Latin American reality which is non-existent in Europe. The same case is provided by the following example, where Eva makes metalinguistic comments about the Latin-American term "tortitas".

(31) Talking about racism in Guatemala.

III Pupils' in-class transgressions of Catalan choice

Children also indulge in choice transgressions in a number of cases and for a number of functions. Two main reasons can be suggested for the pupils' switch from Catalan -the unmarked code- to Castilian: (a) discourse-related purposes, usually related to a change in voices, and (b) linguistic incompetence in Catalan. There is also a minor percentage of utterances produced in Castilian and addressed to the teachers which should be regarded as a failure to adapt to the norm requirement, and that I propose to analyse as produced without discourse meaning.

a. Discourse-related choice transgressions: In spite of the clear predominance of Catalan as the unmarked language of communication with the teachers, Castilian also finds some place in these relationships. Use of Castilian to address the teachers carries discourse-related meanings that agree with the traditional functions of Castilian among Catalan speakers -quotations, humoristic effects, etc- discussed above. Children may quote other people's comments in Castilian and do so in the same language:

(32) Discussing violence in cartoons.
It is obvious that Vgo does not switch to Castilian in order to avoid a lexical gap, for she uses the right Catalan verb *caure* 'to fall down' some seconds later, although in the common Castilian-interfered form which includes a non-normative reflexive pronoun. In this excerpt, Vgo is simply quoting someone else's statement, a function code-switching is frequently assigned in the Catalan Countries. The only significant innovation in this pattern is that Vgo is a Castilian-dominant speaker, not a Catalan speaker, and that according to the norm of Catalan subordination she would stick to Castilian for the whole stretch. Thus, not only has she learned Catalan, but she is also successfully exploiting the traditional transgressions of Catalan choice.

This transgression is by no means restricted to Castilian-speakers. Bilinguals and Catalan speakers also switch occasionally to Castilian for quotation and other rhetorical functions when addressing teachers. In the following excerpt, pupils are giving the answers they got to a questionnaire they had passed to people on the streets. The questionnaire asked about political views on the elections and asked for reasons (not) to vote.

(33) Answering to a questionnaire administered to people on the street.

\[
\begin{align*}
VGO & \quad \text{MAB} & \quad \text{perquè estava jugant a això}\_ \\
VGO & \quad \text{MAB} & \quad \text{i l'altre l'ha\_ \(\ldots\) li va emputxar}\_ \\
VGO & \quad \text{MAB} & \quad \text{i es va caure}\_ \\
VGO & \quad \text{MAB} & \quad \text{i es va fer mal}\_ \\
\text{NKU} & & \{\text{(F) sh\_}\_\}
\end{align*}
\]

XMS VGO

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{VGO} & \quad \text{MAB} & \quad \text{that I said before that a boy fell down\(\ldots\) didn't I\) in the playground\_ playing this\_} \\
\text{VGO} & \quad \text{MAB} & \quad \text{and Jeo said\_} \\
\text{VGO} & \quad \text{MAB} & \quad \text{hey\_ he fell down\_} \\
\text{VGO} & \quad \text{MAB} & \quad \text{but not with\_ but not without a reason\_} \\
\text{VGO} & \quad \text{MAB} & \quad \text{because he was playing this\_} \\
\text{VGO} & \quad \text{MAB} & \quad \text{and the other one has\_ \(\ldots\) did push him\_} \\
\text{VGO} & \quad \text{MAB} & \quad \text{and: he fell down\_} \\
\text{VGO} & \quad \text{MAB} & \quad \text{and hurt himself}\_ \\
\text{(c 3937)}
\end{align*}
\]
In the excerpt above, Scp, a Castilian speaker, and Ncp, a bilingual speaker, use Castilian alike to address the teacher when quoting someone else's words. Note that the teacher does not seem particularly upset by what otherwise constitute significant transgression of the choice of Catalan, not even when a Catalan-dominant bilingual, Ncp addresses her in Castilian. Despite appearances, the teacher is not exactly translating the Castilian utterances into Catalan: each answer has to be counted under one of several headings that have been written on the blackboard and she is reading aloud the right heading -notice her vacillation after Ncp's first intervention.

Castilian discourse formulae are sometimes carried over to Catalan from Castilian. In the following example, Jbc concludes an argument with Eva with a switch to Castilian.

(34) Reprehending Jbc.
EVA JBC {hi ha una cosa que es diu respecte a un company_}
JBC EVA {p(e)rò si no em vol fer cas_}
JBC EVA {(??)(EV) ademés el tio és] tonto_ pue(s') bueno]}
EVA JBC there exists something called respect for your a mate_
JBC EVA but he refuses to obey me_
JBC EVA {(??)(EV) moreover the guy is] a fool_ so well]

It is difficult to find a single reason for this switch. First, this may be seen as simply a second voice in an 'internal dialogue'. It could also be suggested that with this switch away from the teacher Jbc is showing his disconformity with her and seeking refuge in the peer-group language (Jbc's closest friends are Castilian speakers and Castilian is their unmarked language). It could also be argued that in Castilian this discourse marker evokes a stronger flavour of sharpness or indifference to the speaker, so he prefers it to the Catalan equivalent.

As was the case in the out-of-class examples, some of the code-switching instances imply a higher degree of actual renegotiation of social distance than others:

(35) The teacher leaves the classroom during some minutes.
EVA DIV <2> a ve(n)(re_ suposo que em necessitareu_ ((DL))
EVA DIV <2> pero ara me'n vaig al lavabo\éh/ ((DL))
EVA DIV <2> torno de seguida\ ((DL))
ICE EVA nosotros necesitar\e
ICE EVA pa(ra) qué_
ICE (pet)
ICE @@@
EVA DIV <2> let's see_ I guess you'll be needing me_ ((DL))
EVA DIV <2> but I'm going to the toilet\ 0.K./ ((DL))
With his attitude and words, Ice is effectively challenging his teacher’s authority. In fact, his message -both verbal and nonverbal- is simultaneously addressed to her and to his classmates. By choosing Castilian instead of Catalan, and in a rather colloquial form, as witnessed by *pa(ra)*, Ice places the interaction in a less institutionalized context. He seems to be successful, for some seconds later Eva herself accepts his challenge and switches to Castilian to answer back:

(36) Teacher’s answer to the subjects’ switch.  
JBC  cómo le queremos_,  
EVA  DIV  [(EV) hubo una vez una maestra que asesinó a un alumno_]

JBC  how much we love her_,  
EVA  DIV  [(EV) once upon a time there lived a teacher who killed her pupil_]

(b. Linguistic deficits: Linguistic deficits cause a significant percentage of code-switches to Castilian in the subjects’ teacher-addressed Catalan speech. This is only the logical consequence of their different degree of competence in what constitutes a second language for most of the pupils. In the following instance, Jrg switches once and again to Castilian, due to his inability to produce the right verbal form in Catalan. Notice that he finally solves the conflict by saying the difficult form fast in Castilian and moving on in his speech.

(37) Violence in cartoons.  
NAK  JRG  Jrg_,  
JRG  MAB que: si_: (_) que: si: no hubiera ehem ehem [(??) núvols_] haguessin: [(AC) hubiera anat] el Songoku a la terra_ haguessin enviat el Rabit perquè enviaven els guerriers_ perquè conquistessin el planeta i després anaven a recollir-los_  
JRG  MAB  igualment (n’hi) aniria un altre_  
NAK  JRG  Jrg_,  
JRG  MAB  otherwise: another: one: would: go_  

In a number of cases, the researcher has the impression that Castilian-speaking pupils make use of utterances of ambiguous linguistic attribution to avoid a difficult linguistic situation.

(38) Encouraging Map to speak.  
MAB  MAP  [1 Map_: vols dir alguna cosa d’això_]  
DLA  MAB  com que ella havia sigut [2 la capitana_]  
MAB  DIV  [2 la Map_] potser vol dir alguna cosa d’aquest tema_  
MAB  MAP  digues  
MAP  MAB  que: (_) no: sé_  
MAB  MAP  [1 Map_: you: want: to: say: something: about: this_]  
DLA  MAB  since: she: had: been: [the: captain_]
Mab is trying to encourage Map, a Castilian-dominant girl to take part in the debate. Map is a witty, talkative but rather shy girl who hardly uses any Catalan at all. In the excerpt, it seems as if she sought a way out of the pressure to speak. Homophonous utterances like these can be understood as -colloquial- Catalan by the teacher, thus not breaking the unmarked choice, while being simultaneously Castilian, the code in which these subjects feel more at ease. Unfortunately, this hypothesis cannot go beyond mere assumptions, for few of these instances were recorded. Another example of homophonous utterances is the one provided by Zmr to Xvm:

(39) Giving Zmr the tape recorder.
XVM ZMR espera’t fins que s’acabi la classe
ZMR XVM (...) sf_ sf_
XVM ZMR (...) quan s’acabi la classe ia ho arreglarem
DIV xXXx
XVM ZMR wait’ until the class is over
ZMR XVM (...) yeah_ yeah_
XVM ZMR (...) we’ll fix it when the class is over
DIV xXXx
(d 2273)

c. Failure to adapt to norm requirements: A reduced number of utterances in Castilian are addressed to the teachers in the course of the day for which no discernable discourse motivation can be found, and that do not seem to originate in any explicit desire to challenge social distance between pupils and teachers. They often consist of short interventions by Castilian-speaking subjects, mostly those with the minor bilingual competence.

(40) Congratulating class-mates during the assembly.
EBG DIV [(P) la Ejc_ la Nmf i la Ncp]
MAB DIV a ve(ure_ el Fgb_ la Sfb_ el Jcv_ i el Dla_)
MAB DIV per qué_
DIV xXXx_
NKU MAB porque nada_
DGS MAB S(e) han ido xXXx_
NCP MAB a qui feliciten_
NAK MAB Mab_ a qui feliciten_

EBG DIV [(P) Ejc_ Nmf and Ncp]
MAB DIV let’s see_ Fgb_ Sfb_ Jcv_ Dla_
MAB DIV why_
DIV xXXx_
NKU MAB because of nothing_
DGS MAB because they quitted xXXx_
NCP MAB whom are they congratulating_
NAK MAB Mab_ whom are they congratulating_
(a 1062)

Notice that Nku answers Mab’s question in Castilian, and Dgs picks up the same language. No
particular conversational or discourse-related meaning can be attributed to this linguistic choice, and, although the short undecipherable utterances produced in between might have explained it, it should be remembered that Dgs was strongly Castilian-dominant.

(41) Discussing a game.

NKU ICE <2> xxx cuarenta y tres\  
EVA (..) [1 deixa'm això un moment\]  
MPF EVA [1 a ver_] Eva_  
MPF EVA eh/_ pero [2 xx Eva]\  
RPT EVA [2 Eva està] al revés\  
IKU JMS <2> Jms_ ((DL))  
RPT tendría que estar: aquí i ac\  
RPT [encima [(??) gomito] yo\]  
MPF [no_; no está al revés\  
RPT [(CAN) qué es eso_ \]  
NKU ICE <2> xxx forty three\  
EVA (..) [1 give me that for a minute\]  
MPF EVA [1 let me see_] Eva_  
MPF EVA eh/ but [2 xx Eva]\  
RPT EVA [2 Eva_ it is] upside down\  
IKU JMS <2> Jms_ ((DL))  
RPT it should be: here the:\  
RPT [on top (??) gomito] I\  
MPF [no_; no it's not upside down\  
RPT [(CAN) what's that_\]  
(n 1013)

These are not real attempts at renegotiating social distance: in fact, in both cases the pupils are trying to participate as pupils in a class activity, both have spoken Catalan before and/or later on in the same recording to the teacher, and show no aggressivity against this language, the teacher or the school. No conversational function seems to be served by these switches, either. This sort of utterance seems to be produced by Castilian dominant pupils whose use of Catalan with people other than the teachers is scarce or nill. They are ephemeral and do not provoke any reaction on the teachers’ side. It sounds reasonable that these utterances should be better regarded as failure to accommodate to the Catalan preeminence norm. In this case, these switches to Castilian would be understood as due to lack of communicative competence: either the pupils lack the linguistic capacities to express themselves in Catalan or they lack the strategic ability to choose Catalan consistently.

d. Challenging the norms: Illicit choice transgressions. While the short choice transgressions do not constitute serious threats to the norm requiring use of Catalan with teachers, there is a type of choice transgression that can be analysed as a real norm violation: choice of Castilian for long stretches to address teachers, and used so to oppose teachers. This deliberate choice of Castilian, the marked choice in this context, is resented by teachers as a form to challenge their authority, but only as long as the children are known to be able to use Catalan. The anecdotal example of a problematic child who had momentarily refused to converge to Catalan as a sign of his opposition to teacher’s authority was reported by a teacher and confirmed by others, but no such behaviour was ever witnessed by the researcher (cf. Pujolar's (1995) Castilian speaking subjects, section 3.3.7.9).
5.2.4 Norms competition and reformulation

We know from section 5.1 that the pupils at the school have managed to combine the two norms of language use available to them into a new norm of language use, the school version of the Catalan subordination norm. Section 5.2.2 has exemplified how this norm incorporates most of the features of the Catalan subordination norm, including the use of code-switching for a few discourse-related purposes that are already present outside the school, and 5.2.3 has shown how the school has managed to establish Catalan as the language of teacher-pupil communication.

But there remain a large number of unanswered questions: can other traces of the school action be detected in the informants' language behaviour? We know that Castilian occupies an important place in immersion classes. How are both languages managed during the classes? And are the consequences of the school action similar on Catalan, bilingual and Castilian-speaking informants? The present section will explore some effects of norm competition in a number of points:

a. Accommodation to adult overhearers.

b. The functional distribution of languages.

c. The new choice transgressions.

d. The existence of switchers, dyads without an unmarked language, and 'non-convergers'.

e. Castilian speakers' use of Catalan for peer interaction.

Finally, I will explore some of the reasons for these innovations.

I Accommodation to adult overhearers

As a consequence of the school policy, Catalan is the authorised language for class-related interaction. This means that at least the activities orchestrated by the teacher and under his/her direct supervision, such as class debates, are expected to take place in Catalan and not in Castilian. This pressure towards a given language choice was detected in section 5.1 as a significant association between class domain and Catalan, and it constitutes a counterexample to Bell's audience design model hypothesis: the hearer's influence on language variation can override that of the actual addressee due to the former's higher status or control over the interaction.

(42) Class debate on violence in cartoons.
MAB DIV [mentre us respecteu podeu parlar_]
NKU DGS [va Dgs: _] 
DGS MAB que que el: els dibuixos_ eh: fan com si fos de v(e)ritat_
NCP DGS [si perù:: _] 
NMF DGS [pero] no és v(e)ritat_ 
NMF DGS i nosaltres ho sabem_ 
NAK DGS si_ són dibuixos_ 
DGS DIV pero les volen donar realitat_
Notice that pupils address each other in Catalan (replete with transcodic markers) irrespective of their first language: the norm of Catalan preeminence is being applied due to the fact that the teacher is the hearer of a class activity. Thus, Castilian speakers such as Dgs, Nmf, Vgo and Igb address each other and a bilingual like Ncp in Catalan.

Teachers' impact may be felt in several ways. Directives to the whole class were often uttered in Catalan by several informants. One of my first days at the school, I was surprised to hear kindergarten children entering the dining-room and shouting to each other Cat. *a dinar* lit. 'to lunch', while none shouted its Castilian equivalent *a comer*. Later on, during my occasional observation of kindergarten classes I realized this was one of the simplest routines children were taught from the beginning of course, next to *a esmorzar*, lit. 'to breakfast' (Cast., *a desayunar*), and *pleguem*, lit. 'let's call it a day' (Cast., *terminemos, acabemos*). Children learn these and other directives in Catalan and use them often, especially in the initial courses. Some of these routines can be traced down in the text:

(43) Finishing the classes.

DIV xX(15)Xx\  
ZMR Map_ empezamos a recoger\  
ZMR que todavía no hemos acaba- {[(F) a:y\]}  
ZMR (...) para\  
NKU DIV <2> (...) que tenim que recollir_ {{(DL)}}  
NAK DIV <2> (...) a recollir::z_ {{(DL)}}  
NKU DIV <2> a recollir:: ((DL))  
MAB DIV <2> (...) recolliu_sisplau\ {{(DL)}}  
NKU DIV <2> (...) a recollir:: {{(DL)}}  
DIV xX(5)Xx\  
DIV xX(15)Xx\  
ZMR Map_ we start packing up\  
ZMR we haven't finished ye- {[(F) a:y\]}  
ZMR (...) stop it\  
NKU DIV <2> (...) we must finish_ {{(DL)}}
There are occasions when the teachers presence in out-of-class interaction provokes unexpected switches to Catalan. This link provokes that some dyads which have Castilian as their unmarked language of communication switch to Catalan from time to time when discussing in front of the teachers. In my _tesi de llicenciatura_ (Vila i Moreno, 1993b) I provided quantitative evidence that there existed a small but still significant trend towards switching to Catalan among dyads with Castilian as the unmarked language in those cases when a Catalan-speaking adult institutionally linked to the school -in this case, the researcher himself- approached them. This switching was usually short in time and consisted mostly of a few utterances. In the following excerpt, Gbg and Acb switch to Catalan in front of the researcher in spite of Castilian being their unmarked language.

(44) Talking about Josep Guardiola’s (F.C. Barcelona football player) age.

ACB me parece
XVM ACB què [dius_ el Guardiola/]
GBG ACB [[@] què dius_]
GBG ACB [[@] en té dinou\]
ACB GBG dinou\ _sí hombre\ 
NAD el que [1 cumplió] el otro día\ 
ARC [1 claro]\ 
GBG ACB [2 qué dices_]

ACB I think\ 
XVM ACB what [are you saying_ Guardiola/]
GBG ACB [[@] what are you saying_]
GBG ACB [[@] he’s] nineteen years old\ 
ACB GBG nineteen\ _you’re kidding\ 
NAD the one [1 whose birthday was] some days ago\ 
ARC [1 of course]\ 
GBG ACB [2 what are you saying_]
(u 6904)

This sort of switching was rare in out-of-class interactions, for most dyads maintained their usual means of communication. It may be that girls and/or bilinguals were more prone to this sort of behaviour (cf. section 5.2.7), but this point should be further confirmed.

Despite this (rather weak) trend to use some Catalan in front of the teachers, peer interaction remains fundamentally based on the Catalan subordination norms, i.e., Castilian for Castilian ingroup interaction and outgroup interaction, and Catalan for Catalan ingroup interaction.

Castilian is widely used as the language of whispering and personal communication for those dyads who have that language as the unmarked choice. In the following excerpt, Map and Dla hold their particular conversation while Mab tries to impose silence on the class so that the debate can proceed.

(45) Chatting during the class.
It is not exclusively Castilian speakers who use Castilian to each other in class. Rather, it is the whole norm of Catalan subordination which is carried into the classroom. Those few dyads that have Catalan as the unmarked language maintain it. In the following example, Jcv and Jce whisper in Catalan and Jcv switches to Castilian for a quotation, a perfectly licit transgression in Catalan ingroup communication according to the Catalan subordination norm.

(46) Class assembly. Whispering to present publicly a result.

JCV JCE <2> {(P)(@) i a tu t'han dit porque sí_}
JCE JCV <2> {(P) perquè sí_}
JCV JCE <2> {(P) (hi) has ficat aquell_el que hi surt el Pe pe/}
JCE JCV <2> (...) no_
JCV JCE <2> {(P) digue-l'hi_}
JCV JCE <2> {(P)(@) and did anyone tell you for the sake of it_}
JCE JCV <2> {(P) for the sake of it_}
JCV JCE <2> {(P) did you put that one_the one where the Pe pe appears/}
JCE JCV <2> (...) no_
JCV JCE <2> {(P) tell her_}

(b 1670)

It should not be inferred from the above examples that the Catalan subordination norm is secretly only applied. The norm of Catalan subordination is by no means hidden from adults. On the contrary, it is quite an overt pattern that most subjects apply most of the time. Pupils often use Castilian in a loud voice in front of the teachers.

(47) Discussing subjects’ behaviour during sports class.

DIV {(callen)}
DGS MAB (...) al final quan s’ (en) han anat le(s’) nenes érem set contra: tretze_
DGS MAB érem tots tots_
JAA MAB, DGS {(P) xx no/
JAA MAB, DGS todos nosotros no estábamos\}
DGS MAB, JAA [0 pero érem_]
DGS MAB, JAA primer eren quatre_
NKU MAB, DGS [0 {(P) todos nosotros no estábamos}]\]
NKU MAB, DGS [1 érem quatre nosaltres\]
DGS MAB [1 i després] ha vingut l’Aos\ Aos_
DGS MAB [2 i després el Jcv\]
In the fragment above, the boys are trying to convince the teacher -Mab- that the girls' behaviour should be condemned, because they left the playground and as a consequence the two teams became imbalanced. Dgs criticises the girls in Catalan, for that is the unmarked language to speak to the teacher. Others use Castilian. Note that those who use Castilian (Jaa, Fsg, Nku) correct or nuance the previous speaker, and, thus, address their message not only to the teacher but also to their classmates. Some of them (Nku) also speak in a lower voice, and switch to Catalan when they address the public discussion in louder voice.

In the following extract note how a discussion which starts being addressed to the teacher becomes a personal discussion between a group of children. The whole set of choices dictated by the Catalan subordination norm come into play: Catalan remains being used by Catalan and bilinguals -in the fragment, Ncp, Dla and Dcv-, who have it as their unmarked language of interaction, but Ncp converges towards Castilian speakers (see last line).
(football) then: it's normal you get tired of it at the end

(DIV) xXXx\((noise increases)\)
NKU NCP \{(P) many hours\}\n*NMF NCP but you haven't spent \{(P) many hours\}\nNKU \well\)
DLA if xx not xxx_
DCV NCP \{(P) Ncp don't tell us you can't stand xxx_\)
NCP DCV (..) what_
DCV NCP \{(P) that's just you don't like playing this game\}\]
DGS <2> \{(P) that's because she hasn't played ground football\}
NKU DGS <2> \{(P) that's right\}
NKU DGS <2> \{(P) one hour and a half playing...\}
*NCP DGS NKU \{(P) that's because I don't like football\}
(a 173)

Ncp does not hesitate in converging towards Dgs, one of the most loquacious subjects in class, in a telling evidence of the norm of Catalan subordination during the class. An intrasentential code-switch is actually realized by Nmf from Castilian to Catalan. Nevertheless, it is a short quotation that does not call into question the fact that Castilian is their language of interaction. This is indeed one of the stylistic functions of code-switching that Castilian speakers incorporate into the management of their new bilingual repertoire (see below).

The Catalan subordination norm takes precedence, and Castilian gains field in class, especially when the teacher's control over the class activities loosens and pupils speak freely as a group, as in the following excerpt.

(49) Preparing to have a picture taken.
EVA ara les miraràs_
EVA DIV calla un [momentet_
JBC \[como en\] la tele\)
EAD \{(EV) yo no lo veo;\}
EVA DIV qué plom\)
NKU nosotros no \[lo vemos\]
MPF \[xx hacer \] una foto\)
ICE es muy guay_
ICE es muy guay\)
JMS \{(EV) no lo veo_\)

EVA you're seeing them right_
EVA DIV shut up you guy for a [minute_]\)
JBC \[as on\] TV\)
EAD \{(EV) I can't see it_;\}
EVA DIV what a drag\)
NKU we \[can't see it]\)
MPF \[xx take \] a picture\)
ICE it's great_
ICE it's great\)
JMS \{(EV) I can't see it_;\)
(n 452)

Notice that while Eva is trying to keep control over an unspecified subject, other pupils talk aloud in Castilian with messages that might be addressed to other class-mates, but could also be addressed to the teacher herself. In any case, the remarkable thing here is how two of the pupils who speak Castilian are Catalan speakers (Jbc and Jms) and another one is a bilingual (Ead). They are adopting the choice dictated by the subordination norm, and by doing so they...
are deliberately undermining the teachers' authority and increasing the sense of chaos that is getting her tired.

Another instance of the wide currency of the Catalan subordination norm during class interaction is provided by the following excerpt. Eva, the teacher, is showing some pictures about Guatemala to the eighth graders to discuss the sociopolitical situation of Latin America. The pictures had been taken by the teacher herself during a visit to that country:

(50) Showing pictures of Guatemala.

EVA DIV és aquesta la imatge_.
EVA DIV (...) aquests nens no van a l'escola_.
JBC [xXXx]
EVA DIV [i cada dia_] i cada dia tenen una feina que és (a)nar a pescar en aquestes [piragüetes]
JBL [hala_ qué suerte!]
EVA DIV [éh/]
ESG [(PP) es igual _]
JBC pues vaya nabarrones _
MPF [qué suerte!]
EVA DIV [viven en] aquestes cases_.
EVA DIV i això és el riu_ éh/ EVA DIV això és un riu\ ICE MPF si tú tuviera(s') que ir ya veríamos si diría(s') qué suerte_ Mpf\ JBC MPF sf.. porque (???) porque se deben de) levantar_ tío _
ANA JBC, ICE pero ellos no se levantan a las ocho_ ANA JBC, ICE se levantan [a las nueve _] MPF JBC, ICE [tío_ porque es para el cole _] JLL MPF pues ya està\
EVA DIV this is the image_ EVA DIV (...) these children don't go to school_ JBC [xXXx]
EVA DIV [and every day_] and every day they have a task which is to go fishing in these small [canoes] JBL [hey_ how lucky!]
EVA DIV [éh/]
ESG [(PP) it doesn't matter _]
JBC what a big clouds_
MPF [how lucky!]
EVA DIV [they live in] these small houses_ EVA DIV and this is the river_ éh/
EVA DIV this is a river\ ICE MPF if you had to go we'd see whether you would say how lucky_ Mpf\ JBC MPF yeah_ because (???) because they probably] get up_ you guy _
ANA JBC, ICE but they don't get up at eight _
ANA JBC, ICE they get up [at nine _] MPF JBC, ICE [you guy_ that's to go to school _] JLL MPF that's it\

Although Jbl and Mpf's initial remarks can be understood as humorous, the discussion deviates to a serious issue clearly related to the class activity: whether living conditions are better in Guatemala for children. Neither the subject matter not the fact that the discussion is taking place under the teacher's sight seem enough to overrule the dominance of the Catalan subordination norm.

In the previous examples -as in many others-, the teacher's presence is not enough to impose
the norm of Catalan preeminence, so they use Castilian in front of the teacher to speak with
one another. These examples seem to prove that teachers’ influence to impose a given language
choice -and a given normative set- is limited, for the out-of-school predominant practices get
into the class dynamics once and again.

II The functional distribution of languages

Given the school’s emphasis on Catalan as the means of instruction, it would be reasonable to
expect some association of Catalan with school. Functional distribution of languages might
preclude or at least hinder the use of the language not employed as means of instruction in a
number of fields, due to the lack of appropriate terminology of discourse competence. If this
were the case here, Catalan would be automatically activated in school-related discussions.
This is what the following fragment seems to suggest:

(51) Talking in Castilian, an unrecognized subject gives a formula in Catalan.
IKU: \textit{\texttt{xXXx catet al quadrat\_ per\_}} ((DL))
IKU: \textit{\texttt{xXXx squared side\_ multiplied by\_}} ((DL))

It would not be surprising that a formula (Pythagoras' theorem) which is learned by heart, is
most easily remembered in the language it was learned. Another fragment contradicts this
hypothesis: a Castilian and a Catalan subject alike not only speak in Castilian about the same
theorem but also manipulate it to create a humorous effect.

(52) Joking about teachers.
\begin{align*}
\text{MCG} & \quad \text{RPT} \quad \text{\ldots vale vale vale}\text{\ldots}
\text{RPT} & \quad \text{MCG} \quad \text{\{@\} dos al cuadrado igual a xXXx} \quad \text{@ @ @}
\text{JBC} & \quad \text{\{@\} xXXx}\text{\ldots}
\text{JBC} & \quad \text{MCG? RPT?} \quad \text{Mab\_ al cuadrado\_ m\^{a}}(s)\text{\_ Mab\_ al cuadrado\_ igual a hipotenusa al cuadrado}\text{\ldots}
\text{RPT} & \quad \text{JBC ? MCG?} \quad \text{igual a de(s)gracia pura}\text{\ldots}
\text{JBC} & \quad \text{(\ldots) \text{\_ el teorema de Pit\'agoras}\text{\ldots}} ((DL))
\text{JBC} & \quad \text{Mab\_ al cuadrado\_ m\^{a}}(s)\text{\_ Mab\_ al cuadrado\_ igual a hipotenusa al cuadrado}\text{\ldots}
\text{(DL))}
\text{MCG} & \quad \text{RPT} \quad \text{\ldots} \text{O.K. O.K. O.K.}\text{\ldots}
\text{RPT} & \quad \text{MCG} \quad \text{\{@\} two squared is equal to xXXx} \quad \text{@ @ @}
\text{JBC} & \quad \text{\{@\} xXXx}\text{\ldots}
\text{JBC} & \quad \text{MCG? RPT?} \quad \text{\_ squared Mab\_ plus squared Mab\_ equal to squared hypotenuse}\text{\ldots}
\text{RPT} & \quad \text{JBC ? MCG?} \quad \text{equal to pure disgrace}\text{\ldots}
\text{JBC} & \quad \text{(\ldots) \_ Pythagoras theorem\ldots} ((DL))
\text{JBC} & \quad \text{\_ squared Mab\_ plus squared Mab\_ equal to squared hypotenuse}\text{\ldots} ((DL))
\end{align*}

Another school-related activity which is especially in danger of not being fully mastered is that
of telling the time. Standard Catalan and Standard Castilian say the time in opposite ways (cf.
appendix 3), and it might be surmised that an all-Catalan school might have provoked a lack in
competence in this field among Castilian speakers. The following fragment, though, clearly
exemplifies that this is not the case:
Excerpt 53 might be read as translating MCG's difficulties with telling the time in Castilian, his first language. Nevertheless, the actual interpretation of this piece of interaction is quite more complicated. MCG first tries to say the hour in Castilian, his unmarked language of communication with JBC, but he wrongly translates the Catalan form; MCG realizes his mistake and, going back to the Catalan formula, says the correct time. Unfortunately for him, by switching to Catalan, he breaks the Catalan subordination norm and feels compelled to rephrase the utterance again so that he is not misinterpreted by his interlocutor. It takes him a little time (see how he prolongs diez). By translating into Castilian, though, JBC feels offended: he speaks Catalan -in fact, he is a Catalan speaker- and has already understood the message. MCG's initial troubles did not arise from his inadequate abilities in Castilian, for he was perfectly able to say the time in Castilian, but were rather caused by the fact that he was literally translating the instructions giving by JOF in Catalan, of course- a couple of minutes earlier.

Another case that suggested a functional distribution of languages was obtained one day when I witnessed how a group of 5th grade Castilian-speaking girls playing teachers spoke some Catalan to each other. Nevertheless, it would be a great mistake to believe that instruction in Catalan has provoked a lasting link between them of a diglossic-like style. Some of the very girls whom I saw playing in Catalan organized themselves as a children's theatre group. They created and prepared a small play in which they pretended to be a (bad) teacher and (good) pupils. The play introduced some activities and terminology clearly related with school, such as counting. At the end of the play, the teacher was punished for her bad temper and the pupils were happily freed from her. The play was to be presented in front of their teachers, school mates and parents at the end of the year, and was one of the multiple shows prepared every year for the school festival. In spite of the fact that all their school experience had taken place exclusively in Catalan, the whole play was made up in Castilian, without a single word being uttered in Catalan. Even more surprising, the girl who played the teacher (SFB) imitated -quite successfully- an Andalusian accent during the whole play.

As a whole, association between the Catalan language and school seems to be thus much weaker than one would have expected. No examples of functional distribution of languages could be detected during the observational period. Only the teachers' effective participation in
the interaction seemed to actually promote the use of Catalan beyond the Catalan subordination norm limits. Thus, use of Catalan does not seem to be triggered by school-related talk or activities when these are not directed by the teachers. This normative arrangement is fully coherent with the person-related basis for normative organization prevalent in Catalonia.

The extensive use of Catalan as the school language does not determine Catalan choice beyond teacher-pupil interaction, and only facilitates a limited discourse-related exploitation of code-switching. In the following example, the teacher, Eva, is talking about Guatemala. One of the pupils (Jcr) is taking an exam he had not taken some days before, due to his absence that day, and is having serious difficulties to answer the questions. Rpt, a friend of Jcr’s, has been looking for the exam and is copying the right answers in order to give some help to Jcr. In the excerpt, Rpt asks for clarification to the class mate who wrote the exam. Of course, Rpt’s activity is hidden from the teacher, and only some close friends -and the tape recorder- witness this interaction.

(54) Copying in an exam.
RPT <2> {((P) ts ts_} 
EVA DIV una [maçanetònia:] de fruits tropicals\ 
RPT ESG <2> [[[((P) qué pone aquí_]] 
RPT ESG <2> {{{(P) debajo de la goma}} 
ARC amistades\ 
EVA IKU [1,2 sí rosa_ rosa xx molt macò] 
ESG RPT <2> [1 {((P) govern)] 
RPT ESG <2> [2 {((P) com/]} 
ESG RPT <2> {((P) govern:} 
IKU EVA sí_ 
JBL ah_ yo pensaba que la xXX\ 
DIV [3-5 xXX:] 
NAK RPT <2> [3 {((P) estás copiando algo del examen/} 
RPT NAK <2> [4 {((P) es para Jcr\} 
RPT <2> {((P) ts ts_} 
EVA DIV a tropical fruits [salad:] 
RPT ESG <2> [[[((P) what does this say_)] 
RPT ESG <2> {((P) below the rubber\} 
ARC friendships\ 
EVA IKU [1,2 yeah pink_ pink xx very nice\] 
ESG RPT <2> [1 {((P) government)] 
RPT ESG <2> [2 {((P) what/]} 
ESG RPT <2> {((P) government:\} 
IKU EVA yeah:\ 
JBL ah_ I thought that the xXX\ 
DIV [3-5 xXX\} 
NAK RPT <2> [3 {((P) are you copying something from the exam/}] 
RPT NAK <2> [4 {((P) it’s for Jcr\} 

Rpt uses Castilian to speak to the other classmates. It is only when Esg reads to him something in Catalan that a short switch to Catalan by Rpt is triggered, a rather unusual reaction among our subjects. It is impossible to confirm whether other factors enhanced the possibility of this switch, but the fact is that Rpt goes back to Castilian for the rest of the interaction.
Catalan is also used for explicit metalinguistic functions when preparing class activities. In the following excerpt, the subjects are discussing in Castilian public presentations to be delivered in front of the class—in Catalan, of course. One of the subjects asks his class-mates what exactly he is expected to do, and Mfv, a Castilian-speaking girl, volunteers to repeat the instructions. Another Castilian speaker, Xms, who is expected to speak publicly, asks for a linguistic clarification, which provokes the subsequent code-switching.

(55) Preparing the exposition.

```
MFV NKU (...) yo te lo explico\  
MFV NKU encerraban a los moros_  
DIV xXXx\  
XMS MFV encerrar a lo(s’) moros/  
XMS MFV sí y cómo se llama en catalán\  
JCE XMS? (0) Xms: no te aproveches_  
MFV XMS han tancat els moros\  
IKU XMS {(P) no te aproveches}\  
MFV NKU (...) I tell you\  
MFV NKU they shut up the Moors_  
DIV xXXx\  
XMS MFV to shut up the Moors/  
XMS MFV yes! and how do you say that in Catalan\  
JCE XMS? (0) Xms: do not take advantage_  
MFV XMS they have locked the Moors\  
IKU XMS {(P) do not take advantage}\  
```

Other examples of code-switching in Castilian speech are recorded, both competence-related and discourse-related. This comes as no surprise, for all subjects are highly bilingual and they have a model of code-switching in their own Catalan practices.

(56) Preparing a poster.

```
MPM que se notase que eran los españoles_  
MPM y luego haces [una flecha así:]\  
<2> [(pet)]  
MPM y que se notasen que eran los criolls\  
MPM so that it was noticeable they were the Spaniards_  
MPM and then you draw [an arrow like this:]\  
<2> [(fart)]  
MPM so that it was noticeable they were the Creoles\  
(n 2046)  
```

It is unthinkable that Mpm ignored the Castilian word españoles "Spaniards", so it has to be assumed that she was switching to Catalan—as marked by phonetics and morphology—in order to preserve the link with the explanation given some days before in Catalan by her teacher. This connotation may also explain the switch to Catalan for the term criolls (Cast. criollos) "Creoles", although one might also want to explain it as a switch originated by a lexical gap in Castilian.

On the whole, thus, no functional distribution between Catalan and Castilian has been detected as a consequence of choosing Catalan as the language of instruction.
I have argued that people enjoy a (limited) degree of freedom in the creative exploitation of languages norms. The subjects of this research were no exception to the rule. The novelty in this case, in comparison with mainstream society, was provoked by the fact that not only Catalan speakers were able to make use of two languages, but rather the whole population had two codes at its disposal and two sets of norms governing them. In any case, the creative abilities of the subjects seem closely determined by the norms in play: no norm was detected that the speakers created *ex nihilo*; rather, norm manipulation was clearly a reflexion of the two available norms.

In the past, code-switching used to be reserved to Catalan speakers. The subjects of the present research make some use of code-switching which are related to those described in section 5.2.2 for Catalan speakers, and which do not seem to call into question the basic choices dictated by the school version Catalan subordination norm.

Some subjects who switched to Catalan for citation purposes in speech having Castilian as the unmarked choice. This phenomenon mirrors the functions assumed by code-switching in Catalan, but was not so apparent in Castilian. While in the past Castilian speakers were not necessarily bilingual, Castilian-speaking pupils in the school are known to be productively bilingual and may not only understand Catalan but speak it fluently. In the following example, Jbc reports in Catalan an imaginary interaction between a Catalan and a bilingual classmate:

(57)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCG</th>
<th>JBC</th>
<th>(((@) cuéntame) el chiste)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCG</td>
<td>JBC</td>
<td>(((@) cuenta el chiste otra vez)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBC</td>
<td>MCG</td>
<td>(...) {(!?) està} de fin de curso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBC</td>
<td>MCG</td>
<td>y dice: [(..) la Ana al Jms_]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>&lt;2&gt;</td>
<td>[{(F) paso (..)} paso]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBC</td>
<td>MCG</td>
<td>Jms: <em>Jms</em> treu-me el sostèn:_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBC</td>
<td>MCG</td>
<td>m: _{(F) crac xaf} ((imita el desplegament d'uns pits descomunals))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBC</td>
<td>MCG:</td>
<td>((@) xXXXx)! @@@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCG</td>
<td>JBC</td>
<td>[{(F) paso (..)} paso]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCG</td>
<td>JBC</td>
<td>[{(F) let me pass (..)} let me pass]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBC</td>
<td>MCG</td>
<td>Jms: _ Jms_ take my bra off_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBC</td>
<td>MCG</td>
<td>m: _{(F) crac shaff} ((imitating how two huge breasts stretch away))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBC</td>
<td>MCG</td>
<td>((@) xXXXx)! @@@</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Castilian speakers themselves employ this language juxtaposition for quotation purposes.

(58)  

| XMS | (...) se pone el Mnj |
| XMS | el Mnj 6(s) molt bo_ |
| XMS | (...) says Mnj |
| XMS | Mnj is very good_ |

(g 6998)
Castilian speakers' new bilinguality is reflected in a variety of instances. See for instance how Ice picks up the monitor's term *enquadernació* 'book binding' to refer not to the activity proper but to the group to which he is being assigned.

Getting ready to dye pieces of paper.

MMU ICE oye_ qué grupo son/
ESG ICE pero el bajo este no [va a qued- éh_]  
ICE MMU [nosotros somo:so] *enquadernació*
MMU ICE pero ya_  
MMU ICE pero tú con quien vas\  
ICE MMU contigo\  
ICE MMU *enquadernació*\  
MMU ICE no_ [ya:] pero qué hay que hacer_ do(s') grupos de estos\.

Multiplying.

MMU ICE listen_ what group are they/
ESG ICE but this short one [is not going to remain_ éh_]  
ICE MMU [we are:] *binding*\  
MMU ICE but I see:_  
MMU ICE but whom do you go with\  
ICE MMU with you\  
ICE MMU *binding*\  
MMU ICE no_ [I see:_] I what must we do_ two of those groups\.

On other occasions, it is the expressive function often referred to in the literature which is served by a switch to Catalan in an otherwise Castilian speech.

Swearing in Catalan.

FSG EBG para enganchar esto y esto\ (...) y el palo *dels collons*\  
FSG EBG to have this and this stuck\ (...) and the *darned* stick\  
(f 4941)

The subjects can now make use of their bilingual repertoire in multiple ways which do not necessarily call into question their social distance. See for instance how Map sings -in fact, shouts- a song in Catalan in front of her friends just for fun, since she knows the song will be recorded.

Singing a traditional song.

ZMR @ @ @  
MAP xx dejar a la V go xXXx esa_ [esa canción_]  
JRS [que se grabe_]  
MAP (...) esa de_  
MAP {CAN(F) si vos aigua ben fresca_}  
DIV @ @ @  
MAP {CAN) has d'anar_}  
MAP {CAN) si el que vos_ @}  
DIV @ @ @  
IKU MAP xx_ que va a lllover_  
MAP {CAN(P) és fer gresca_} @ @  
DIV @ @ @  
MAP {CAN) un amic ha de trobar_}  
DIV ((aplaudiments))  
NKU MAP? ia has trencat els vidres/  
NAK @ @ @  
MAP o:-la-la cu-cu_  

341
Even Castilian speakers with a limited proficiency in Catalan manage to make productive use of their abilities. In the following example. Xms, a heavily Castilian-dominant speaker, is acting as a debate moderator in fifth grade. He asks for silence to his class-mates in Catalan.

(62) Asking for silence during a debate.

XMS \{(@)(F) voleu callar_\}

XMS \{(@)(F) will you shut up_\}

One would be mistaken to consider that he chooses Catalan exclusively determined by his role of moderator. It is true that he speaks Catalan on several occasions while playing this role, but it is also true that he is not embarrassed at using Castilian as a moderator, as example 63 proves:

(63) Arguing a class debate.

NCP \{(F) doneu paraula_\}

NAK MAB? (..) que no donen paraula_  

XMS NAK (..) porque quiero_  

NCP \{(F) give the floor_\}

NAK MAB? (..) they don’t give the floor_  

XMS NAK (..) because I want ((it that way))_  

Thus, in example 63 Xms is perfectly aware that he is taking (unfair) advantage of his momentary supraordinate position to impose himself as the director of his classmates’ behaviour. He is associating himself with the one norm which gives him the power to control and command, and he is showing off his newly acquired power. This use of Catalan as the language of class authority is applied a slightly later to Dla when he tries to gain the floor
without the moderator's consent:

(64) Debating on TV cartoons.
DLA: pero si estan fet a França_
XMS: (0) Dla_ the donat la paraula/
XMS: @
DLA: but, if they are doing in France_
XMS: (0) Dla_ did I give you the floor/
XMS: @
(c 3858)

After his intervention, Xms bursts into laughter (indicated with @), making it evident that he is aware of having imposed himself by the use of the marked language for peer-communication.

As a result of their increased bilingual ability, bilingual puns and metalinguistic comments and awareness are also present in the subjects' Castilian speech. See Ice's comments to the repeated appearance of number 8 (Cat. vuit) in relation with "vacuum" (Cat. buit, Cast. vacío)68.

(65) During a raffle in class.
IKU JOF vuit\
IKU JOF vuit\
IKU JOF (..) el vuit\
JOF DIV vuit\
NKU <2> {(P) oye_ lo abro\}
ICE el vació\
FAR (..) halâ (..) el trece_ el trece [no en- xXXx\]
ICE <2> [va a haber el vui(t) y el vació]
IKU JOF eight\
IKU JOF eight\
IKU JOF (..) the eight\
JOF DIV eight\
NKU <2> {(P) listen_ I open it\}
ICE the vacuum\
FAR (..) waw\ (..) the thirteen_ the thirteen [does no- xXXx\]
ICE <2> [there's going to be the eight and the vacuum\]
(p 459)

Ice also humoristically applies Catalan morphophonological rules of vocalic neutralization (i.e. unstressed o > [u]) to the Cast. melocotón 'peach' in the following example. His metalinguistic comments in the same interaction prove that he is aware of how he is playing with both languages.:

(66) Word games
ICE el el mulucó\
ICE the the peach\ (p 4089)

As a whole, though, all these examples show very brief choice transgressions. It is precisely because of their markedness, i.e., their salience in a context where they would not be expected,

68In Standard Catalan, b and v represent the same phoneme /b/.
that these switches carry non-referential meaning at all. They by no means put in doubt the unmarked choice.

**IV Switchers, dyads without unmarked language and 'non-convergers'**

The practical totality of dyads could be said to function in either one or the other language, that is, very few dyads did not have a customary unmarked language of communication. Nevertheless, a short number of dyads were recorded and observed for which it was practically impossible to ascertain this habitual means of communication. These dyads included a very reduced number of subjects with two central subjects: Ana and Gbg (cf. 5.1.7.3).

**a. Switchers:** Ana was probably the only subject who approached the *switchers* described by K. Woolard (1989), although she was by no means marginal or hardly integrated as suggested by that author. A girl of a bilingual family background, she showed some trend towards instability with regard to language choice. Ana seemed to switch somehow erratically, sometimes following the pre-existent language choice irrespective of other considerations, sometimes for discourse reasons, sometimes without apparent motivation. See for instance in the following example how she addresses Jms (Catalan speaker) in Castilian, a decision probably triggered by the latter's previous choice. Jms reacts by answering in Catalan, the expected choice in this case, and Ana has no trouble in following that choice.

(67) Talking about football players.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JMS</th>
<th>IKU</th>
<th>te lo dije el otro día_</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>y el Guardiola qué_ [juega bien o no_]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>[xXXx]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>sí, di que sí_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>o te partoí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>el Guardiola/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>sí, pero el millor_ el millor és el Ferrer_ vale/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>vale sí_ vale sí_ 'ho reconeç\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>va jugar molt bé\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>vale\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>perquè solament_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>ho deia_ això [ho deia xXXx]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>[jugava de puta mare]\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>(IP) si no arriba a estar_ mare meva\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAK</td>
<td>&lt;2&gt; ((truquen a la porta)) {(F) qui és:-) (DL))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>ANA?</td>
<td>el que pitjor [va estar: va ser:-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>[aquest\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>aquest\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>{(F) aquest és una canya}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>(...) va ser el Laudrup\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>IKU</td>
<td>I told you some days ago_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>and what about Guardiola_ [doesn't he play well_]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>[xXXx]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>yes\ say yes_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>or I kill you\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>Guardiola/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>yes_ but the best one_ the best one is Ferrer_ O.K./</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>O.K._ O.K._ I agree\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>he played very well\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>O.K\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>because only_</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This recording contains several other examples of this switching behaviour, in which she was sometimes followed by Jms. Ana also showed a certain penchant towards intrasentential code-switching, certainly a rare trend in the school described here.

(68) Talking about Josep Guardiola, a Barcelona F.C. football player.

Ana realizes Xpr's rugby ball is thrown through the window.

(69) Ana realizes Xpr's rugby ball is thrown through the window.

There are few explanations for her use of Cast. árbitro instead of Cat. àrbitre or popular Cat. àrbit (especially when one considers that she does use the latter some records later). Her choice of Castilian is maintained one utterance further, and then abandoned. In any case, and in spite of these switched utterances, the absolute majority of Ana's utterances were strictly monolingual.

b. Switching dyads: Gbg and Esg formed a 'switching dyad' in that they produced long stretches of either Catalan and Castilian monolingual conversation, but seemed to choose the language as a function of the situational factors such as who was surrounding them or with whom they were talking. Catalan predominated in their choices, as shown by example (3). But they could also use Castilian spontaneously, as in the following example:

Complaining about having to visit an exhibition.

Esg GBG ojalá sea chulo eso_ (...) no/
GBG Esg eh/
Esg GBG que a veces nos aburrimos_ no/
GBG Esg yá/

(u 8698)
Gbg showed linguistic instability in other cases. Both in the case of Ana and Gbg, we have family bilingualism with low degrees of Catalan language use at home. As suggested in section 5.1.7.3, their -by Catalonia's terms- linguistically erratic behaviour responds to the school pressure to counteract the environmental trends. Had it not been for the school use of Catalan, it seems very probable that their behaviour would have been comparable to that of Ead, a completely castilianized family bilingual.

c. Lack of convergence towards the group: Although constituting a tiny minority in the whole population, the dyads having Catalan as their unmarked language did not switch to Castilian in front of their class-mates. This maintenance of each dyad's language took place even when they found themselves in the most absolute minority. See for instance the following example.

(71) Playing with a fortune telling machine.

IKD  (..) no\ poner_
ICE  <2> estaría guay\ 
ICE  <2> la caja sorpresa\ 
ICE  <2> [metan la mano_] 
MCP  [por poco] me metes en el ojo {(?!) la moneda} 
ICE  <2> xXXx la mano_
EAD  ANA  ahí abajo\ 
ESG  ANA  no\ [a dalt_: a dalt_:]
MCP  ANA  [no::] arriba\ 
ICE  <2> metan la mano\ 
ICE  <2> meten la mano_ 
ICE  <2> [1-3 y se pone xXXx_]
NAK  ANA  [1 metenla]\ 
DGS  ANA  [2 mete\] 
ANA  [3 {?!} a que encoge lo(s') dedo(s')_] 

IKD  (..) no\ put_
ICE  <2> it would be fantastic\ 
ICE  <2> the surprise box\ 
ICE  <2> [place the hands inside_] 
MCP  [you almost] put {(?!) the coin} in my eye\ 
ICE  <2> xXXx the hand_ 
EAD  ANA  down there\ 
ESG  ANA  no\ [up there_: up there_:] 
MCP  ANA  [no::] up\ 
ICE  <2> place the hand\ 
ICE  <2> place the hand_ 
ICE  <2> [1-3 and it becomes xXXx_]
NAK  ANA  [1 put it inside]\ 
DGS  ANA  [2 put\] 
ANA  [3 {?!} I bet he'll shrink his fingers_] 

No Catalan had appeared in the previous 70 utterances, and it did not reappear until more than 185 utterances, for these two subjects did not interact with each other. But they did not feel compelled to adopt Castilian, i.e., they did not have to converge towards the rest of the group.
This is just but one example of the extraordinary resistance to group convergence, understood as a need to adopt the language most spoken in the group. This resistance might look striking in the light of such a Castilian-dominant context, but happens relatively often to all Catalan-speaking dyads. The explanation for this relative independence from the immediate surrounding is to be found in two combined factors: on the one hand, language remains a powerful addressee-identificator for the subjects studied here; switching always entails some risk of being misunderstood. On the other, in a bilingual environment such as this, there is little actual need to abandon a dyad's unmarked language.

As a consequence of this lack of need to converge, Catalan utterances may pop up in speech from time to time without other particular discourse purpose than that of signalling addressee. This behaviour supports my claim that the assumption that code-switching is to be always interpreted *sequentially* is too powerful: in cases such as these, sequential analysis cannot account for code-switching. It is only sociolinguistic background information -in this case, unmarked language for a particular dyad- that explains this otherwise unexpected behaviour.

### d. Non-convergence towards Castilian:
I showed in section 5.1 that convergence towards Castilian was the overwhelmingly predominant behaviour with Castilian-speaking addressees. Nevertheless, occasional cases of actual divergence were recorded. In the following extract, Xpr, a family bilingual, switches between Castilian and Catalan as he reproaches Acb, who has thrown Xpr's rugby ball through the window, in an uncommon move that may be interpreted as an attempt to increase the social distance between both.

(72) Acb throws a ball through the window.
XPR ANA *que_*
LLU *que anima\(\)" (DL))
ARC l'ha tirat per la finestra\(\)" (DL))
XPR ACB \{IF\} dos mil peles\}
XPR ACB \{(F) ma-\}
*ARC XPR *ha sigut ella\(\)" (DL))
*XPR ACB \{(F) mañana dos mil pesas\}
*ACB XPR n\{i hombre\}(DL))
*XPR ACB \{(F) dem\{a\} dos mil peles\}
ACB xXXx (DL))
NKS xXXx home\_" (DL))
*XPR [donc\{s\} donc\{s\}]
JMS xXXx (DL))
ICE xXXx (DL))
XPR ACB \{(F) donc\{s\} donc\{s\} vés ï\}"
XPR \{(F) tios_ qué tonta_\}
XPR (\_) \{(F) mi pelota:\}"
XVM XPR <2> io no he tocat res\(\)" (DL))
IKU <2> xXXx (DL))
ICE xXXx
XPR (\_) \{(F) me han_ me han cola(d)\o la pelota\})
XPR \{(F) com no me la den_ me pagan dos mil pesas\}
XPR \{(F) ya hombre_ joder\})
XPR hombre_ a ver_

XPR ANA *what_*
LLU what a brute\(\)" (DL))
ARC he threw it through the window\(\)" (DL))
XPR ACB \{(F) two thousand pesetas\}
Some subjects who employed Catalan for a majority of their relationships including those with Castilian speakers. Jcv seemed to maintain Catalan with most of his relationships, and his class-mates responded to him in the same language. Jcv represents thus the only subject who followed thoroughly the Catalan preeminence norm, i.e., the only subject for whom Catalan had become the means of most of his interactions with class-mates, irrespective of their first language. As an instance, note in the following excerpt how Dgs, a Castilian-speaking boy, resorts to Catalan to address Jcv, although he switches to Castilian for at least one utterance, probably due to his being Castilian dominant.

(73) Asking Jcv about what he had been doing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JCV</td>
<td>DGS:___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGS</td>
<td>(2) on vas anar/ (&quot;on has anat&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGS</td>
<td>(..) per què te'l posa((el \ casset))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCV</td>
<td>DGS (..) perquè no es sent re((sinó))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NKU</td>
<td>(..) ((F) \èh \èh, \ holà)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NKU</td>
<td>&lt;2&gt; (..) champù:((DL))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGS</td>
<td>JCV (4) y así se siente/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>xX(10)Xs|</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGS</td>
<td>JCV i per què t'ha cridat a tu/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCV</td>
<td>DGS (..) perquè és el que estava més a prop d'ell_ potser_</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In his use of Catalan as the unmarked language of communication with Castilian speakers, one language is preferred and little code-switching in the same dyad practised. When, due to any cause, Jcv fails to adopt the right language, he self-corrections and switches to the right choice:

---
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In his use of Catalan as the unmarked language of communication with Castilian speakers, one language is preferred and little code-switching in the same dyad practised. When, due to any cause, Jcv fails to adopt the right language, he self-corrections and switches to the right choice:
Self-correction.

JCV  (...) {(CAN) a txi pi_ txa}
JCV  DGS  (...) me pasa(s') el ne:- no no no\ the *taronja*/
JCV  (...) {(CAN) a chi pi_ cha}
JCV  DGS  (...) can you pass me the blac:- no no no\ *the orange colour*/

Jcv seems to use Catalan on a regular basis even for addressing the whole group, as in the following example:

Discussing turns in the cue.

MAP  xXXXx del Jce:\
MAP  ahora me toca a mi\ absence
DIV  xXXXx\ presence
IKU  después de la Zmr xx
SCP  IKU  no_ va el Jce_ eb_
XMS  SCP  pues que te crees que voy yo\ absence
IKU  SCP  [(F) y después del Jce voy yo\ absence]
IKU  SCP  [(F) después del Jce voy yo_]
XMS  IKU  [(F) pues después del Jce vas tú_]
MAP  [(F) xXXXx_]
IKU  [(F) y después yo\ absence]
IKU  [(F) después de ti voy yo\ absence]
JCV  IKU  {(F) vaig io_ davant del Jce:\
IKU  [(F) xXXXx voy yo\ absence]
FSG  [(F) xxx que tú_]
SCP  XMS  [(F) oye_ Xms_]
IKU  [(F) xXXXx la última\ absence]
IKU  qué_:
ZMR  [??] tirate\ un poco\ absence
IKU  después de la Ejc xXXXx

MAP  xXXXx follow Jce\
MAP  now it's my turn\ absence
DIV  xXXXx_\ presence
IKU  following Zmr xx\ absense
SCP  IKU  no_ it's Jce’s turn_ isn’t it_ absence
XMS  SCP  what are you saying it's my turn\ absence
IKU  SCP  [(F) I follow Jce\ absence]
IKU  SCP  [(F) I follow Jce_]
XMS  IKU  [(F) so you follow Jce_]
MAP  [(F) xXXXx_]
IKU  [(F) and then it’s my turn\ absence
IKU  [(F) I follow you\ absence]
JCV  IKU  {(F) it’s me_ before Jce_:
IKU  [(F) xXXXx it’s my turn\ absence
FSG  [(F) xxx than you_]
SCP  XMS  [(F) listen_ Xms_]
IKU  [(F) xXXXx the last one_]
IKU  what_:
ZMR  [??] move_ a little bit\ absence
IKU  following Ejc xXXXx

In spite of his adopting Catalan as the preferred language of interaction, Jcv also made
occasional use of Castilian in untutored interaction.

Jcv constitutes a particular case in that he makes little overall use of Castilian in his daily life. Out-of-school observation confirms that he manages to speak Catalan even in occasional interaction with unknown Castilian-speaking adults. As an instance, I witnessed a short conversation in Catalan between Jcv and a lady employee at the local swimming-pool, when Jcv's choice of Catalan was not hindered by her poor command of productive Catalan. Jcv takes advantage of the increasing knowledge of Catalan displayed by his surroundings and does not seem compelled to accommodate to Castilian as his class-mates do.

V Castilian speakers' use of Catalan for peer interaction

We saw in the quantitative section that very few Catalan speakers failed to converge linguistically towards Castilian when addressing Castilian speakers. In the few cases in which this convergence did not take place, the converse phenomenon, i.e., convergence towards Catalan, seemed to be the predominant pattern. That means that bilingual conversation, or the maintenance of each speaker's first language, was seldom if ever practised by the subjects.

Castilian-speakers were not always able to sustain long stretches of conversation in Catalan. Sometimes the choice of Catalan was not maintained by the Castilian speaker, who turned back to Castilian. On other occasions, the Castilian speaker seemed to anticipate the next addressee and switches to Castilian, like Fsg in example 77, when he switched to Castilian before he was explicitly addressing his utterance to Aos.

(76) Arguing about each subjects' abilities at playing football.
FSG JCV pero Jcv tu almenys fas algo perquè el Aos_
FSG JCV mira' al Aos le dice(s') delantero derecho_
FSG JCV se va al delantero izquierdo_
FSG AOS te tienes(s') que quedar en tu puesto_
FSG AOS y no_
FSG AOS (...) tú vas siempre a por(i') la pelota_
FSG JCV but Jcv at least you do something for Aos_
FSG JCV listen' you tell Aos to be centre forward_
FSG JCV he goes to left forward_
FSG AOS you must remain in your place_
FSG AOS rather than_
FSG AOS (...) you always go after the ball_
(e 3017)

On occasions of special tension, Castilian speakers seemed less able to maintain Catalan. Several instances show how Castilian speakers who spoke Catalan to a given Catalan speaker turned to their first language to defend themselves from or attack the Catalan speaker. Note for instance how a verbal game degenerates into a series of personal insults and how Dgs switches to Castilian.)

(77) Verbal duelling; Dgs is being called jamón (Castilian for ham).
JCV DGS Dani per lo menys està bo_
JCV DGS (...) més bo que tu_
This sort of verbal duelling is not uncommon among the subjects. It comes as no surprise that Dgs, whose untutored use of Catalan is practically reduced to this dyad, does not possess the verbal abilities required for this sort of confrontation, or at least encounters fewer troubles in doing so in Castilian (see especially the switch in cerdo 'pig'). Placed in a situation in which...
loss of face depends heavily on his manipulation of linguistic resources, Dgs switches to Castilian. It can also be possible that switching to Castilian increases the social distance between both subjects.

The following example shows how two of the less convergent-prone subjects, Zmr, a Castilian speaker, and Jcv, a Catalan speaker and a central member of the Catalan-speaking core group, organize their intercommunication. This was indeed a rare event, because these two subjects rarely interacted.

(78) Non-convergers’ encounter.

ZMR JEO (...) bueno\(\ldots\) te cambio\.
ZMR JCV J- mh Jcv_ ven aquí por favor\.
JCV ZMR \ldots\ om\.
ZMR JCV \ldots\ va:(l)e:_ merci_ val\(\ldots\) déu\.
ZMR JEO \ldots\ O.K.\(\ldots\) I change it.
ZMR JCV J- mh Jcv_ please come here\.
JCV ZMR \ldots\ where\.
ZMR JCV \ldots\ of painting here\.
ZMR JCV \ldots\ O.K.\_ thank you\_ O.K.\ bye\.

Zmr asks Jcv -in a rather bossy way- to come and help her. The latter answers in Catalan and Zmr gives him instructions in Castilian. In the excerpt, only a fragment is understood, but it includes an infinitive in Castilian (pronounced [pin’tar]; cf. Cat. [pin’ta]) which leads us to believe it was a Castilian utterance. After a pause comes the most interesting utterance: Zmr tries to thank Jcv for his collaboration. To do so, she starts with a Castilian discourse marker -vale- which is frequently used as a borrowing in Catalan; she then thanks Jcv with a French borrowing which is widespread in Catalan, but unheard in Castilian; after that, she reformulates her first discourse marker ['bale], which is Catalanised into val. Finally, she resorts to a Catalan farewell which is widely used in Catalonia's Castilian. Although this final line is by itself linguistically mixed and admits several interpretations, I would argue it represents Zmr's genuine attempt to converge towards Jcv by means of formulaic expressions while avoiding the need to go into more complicated linguistic usages. The Castilian speaker is trying to make the utterance sound more Catalan by using the less Castilian-like items: apart from vale/val duet, merci is definitely not Castilian, while gràcies, its Catalan equivalent, closely resembles Cast. gracias.

VI Reasons for the new choice transgressions

Together with the code-switching practices reviewed in section 3, the new choice transgressions analysed in this section represent the incorporation of a limited range of code-switching functions into Castilian speech. This phenomenon is closely linked to the overall process of Catalan language learning and normalization. But it remains uncertain to what extent code-switching has exclusively been propelled by school action. In fact, a certain degree of linguistic manipulation is already available in the community as a whole, and it is only
natural that children apply it to their newly acquired bilingual competence. Moreover, several authors (Nussbaum, 1989; Boix, 1989, 1993) have stressed that the progresses made by Catalan have opened the door to a major freedom for code-switching, and Pujolar's (1995) research has confirmed that bilingualised Castilian speakers make some use of Catalan as a second voice. The progress in Catalan language competence is undeniably a merit of the school system. The implementation of the Catalan preeminence norm in teacher-pupil interaction is also undeniably due to the school. It remains unclear, though, whether the rest of new functions served by switching (e.g. switching to Catalan for discourse-related purposes in a Castilian context) should be attributed to the school action or to a more general advance of Catalan in the overall society.

Several examples of switching that cannot be said to depend on the school action support our suspicion that school action is not the only element to be taken into account. On several occasions, the Castilian speaking pupils switched to Catalan for a very particular purpose: singing the Barcelona F.C.'s anthem. The context of production of this interaction is relevant to its right understanding: Mnj, a Castilian-speaking monitor who spoke only Catalan to the children, had been getting the children mad by proclaiming Real Madrid the best football team in Spain. The children responded to such a challenge both in Catalan and especially in Castilian. Given the latters' reduced dialectic abilities, the discussion derived towards an anthem war in which children sang the Barcelona's anthem and anti-Madrid slogans in Catalan, while Mnj sang pro-Madrid slogans. This scene was repeatedly recorded in untutored interaction and even during the interviews.

A further example of the linguistic abilities for verbal manipulation are provided by the following pun, in which Xms combines the Cast. adverb efectivamente 'that's right' with Stevie Wonder's name.

(79) Talking about horoscopes.
JEO [are you a Virgo?]
XMS JEO efecto eleven Wonder
JEO XMS va venga qué eres /
XMS JEO efecto eleven Wonder
JEO XVM virgo /
NKU JEO { (F) efectivamente }
XMS JEO efecto eleven Wonder
JEO XMS [igual que] mi madre_ tío /
JEO XMS [ just as] my mother /

Other examples of discourse-related multilingual manipulation are provided by the exploitation of the students' other linguistic resources.
Preparing a poster.

ICE o sea la aduana
ICE ahora hacemos como un mostrador
ICE y el tío pone: pone
ICE algo qué declarar/
ICE el café@@@
ICE [o algo asf no]

MPM ICE [xx tiene xx cuerpo_] {(@) por lo menos}

JBC ICE se ve_ se ve_ se ve una cosa que pone Spanish

NAK JBC {(@) Spanish}

JBC ICE un gordo_ (...) grande_

JBC ICE un tío grande cachas_ (...) con algo:] un arma: amenazadora_

ICE that is the toll_
ICE now we do a sort of a counter_
ICE and the guy puts: puts_
ICE anything to declare/
ICE the coffee@@@
ICE [or something like that isn't it]

MPM ICE [xx has xx body_] {(@) at least}

JBC ICE you can see_ you can see_ you can see something with Spanish on it!

NAK JBC {(@) Spanish}

JBC ICE a fat one_ (...) big_

JBC ICE a big muscled guy_ (...) with something:] a threatening weapon_

(n 2225)

English, French, Italian and German are occasionally used, normally in stereotyped forms (e.g. rien, merci, ciao, heil Hitler, and so on) by the subjects. Limited as they can be, these loanwords and/or switches bear testimony to the trends towards linguistic manipulation that cannot be attributed to the school. It is therefore necessary to be extremely cautious in the attribution of a causal relationship between the -after all, moderate- increase in code-switching function among our subjects and their schooling in Catalan. Other external factors may be playing their role in this process. These examples confirm that the school's action should be seen in perspective with the overall sociolinguistic processes.

5.2.5 Teaching and learning norms

I Entering school

In the school researched, two alternative norms are offered to the pupils in their daily lives: the Catalan subordination norm, predominant in the out-of-school society, and the Catalan preeminence norm, promoted by the school. Children have elaborated a synthetic norm that includes most features of the Catalan subordination norm but incorporates a new requirement, that of choosing Catalan to speak to teachers irrespective of the speaker’s first language. They have also developed their code-switching abilities, to the extent that Castilian speakers are now able to code-switch when they feel it to their benefit, and a new, more bilingual space of interaction has been created.

Nevertheless, children entering the school do not necessarily possess the communicative competence to know both languages and the norms to govern their usage. This is especially
true for the youngest children. Norms have to be learned, and they are learned by means of interaction with teachers and peers. In this section, I intend to offer a glimpse to the language norm learning and establishing processes.

Examples of very young Castilian-speaking pupils addressing each other in Catalan after some months of school are reported by teachers and parents, and even examples of children addressing short utterances in Catalan to their Castilian speaking parents are not rare at all in the initial courses. It seems as if they found themselves in an initial stage in which language norms interfere with each other in unstructured ways. This is by no means the situation among fifth-graders and older pupils. At their age, norms have already been established and few divergences are detected.

In the course of this research, I spent a number of hours in the company of pupils from the lowest grades. I also visited on several occasions a class of P4 (four year old children) during a period of two months. These observations are presented here to furnish a comparative framework with what has been said about older students.

Most Castilian-speaking children in their first school year show low - or no - knowledge of Catalan, and they experience a process of second language acquisition which seems to consist in the progressive development of Catalan on the basis of their Castilian. The process seems to start by the insertion of single lexical units - one-word code-switches- as in the following example, where Amg includes Cat. color [ku’lo] instead of Cast. Color[ko’lor] "colour" following the teacher's suggestion to play with colours.

(81) Playing in class.  
AMG IAA dice una cosa_  
AMG IAA dime una cosa de color_ ( .. ) verde [ku’lo]  
DGT AMG IAA una cosa de color_ ( .. ) lila_ [ko’lor]  
AMG DGT IAA dime una cosa de color_ ( .. ) azul [ku’lo]  
DGT AMG IAA dime una cosa de color_ ( .. ) amarillo [ku’lo]  
AMG DGT IAA ahora me toca a mi_  
AMG IAA tell me one thing_  
AMG IAA tell me one thing in_ ( .. ) green colour_  
DGT AMG IAA one thing in_ ( .. ) lila colour_  
AMG DGT IAA tell me one thing in_ ( .. ) blue colour_  
DGT AMG IAA tell me one thing in_ ( .. ) yellow colour  
AMG DGT IAA now it’s my turn_  
(FN, 3/10/92)

Notice that Dgt (a family bilingual, perfectly fluent in both languages) is at the beginning unable to copy Amg’s utterance and keeps both languages apart. Soon, though, he converges with Amg's linguistic operations and repeats the switched utterance.

Another example of this behaviour is furnished by Rsr. In this case it is difficult to judge what

---

69See the children's linguistic background in annexe 5.
is the switched element, for va a la 'goes to the' is homophonous in Catalan and Castilian (cf. chapter 6).

(82) Playing in class.
RSR esto va a la cuina
RSR this goes to the kitchen
(FN, 3/10/92)

In both cases, the switched elements are not filling lexical gaps: they are produced in this context because of their closer association with the teacher's words, who has suggested to play with colors and introduced the children to the racó de la cuina or "kitchen corner". But this connexion was not always as obvious. In other cases, high degree of intrasentential code-switching could not be related to other factors than the desire to introduce Catalan into their utterances:

(83) Asking what to do.
AMG ARP hacemos(s') aquest/
AMG ARP shall we do this one/
(FN 5)

As the process of language acquisition progresses, all sorts of language contact phenomena at all linguistic levels mark the route followed by the young learners. As expected, these phenomena abound much more here than in higher courses. In some cases they blend words, as in the following example where Cat. llimona [ʎiˈmonə] x Cast. limón [liˈmon] = [liˈmona] "lemon".

(84) Celebrating the Castanyera.
XVM IKU de qué en vos_ de taronja o de llimona_
IKU XVM de limona_
XVM IKU what flavour do you want_ orange or lemon_
IKU XVM lemon_
(FN, 3/10/92)

In other cases, it is morphology which is mixed, as when Cast. callad, callaos or callaros, Cat. calleu71 '(you people) shut up' becomes [kaˈjatus] or [kaˈjaðus]. This example points as well to the importance acquired by phonological rules in the mouths of the learners: vocalic neutralization seems to be among the first rules applied to speak Catalan; therefore the [us] ending. The form [ˈla β jus], resulting from Cast. labios [ˈla β jos], among many other, bears testimony to such a trend. Closer to Catalan, the form [ˈaβru] appears a mixture of Cat. arbre [ˈaβrə] and Cast. árbol [ˈarβol].

70The racó technique consists in distributing the class in separate fictitious environments such as the kitchen, the home, the market, etc., where children can play pretending to be adults. This technique is widely popular among immersion teachers for it facilitates the introduction of many communicative situations otherwise unavailable to class interaction.

71Contrary to Castilian, in Catalan, this is not a pronominal verb; the Castilian-interfered pronominal form calleu-vos and calleu'se is nevertheless quite frequent in Barcelona.
While it is readily admitted that many Castilian-speaking children arrive at school with little or no competence at all in Catalan, little is known about the degree of Castilian language knowledge among Catalan-speaking kindergarteners. As a matter of fact, it seems to be assumed that they know Castilian, although some authors have already drawn attention to the fact that their competence should not be overestimated (cf. Tusón and Payrató 1991a, b for an example).

Some evidence encountered in my data suggest that in some cases this lack of competence might affect even some of the youngest Catalan speakers in a such a Castilian-dominant place as Santa Coloma de Gramenet. I had the opportunity of following several subjects in a P4 class in the same school during a short period immediately after their entry to school. During the first weeks, Iaa, a Catalan speaker, was not heard speaking Castilian to his class-mates, tended to join other Catalan, bilingual or bilingualized Castilian speakers, and seemed reluctant to join monolingual Castilian speakers. He seemed disoriented, and associated himself predominantly with the most competent bilingual, Dgt. On his side, Dgt freely associated with other subjects and used Catalan and Castilian depending on the interlocutor.

Early in November, Iaa was already becoming integrated: he now played and shared activities with other subjects and reacted more favourably to class dynamics. Although Dgt remained his closest friend and Catalan his most often used language, he was observed and recorded making some use of Castilian with other class-mates.

(85) Playing with class-mates.

| AMG   | voy ganando_ |
| IAA   | no estás ganando_(des d'una altra taula)[no as'tas] |
| AMG   | I'm winning_ |
| IAA   | (you) are not winning_ (from another table) |

(FN 2)

Nevertheless, Iaa's Castilian seemed remarkably precarious. See the following example:

(86) Playing with dolls.

| IAA   | RSR LVR   | femos una cosa_ |
| IAA   | RSR LVR   | este_ (...) este_ |
| LVR   | IAA RSR   | era el pare_ |
| LVR   | IAA RSR   | y este_ (...) era el fill petitonet\ |

| IAA   | RSR LVR   | let's do a thing_ |
| IAA   | RSR LVR   | this one_ (...) this one_ |
| LVR   | IAA RSR   | was the father_ |
| LVR   | IAA RSRa  | nd this one_ (...) was his small baby\ |

(FN 1)

Notice that Iaa conjugates Cat. fer (Cast. hacer, 'to do, to make') with Castilian verbal morphology (imperative: Cat. fem, Cast. hacemos 'let's do'). This switch in the case of such a pro-verb suggests again a weak competence in Castilian.
Iaa often engaged in bilingual conversations with Castilian-speaking classmates. In these conversations they switched between languages apparently at random, probably in connexion to their own competences. As a whole, Iaa tended to use much more Catalan than Castilian. Although there is by no means enough evidence available to convert this scarce data into a solidly grounded claim, I suggest that children from homogeneous Catalan speaking families such as Iaa may have not been in contact with Castilian for enough time to develop productive competence in that language when entering kindergarten.

Pre-schooling reality determines language abilities in these first days. Let us compare two cases here. The first one is that of Lvr, the third daughter in a Catalan-speaking family of shopkeepers. Lvr was extremely shy and affectionate. Catalan was the only language spoken by her parents and siblings in family. Her mother claimed that the girl spoke half Catalan and half Castilian with the family members. In fact, she hardly produced a whole utterance in Catalan in the class, using Castilian most of the time. Her knowledge of Catalan seemed scanty, as proved by the following examples, where she uses Cast. *terminar* instead of Cat. *acabar* ‘to finish’, and Cast. *más* insted of Cat. *més*:

(87) Lvr finishes her work.
    LVR  LLA  senyoreta senyoreta_ ia he terminat_
    LVR  LLA  ia he terminat a:- això_
    LVR  LLA  teacher teacher_ I’m already finished_
    LVR  LLA  I’m already finished wi:- with this_  
    (FN 1)

(88) Working in class.
    LVR    això això és más guay_
    LVR    this this is nicer_  
    (FN 1)

While Lvr was able to produce monolingual Castilian utterances, her Catalan utterances attained high degrees of intrasentential switching quite often, pointing to incomplete mastery of the language.

(89) Pretending to cook.
    LVR    te vaig a hacer sopar_
    LVR    I’m going to make dinner for you_  
    (FN 3)

Another case of interest was that of Amj. The son of a linguistically heterogeneous family, Amj’s mother claimed to speak Catalan to the child, although she acknowledged that she was the only one in the family to do so, and that he usually spoke only in Castilian to her and to the rest of the family. Despite this apparent lack of competence in Catalan, Amj displayed a remarkable capacity to learn this language and was by far the Castilian-speaking child most prone to use the language.
In both cases, out-of-school experience determined the children's linguistic abilities. Lvr's parents worked all day long. She had attended a Castilian-speaking crèche where no Catalan at all was used, and, when at home, she was taken care of by the older sibling -a teenager- who, according to several reports, left her watching TV for hours on her own. Amj had received Catalan input from his mother and the Catalan-speaking -or at least bilingual- crèche he had attended, and, although he used to interact in Castilian with his mother, progressed enormously in their knowledge of Catalan during the year. Lvr, a -theoretical- Catalan speaker, spoke only Castilian with his class-mates, while Amj soon started to interact in Catalan with Iaa. Traces of their maternal link with Catalan were otherwise obvious in some cases, as in example 89 where Lvr produced a complex, familial and clearly affectively loaded fill petionet, lit. 'little, dear and small son', or in the following example:

(90) Playing parents and children.

   AMJ  nina cômetela fill meu_
   AMJ  doll eat it my son_

(FN 7)

As a whole, the initial period of the children at school records a considerable confusion regarding language separation and patterns of language choice and use. Not only utterances attained higher degrees of language mixing among younger students than those we were familiar for fifth- and eighth-graders. Patterns of language choice and switching were not clearly established, and considerable intrasentential and intersentential switching was detected in both ingroup and outgroup relationships. The teachers consulted confirmed that this was the regular state of affairs: the process started each year with a new kindergarten class entering the school, and confusion progressively turned into the regularity we examined in the previous chapter. It is therefore evident that a process of language norm-learning and fixation develops in the course of schooling which finally generates the Catalan subordination norm in its version prevalent at school.

II Norms of language choice and switch

The association of Catalan with the teacher is rapidly assumed by the subjects. Children try to converge towards the teacher in spite of their precarious knowledge of Catalan, as shown in examples 84, 86 and 87. But switching was not limited to addressee-specification. Only two months after the beginning of their schooling, some children were already making use of Catalan to draw authority. See for instance how Dgt, a fluent bilingual who had been observed as speaking Castilian to his Castilian-speaking class-mates, reformulates the teacher's statement in the following example:

(91) Deciding who takes a doll home during the week-end.

   LLA DIV qui s'emporta el mimós_ ((mena de ninot))
   DIV LLA (F) yo yo_
   LLA DGT no tu l'has emportat mai/ tu/ Dgt/
   LLA DIV avui se l'emporta el Dgt/
   IKU LLA xXXx ((algun nen protesta))
   DGT DIV avui me l'emporto io/
   LLA DIV who takes mimós home_ ((a puppet))
Due to the teachers' maintenance of Catalan, Castilian-speaking children make the effort of linguistically converging with them and by that acquire Catalan; but peer-pressure decisively contributes to the establishment and transformation of linguistic norms. The initial period of normative confusion that children seem to pass through is probably solved by means of trial and error, as the following example shows. Npe was a new female pupil in one of the earlier grades, and one strongly dominant in Castilian. Very shy, she felt out of place in the school and was still learning to interact with her mates. Excerpt 95 was obtained from an excursion, when, exhausted by the long walk, Npe was trying to convince Xms to ride her horseback.

Npe feels she must modify her utterances twice, while preserving intact the referential meaning. Her first utterance constitutes a partially failed attempt to produce a message in Catalan: she uses a Castilian pronoun and does not pronounce 'puges 'you ride me' properly. She corrects herself immediately and tries a second time. This time she succeeds in linguistic terms. After a short pause, she realizes she is not obtaining any answer, so she reformulates her petition again, but now in Castilian. This time she gets a minimal feed-back: Nkt feels addressed and asks in Castilian what it is that Npe wants. That is the sort of feed-back sought by Npe, who insists in Castilian trying to include other children in her request for help.

It is difficult to know why Npe chose Catalan the first time. It might be that the Catalan preeminence norm exerts a certain pressure on the newly arrived children until they get to establish their new relationships. Nevertheless, the truth is that Npe's first choice was erroneous this time, for her interlocutors do not seem to have felt addressed by her until the moment she spoke Castilian.

Data from fifth-graders and eighth-graders made it clear that language norms were rather established by the age of ten, at least for those who had attended the same school. While norms were usually adopted as a matter of fact and little non-purposive divergence appears, and while
we have seen that there existed a (relatively) wide margin to manoeuvre linguistically, deviations from the expected norms were not easily tolerated by peers. It happened sometimes that some participants interpreted the situation as requiring a given norm, while other participants interpreted the situation according to different parameters. If the choices dictated by each norm were not coincidental, an overt conflict could arise and lead the participants to discussion. I will come back to this issue in the following section.

Teachers are not excluded from norm teaching at all. It is unnecessary to insist here on their primary role as transmitters of the Catalan preeminence norm. But it might pass unnoticed that they may from time to time relapse to the out-of-school norms and even impose these rules on the students.

(93) Giving the results of a poll in class.

AOS MAB perqué és un deber_ ciutadà\n
MAB AOS està en castellà o català això_ ((la resposta de l'entrevistat))

AOS MAB en castellà\n
MAB AOS doncs digue-ho en castellà\n
MAB DIV porque es un deber [ciudadano]\n
IKU MAB [por votar]\n
MAB DIV por votar\n
DIV sXXx

XMS MAB (..) o porque me interesa\n
MAB DIV (..) per interés\n
AOS MAB because it is a duty_ as a citizen\n
MAB AOS is it in Castilian or in Catalan_ ((the interviewee's answer))

AOS MAB in Castilian\n
MAB AOS then say it in Castilian\n
MAB DIV because it is a duty as a [citizen]\n
IKU MAB [just to vote]\n
MAB DIV just to vote\n
DIV sXXx

XMS MAB (..) or because it interests me\n
MAB DIV (..) out of interest\n
(b 2061)

In face of a lack of competence from Aos, Mab requires him to speak Castilian. Mab is not only teaching how to speak Catalan: she is also giving a concise instruction regarding language choice and appropriate code-switching patterns. In this case, she requires a pupil to code-switch to Castilian for quotation purposes, telling him to be faithful to the original language, or at least to avoid the troubles caused by lack of mastery in translating. The message is evident: not only should you learn to speak Catalan properly, but also to code-switch as a native speaker.

III Norms of language separation

Not only code choice was norm governed in the school. There existed a strict control with regards to language separation according to community patterns. In principle, language mixing below the sentence level was clearly refused unless it accomplished one of the functions enumerated before. Social norms governing language separation combined out-of-school standards of spoken language with some school-derived knowledge, and, while probably trying
to approach normative canons, did not necessarily coincide with them. Thus, no control seemed to be exerted over some clearly non-normative phenomena, such as, for instance, nonnative pronominal morphosyntactic behaviour in Catalan, or some widespread borrowings (see chapter 6), but other language contact phenomena were violently rejected.

Use of linguistically mixed forms regarded as socially inappropriate was punctilliously controlled by the very speakers, who reacted by (self-)correcting when unconscious mixes appeared:

(94) Talking about swings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESG</th>
<th>XXXx a les escoles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCP</td>
<td>em ve de gust subir-me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESG</td>
<td>{{@} subir-me_}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCP</td>
<td>{{@} al subir-me_ {{(F) pujar-me_}}}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not only native speakers corrected themselves: nonnative speakers also showed awareness of their "mistakes". See how Acb reformulates her utterance so that Cat. *alcohol* is pronounced in a more standard form:

(95) Asking about a liquid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACB</th>
<th>XVM</th>
<th>mhm\ës alcohol això\</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACB</td>
<td>XVM</td>
<td>(...) això és alcohol\</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self corrections were more frequent in the interviews than anywhere else, and only affected Catalan, never Castilian. It should be remembered, though, that it was precisely in the interviews where Castilian speakers felt compelled to speak Catalan, and thus their weakest language came to the fore. It is difficult to know to what extent the same behaviour is applied in totally free interaction. This sort of interaction takes place mostly in Castilian, and little linguistic correction is still needed at this age for the subjects to conform to social requirements regarding this language. The fact is that no noticeable difference could be detected between tutored and untutored interaction regarding this aspect; examples such as *subir* (97) suggest that the same basic principles of language separation are applied.

Self-correction may give birth to striking forms such as *aquell-lls_* [a'kel'ʎs] (w 461), resulting from the blend of Cast. *aquel* [a'kel] and Cat. *aquell* [a'kel].

---

72Esg does not realise that, in fact, and due to a syntactic calque, her correction still misses a pronoun to be total: *pujar-m'hi*, i.e. "to get on it". Even more, it would be preferrable to use another verb: *enfilar-se*, 'to climb'.
Metalinguistic comments, on the other hand, were seldom recorded. In the following example, Ice makes it evident that he does not know the Catalan equivalence for a discourse structure.

(96) During the interview.
ICE XVM[doncs_] ara: esperem que amb la gent jove doncs es reanini aquests aquesta:
aquest sentiment no/ perquè per lo vist per lo per lo vist_
ICE XVM és que no sé com es diu en català per lo vist_
ICE XVM doncs mmm_
ICE XVM[so:] now: let's hope that with the youth: well this this this feeling revives_ O.K/ for apparently apparently apparently_
ICE XVM I don't know how to say it in Catalan_ apparently\
ICE XVMer mmm_

When the speaker fails to correct himself or herself, others may provide the acceptable alternative.

(97) Describing a walk.
JEO XVM i vem anar a la plaça del relo(j) XMS XVM després vem anar a la plaça del rellotge_
JEO XVM and we went to the clock square_
XMS XVM later on we went to the clock square_
(j 3282)

Corrections were not always mild or gentle. Class-mates could be cruelly ridiculed in front of others because of their lack of command of a language. In the following example, Jcr was laughed at, mimicked and explicitly despised by his class-mates when he failed to use the Cat. collocation *posar banyes* (Cast. *poner cuernos*), 'to cuckold', literally 'to put horns on' and used instead the approximation Cat. *fer* 'to do' + Cast. *cuernos* 'horns'.

(98) Discussing personal relationships during the interview.
JCR XVM quan la quan la Slj va descobrir això dels que li feia els cuernos_
ICE [[(@) els(s) cuernos]]
JMS [ah:] DGG {{(@) e(ls) cuernos_}}
DGG le hace cuennus_\nJMS JCR {{(AC) ai Jcr no sabes decir xXXxs/ bua\ ((fàstic))}}
JCR @@
XVM JVR què va dir_
JCR XVM [li va_] JMS XVM [xx] DGG XVM li feia els cuernos_ JMS XVMMaixò que hem dit que segons: que segons com que: l'Acb fa que la gent vagi radere d'ella_
XVM DIV ia ia ia DGG XVM sì perquè quan 1 la Slj_
JMS nada\ DGG XVM [1 s'està] quedant [2 sola] ICE XVM [2 quan] la Slj va veure que el Jbc li feia els cuernos doncs_
JCR XVM when when Slj discovered that: he was horning her_ ICE [[(@) hornings\]]
It should not be disregarded that the intensity of the reproaches was closely linked to the victim's social status in the class. A fat, clumsy and childish boy, Jcr often became the object of mockery of his classmates, and his very appearance could provoke malign jokes. It is not surprising then that the critiques addressed at him were more bitter than others. This very same calque—otherwise, a widespread one—was produced by a female subject: *els corns* (y 4066), with the result of a general laugh and a gentle correction by a class-mate, and, in still another interaction, by Far, a bilingual, as *li fotia els cuernos* (z 6098) without any reaction.

Sometimes, social control against illicit language contact phenomena went beyond what was accepted in the out-of-school society and favoured a more puristic solution. In the following, Arc mockingly imitated Acb’s use of Cat. *aparato* a widespread borrowing from Cast. *aparell*. It should be noted that its genuine alternative, Cat. *aparell*, is common but not dominant at all.

It is interesting to remark that this peer pressure did not make any difference between Catalan and Castilian speakers: all of them could be scolded and an object of derision when caught by their peers. In the following extract, Jbc uses the spread Cat. loanword *pasteler*, from Cast. *pastelero* ‘pastrycook’, instead of the genuine Cat. *pastisser*, provoking his classmates' unanimous hilarious reaction, in spite of his being a native speaker and a dominant figure among boys. Peer pressure does not stop until he publicly acknowledges his mistake.
Sometimes, though, the native speakers’ reaction is not one of bending to pressure. On one occasion, a young child came to the researcher and asked him for help with a *estoig* [əˈstʊɛtʃ], Catalan for ‘pencil box’. This is a term that has been almost completely replaced by *estutx* [əˈstʊtʃ], a borrowing from Cast. *estuche*, so the child’s word had obviously been learned at school. Just after the child spoke Tar, a bilingual seventh-grader who was standing next to the researcher, made an insulting remark about the child’s “inability” to speak properly, to which Xvm felt compelled to retort that, in fact, the child was not exactly wrong. Feeling put down, Tar answered back “well, that might be so at your home, but not elsewhere”.

This norm-enforcement is not limited to language contact phenomena: it includes all other deviations from the norm and verbal inability. In the following excerpts, Jcr was laughed at due to his poor description by Ana, and his utterance is corrected by Jms:

(101) Talking about martial arts equipment.
JCR (...) una cosa así de larga de caña de bambú
JCR y en y en mi gimnasio (...) (uns estris concrets) tenían la(s’) cosas separadas _no/
JCR y a veces(s’) cuando [daba(s’) _ te cogía la carne
JCR pla:s:
ANA [{(@) las cosas _ separadas\} @@ @]
NAK [alt:::_]
JMS JCR [o sea_] o sea que estaba estaba abierta la caña, _
JMS JCR y que: a lo mejor te pillaba\
Finally, Gbg corrects herself during the interview by replacing the verb pro-verb *foutre*, found vulgar in this context (cf. French *foutre*) with the neutral *fer* "to do, to make".

(102) During the interview.

GBGXVM em fot_em fa una mica de vergonya pero després amb el temps doncs::

GBG XVM it makes me_it makes me feel slightly ashamed but then with time

(y 4126)

**IV Learning and teaching of language norm: synthesis**

When confronted with bilingualism on their arrival at the school, children react with confusion. It takes them some time to adapt to the normative clash and learn the synthesis of the out-of-school and in-school norms practised in the school, but we know that these norms are clearly defined by the age of ten. We still ignore much about the actual process of norm acquisition and combination, their timing and the nature of their creation. Nevertheless, we know that norms are enforced by a combined pressure of peers’ explicit and implicit behaviour. Teacher pressure seems to be of a more indirect nature in comparison with that exerted by classmates, although they also make the occasional explicit point on language separation and switching.

In the following section I will discuss the application of norms to the interviews, an arena which was previously undefined from the point of view of normative sets and which therefore allowed more room for the explicitation of tensions between different norms. The background information obtained in the preceding chapters will shed light on the subjects’ reactions so that a clearer understanding of their behaviour can be achieved.

**5.2.6 The interviews: different answers to social constraints**

**1 Interviews as particular social events**

Interviews have a long tradition in sociolinguistic research. They undoubtedly offer many advantages with regard to external validity, for they facilitate control of many variables in play and often constitute the only realistic way to approach large numbers of subjects. On the other hand, they entail a number of widely-known methodological dangers, for an interview constitutes a genre in itself with a number of linguistic and interactional limitations and requires a certain degree of formality and self-control which modifies, or may modify, language behaviour to an unknown extent (cf. Milroy, 1987b).
In the present research, many subjects were never recorded speaking Catalan spontaneously in class or outside it. The interviews were designed and carried on in order to obtain samples of Catalan speech from at least all core subjects. The interviews avoided language-related issues and -in principle- allowed free language choice; it was expected that most subjects would address the researcher in Catalan, for this was his unmarked language with all subjects in dyadic interactions.

Each interview was initially designed to include four subjects of the same sex and class. Four interviews were initially planned: one with four female fifth graders (text i), one with four male fifth-graders (m), one with female eighth-graders (y) and another one with male eighth-graders (z). An extra interview (w) to a mixed group of eighth-graders who insisted on being recorded was finally added.

Class-interaction and out-of-class interaction constitute well established communicative situations in the life of the subjects. Conversely, interviews represented a situation for which linguistic norms had to be adjusted anew on the basis of both formal and informal experience. Subjects did not coincide in the application of language norms. Some of them tried to enforce the out-of-school variety of the Catalan subordination norm, while others followed its school version. A final group seemed to apply the Catalan preeminence norm. Normative conflict became explicit in the interviews to the 5th graders (texts i and m), with completely opposed outcomes.

II Bilingual conversation: female fifth-graders

The female subjects selected for this interview maintained close ties with each other. They were not only class-mates but also close friends, and often shared out-of-school activities. Their close relationships were substantiated by their calling each other tata (Cast. child term for 'sister') and by establishing imaginary family relationships according to which their respective brothers and sisters would get married in the future. In social network terms they formed a dense and multiplex network.

Text i represents the only example of sustained bilingual conversation in the whole corpus. According to the role previously designed, the interviewer maintained Catalan during the whole meeting. The subjects, on their side, produced most of their utterances in Castilian. This behaviour was by no means predictable from the dyadic relationships maintained by each subject. Two of the subjects interviewed, Ebg and Erl, had clearly established Catalan as their unmarked language of communication with the researcher, while Sfb alternated between Catalan and Castilian. Only Zmr and, especially, Map, consistently maintained Castilian. I will come back to this point later.

In spite of the general pattern of bilingual conversation, numerous code-switches sprinkled the girls' speech, usually when addressing the interviewer. A significant number of these switches to Catalan were the immediate answer to a question formulated by the researcher. Interesting enough, these switches were more often than not group reactions, articulated as short periods
when several subjects would speak in Catalan. See the following example:

(103) Narrating an encounter with football players.

DIV [(F) xXXx]
NAK XVM xXXx at last he got mad and did not._
XVM DIV yeah_ who was aking for signatures_
NAK XVM wha[t/]
ZMR XVM [(0) we were]
EBG XVM (0) we were\]
SFB XVM (0) we were\]
MAP XVM and the _ [1 and the tourists_] ]
ZMR XVM [1 and the _] [2 els turistes_ ]
SFB XVM [2 els turistes] ]
XVM DIV ah p(e)rò també (hi) havien turistes/ \]
XFM DIV [3 clar\ és que a mi no m’ho dit_]
EBG XVM [3 sí: _ franceses] japoneses [4 italianos_]
NAK XVM [(3 sí:\]
XVM DIV [4 bueno\ ah (…) o sigui que no només hi havien [5 japonesos]
*ZMR XVM [5 ah y los_ j y y los japonesos salieron en la tele tambièn\ [3apu’ nezus]
SFB XVM (0) y franceses tambièn\ (continuen en castellà)

Most of their interventions in Catalan constitute reactive and imitative behaviour. Many of these switches could be described in terms of discourse -mostly lexical- cohesion, as a mechanism to link utterances with one another. Thus, in the previous example, Cat. japonesos (signalled with *; cf. Cast. japoneses [japoneses]), represents the repetition of Xvm’s previous words. In the following case, Ebg picks up the Cat. word divendres (Cast. viernes, “Friday”) from the blackboard, inserts it in a prepositional phrase which can be analysed as either Catalan or Castilian, and connects it to a Castilian verb.

(104) Ebg is erasing the day names written in Catalan on the blackboard

SFB XVM e(s’)tamo(s’) a divendres(_ ) [et ‘tamo a ðiβiβendrə]
SFB XVM e(s’)tamo(s’) a divendres(_ ) [et ‘tamo a Ωiβiβendrə]
SFB XVM this is Friday_
SFB XVM this is Friday_

As a whole, switching to Catalan during this interview was short, normally reactive and
frequently collective, and took place in the unusual framework of a bilingual conversation.

The choice of Castilian should not be attributed to a general lack of competence in Catalan. One of the subjects, Ebg, was a family bilingual; Ebg, Erl and Sfb, were proficient in Catalan, and they had proven their command of that language in class interaction. In fact, the texts contains several instances of spontaneous, creative use of Catalan produced by Sfb, Ebg, Erl. But Zmr and Map possessed a very limited competence in Catalan and seldom made any use of that language for any purpose. In particular Map, seemed to experience serious difficulties in expressing herself in Catalan. See for instance the trouble encountered by Map at merely repeating Xvm's previous utterance in the following fragment: not only does she start the sentence with two Castilian borrowed discourse connectors, but she also lengthens them unnecessarily -as if reflecting about the utterances she is producing- and erroneously substitutes the Cast. preposition en (en verano, 'in summer') for the Cat. a (a l'estiu, colloquial a l'istiu). The whole utterance is produced amidst her own laughter and in a disguised voice, and cut off as soon as she has the opportunity to switch back to Castilian. Indeed, when Ebg requires Map to speak Castilian instead of Catalan, Map not only follows the advice but reveals herself as a loquacious speaker who does not hesitate or unnecessarily lengthen words.

(105) Discussing summer plans.
XVM MAP [2 què fas
XVM MAP on vas tu a l'istiu]
SFB XVM [2 voy a la Expo:; _]
MAP XVM (.) (IEV)(@) pues:; bue::no jo [en l'istiu]
EBG XVM [(ACC)(F) bueno ya a ha acabado(_)
EBG XVM oh qué bien! @@@
MAP XVM aún no he empezado(_)
MAP XVM en el istiu (._) pues:
EBG XVM (F) en castellano
EBG XVM no en catalán
MAP XVM o me voy a mi terreno
MAP XVM (._) [1 o me voy al pueblo] de mi padre (._) [2 o de mi madre_]

XVM MAP [2 what are you doing
XVM MAP where are you going_ in summer]
SFB XVM [2 I'm going to the Expo:_]
MAP XVM (._) (IEV)(@) well::; that is [to summer]
EBG XVM [(ACC)(F) well she's finished_]
EBG XVM how good! @@@
MAP XVM I haven't started yet
MAP XVM to summer (._) well::;
EBG XVM (F) in Castilian
EBG XVM not in Catalan
MAP XVM either I go to my cottage
MAP XVM (._) [1 or to my father's] village (._) [2 or to my mother's_]
(i 1044)

Ebg's intervention points to the actual reasons for choosing Castilian as the language of interaction here. How is it to be understood that a competent bilingual impose Castilian on a Castilian dominant speaker? I would argue that all girls knew their own capacities and preferences regarding language use, and were aware of Zmr and Map's reluctance to speak Catalan. In class, this language preference was relatively easy to content by restraining to speak (cf. 3.2.2). An interview in Catalan, on the contrary, constituted a clear risk of losing
face due to linguistic inability. By enforcing Castilian as the language of the interview, Ebg was not only facilitating the least competent speakers' participation but also doing so without putting at stake her friends' face.

The girls' insistence on choosing Castilian reappeared later on when Erl, a Castilian-speaking girl friend joined the group. She was highly competent in Catalan, and, since she had not followed the previous process of choice enforcement, resorted to Catalan as the language of interaction with the researcher, for that was their unmarked language. Unfortunately for her, this choice was running against the decision taken by the group; see their reaction to Erl's words.

(106) Describing the place where the subjects live.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVM</th>
<th>ERL</th>
<th>ia: aïxò quin barri és\</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>XVM</td>
<td>(...) m::: (...) està pel barri del Fons_(el Fondo, barri de Santa Coloma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>XVM</td>
<td>p(e)rò hi ha un altre barri\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZMR</td>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>eh_ en castellano_ que estamos entre amigos\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>Erl_ [{(F) Erl en castellano}] {{fort però no agressiu}}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBG</td>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>[en castellano]\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>EBG ZMR</td>
<td>ah bueno\ eh: [parlo xXXxs]\</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVM</th>
<th>ERL</th>
<th>and what city quarter is that\</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>XVM</td>
<td>(...) m::: (...) that's around the Fons area_ {{Fondo, barri de Santa Coloma}}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>XVM</td>
<td>but there's another quarter\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZMR</td>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>hey_ in Castilian_ we're among friends\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>Erl_ [{(F) Erl in Castilian}] {{strong but not aggressive}}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBG</td>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>[in Castilian]\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERL</td>
<td>EBG ZMR</td>
<td>oh well\ er: [do I speak xXXxs]\</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now that an agreement favourable for the girls had been reached, they were not going to let it be ruined by their mate, so they all jumped on her to impose their choice. And they gave her a definite argument: they found themselves among friends, not in class, and therefore Castilian was the only adequate choice. So used, the argument was striking and fundamentally deceptive: the researcher was transformed into a friend (amigos, in masculine refers to either male or to both sexes; cf. amigas, "exclusively female friends") and the interaction stoped being an interview and became a chat. But these words should not be taken litteraly: the interview structure was never challenged, and Xvm was never required to speak Castilian "as a friend". Zmr was appealing to peer solidarity to transform the potentially dangerous interaction into a more comfortable one.

Feeling at odds with the choice of Castilian to speak with Xvm, Erl persisted in speaking Catalan to him. Again, her class-mates commanded her explicitly to speak Castilian. Erl hesitated and finally gave in: under the pressure of her class-mates, and nervously giggling, she accepted to speak Castilian to the researcher. She still delayed the resumption of her explanation, which was used by her peers to recriminate her attitude: at the end of the day, although they were aware that this was a marked behaviour, they were not asking for an extraordinary effort, they argued. She still made a mistake, confirming that Castilian would not
be her spontaneous choice here: she turned to Catalan after Xvm's words, which aroused laughter from her class-mates. But now, she had already made her mind up, and continued in Castilian to the end of the interview.

(107)  Imposing Castilian to ERL.
ERL  XVM  [a Guadalajara\]
ERL  XVM  està a Guadalajara\  
ZMR  XVM  a Guadalajara\  
EBG  ERL  [{(P) habla en [castellano\]}]
SFB  ERL  [muy bien\]
XVM  ERL  i què fas a: a Guadalajara\ a O- Orea\  
XVM  ERL  (..) Orea\  
EBG  ERL  {[}\  
SFB  ERL  [{(P) en [castellano\]}]
NAK  [xXXx]\  
ERL  DIV  [{(P) bue:no_ en castellano\}]
ZMR  ERL  oy_:  
EBG  ERL  tampoco [es para tanto]\  
MAP  [xXXx]\  
EBG  ERL  harla ya\  
Dlv  @@ @  [@@@]  
XVM  DIV  [deixeus-la\]  
XVM  DIV  pobra nena_ que digui lo que vulgui\]  
ERL  XVM  vaig al_:  
ERL  XVM  voy al: bosque_  
NAK  [(@)(PP) xXXx]\  
ERL  DIV  qué pasa/  
DIV  ERL  [{(P) nada:_ xXXx}\]  
XVM  ERL  va continua\  
SFB  ERL  no pasa nada\  
SFB  ERL  na(da) más que estás tardando un poquito\  
EBG  @@ @  
XVM  èh:/  
ERL  XVM  [{(P) y juego por ah\}]  
ERL  XVM  [in Guadalajara]\  
ERL  XVM  it's in Guadalajara\  
ZMR  XVM  in Guadalajara\  
EBG  ERL  [{(P) speak in [Castilian_]\}]
SFB  ERL  [very well\]
XVM  ERL  and what do you do in in: Guadalajara\ in O- Orea\  
XVM  ERL  (...) Orea\  
ERL  XVM  (...) well: m:_.  
EBG  ERL  [{(P) in Castilian}\]  
SFB  ERL  [{(P) in [Castilian\]}]  
NAK  [xXXx]\  
ERL  DIV  [{(P) well:_ in Castilian\}]
ZMR  ERL  oy_:  
EBG  ERL  it's not as [bad as all that]\  
MAP  [xXXx]\  
MAP  ERL  speak\  
DIV  @@ @  [@@@]  
XVM  DIV  [leave her\]  
XVM  DIV  poor girl_ let her say what she wants\]  
ERL  ERL  I go to_  
ERL  XVM  I go to the: forest_  
NAK  [(@)(PP) xXXx]\  
ERL  DIV  what's wrong/  
DIV  ERL  [{(P) nothing:_ xXXx}\]  
XVM  ERL  go ahead\  
SFB  ERL  there's nothing wrong\  
SFB  ERL  it's just that it's taking you too long\
In this situation of norm competition, several options were available to the subjects. All options implied winners and losers: the Catalan preeminence norm would have led to a situation in which some peers (Map, at least) would not have the same possibilities to intervene and express themselves freely, and meant a lack of peer solidarity. The Catalan subordination norm, on the other hand, meant breaking the most sacred school norm: teachers have to be addressed in Catalan. It entailed other practical inconveniences, such as the need to repress spontaneous convergence towards Catalan by Catalan proficient subjects who had made the latter their unmarked language of communication with Xvm. The interview with the girls represented the imposition of the out-of-school version of the Catalan subordination norm against the unmarked languages of communication of several girls -Ebg, Erl, Sfb- with Xvm. Peer pressure and group solidarity imposed the norm which offered more benefits for the group as a whole against the subjects' individual options to choose in favour of their personal interests. Inclination to converge towards Catalan had to be repressed once again by the most bilingualised subjects. The successive switches to Catalan and the overt, explicit peer pressure to speak Castilian witness that non-convergence was not an easy task.

III Applying the school version of the Catalan subordination norm: interviews with male subjects and with the mixed groups

The subjects selected for the two interviews with male subjects (text j: fifth-graders; z: male eighth-graders) and with the mixed group (w: eighth-graders) did not form dense networks. They all came from the same classes and therefore knew each other, but were not united by strong, multiplex links as in the previous case, and lacked the strength to impose norms of behaviour on each other which the girls' group enjoyed.

As a whole, the norm basically applied by the subjects during the interview was that of Catalan subordination as it operates at the school, i.e., with Catalan as the unmarked choice with teachers and monitors and some limited choice transgression of the unmarked choices for rhetorical purposes. As discussed in the previous sections, two main causes can be singled out which account for most code-switching patterns: first, there were the traditional and the new stylistic uses of code-switching described in the previous sections; second, the subjects' deficiencies in competence.

All subjects seemed to switch irrespective of their linguistic backgrounds. Nevertheless, a subtle difference seemed to differentiate some Castilian speakers from the rest of their classmates on this issue. Indeed, several Castilian-speakers gave evidence of their lack of control of switching patterns, and they ran once and again into trouble when trying to alternate for stylistic purposes. In the following example, Xms seems unable to locate the right discoursive points where he should be adopting a second voice (see *), and appears unable to switch
between Catalan and Castilian when alternating between the narrator's voice to that of a gang member.

(108) Explaining how the subjects are accosted by gang-members.

Jeo, the other Castilian speaking fifth-grader interviewed, ran into the same trouble when trying to code-switch for quotation purposes. Note for instance how Jeo is unable to switch back to Catalan after his alternation.

(109) Explaining how Jeo found a partner to help him with a class homework.
Only after several seconds does he realise that he should have switched back and attempts to do so with bad results "y como: la Montse: (...) siempre: li fa: bone(s') notes a l'Amp."

The verb fer "to do, to make" is obviously not adequate here, but Jeo's limited control of Catalan and code-switching strategies prevents him from achieving more elaborate products.

Conversely, Catalan and bilingual speakers switched with much higher precision between both languages according to the voice and addressee. Note for instance how Jbc manages to alternate between Catalan and Castilian in the expected slots:
Talking about video tapes.

At least two alternative explanations may be used here to explain these data. On one hand, it could be suggested that Castilian speakers do not code-switch according as Catalan speakers because bilingualized Castilian speakers would be developing their own autonomous patterns of language alternation. This hypothesis would be supported by the fact that, indeed, structural and discourse differences can be detected among both code-switching patterns (cf. also section 6.6.3); the hypothesis of an autonomous code-switching pattern should describe it in terms of discourse, conversational or other principle, and it should explain why it seems to affect predominantly Castilian speakers’ weakest language (i.e., Catalan) and not their first language.

The other hypothesis is much simpler: it may be argued that Castilian speakers are not developing new code-switching patterns, but rather adopting those already available for them; nevertheless, their lack of actual practice in speaking Catalan—remember that they only use it with teachers and monitors—hinders Castilian speakers’ efforts to code-switch adequately.
Thus, as was the case with Poplack’s Puerto-Ricans, it is the most competent bilingual speakers - those who use both languages on a regular basis - the ones who learn and use the particular code-switching grammar in use in the community. Castilian speakers, when confronted with the need to alternate between both codes, find it at odds and rarely succeed.

Two points were especially significant in perceiving norm management: (a) the language used with the researcher, and (b) the language used with peers. The first one signals the limit between the two versions of the Catalan subordination norm, while the second establishes the difference between this norm and the Catalan preeminence norm.

a. Language use with the researcher: As expected from the individual linguistic behaviour of the subjects with the researcher, Catalan was the language most usually employed to speak to him during the interviews. Nevertheless, use of Castilian was not totally absent, especially during the most noisy and informal passages. It comes as no surprise then that Castilian was used from time to time to signal the breaking away of the school constraints, especially when referring to sex, boy-friends and girlfriends, etc.

(111) Talking about the reasons why Jbc could not go on a trip with his class-mates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JBC</th>
<th>XVM</th>
<th>xx cosa\</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XVM</td>
<td>JBC</td>
<td>(...) totes elles_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBC</td>
<td>XVM</td>
<td>no_ no se\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>XVM</td>
<td>por follar\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>[ @@ @ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JBC</th>
<th>XVM</th>
<th>xx thing\</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XVM</td>
<td>JBC</td>
<td>(...) all of them_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBC</td>
<td>XVM</td>
<td>I don’t_ I don’t know\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>XVM</td>
<td>because of fucking\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>[ @@ @ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Switches could prolong themselves for a longer while when the interview structure was in any way violated by the subjects’ behaviour.

(112) Telling a joke

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICE</th>
<th>XVM</th>
<th>Xvm Xvm_ (...) saps quina és el la beguda més afrodissiaca_</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XVM</td>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>no\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>@ @ @\</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>XVM</td>
<td>l’ai- l’aigua calenta\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>XVM</td>
<td>después et [dirà per què]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>XVM</td>
<td>[per- perquè] (...) abre almejas y pone lo(s’) huevos(s’) duros\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGG</td>
<td></td>
<td>oy Dios mío de mi vida\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>(...) està gravat\</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>s(e) ha grabat(d)io bien_ no/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>porque si no lo repito\</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>[ @@ @ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>[ lo repito_</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>yo lo repito\</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>@ @ @</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBR</td>
<td>XVM</td>
<td>{(@) se ha queda(d)io contigo tío}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>@ @ @</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICE</th>
<th>XVM</th>
<th>Xvm Xvm_ (...) do you know the most aphrodisiac beverage_</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XVM</td>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>no\</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use of Castilian admits a double interpretation: on the one hand, it could be seen as the application of the standard version of the Catalan subordination norm; in such a case, Castilian would be seen as the unmarked language for this purpose and would therefore not be connected to any special values. On the other hand, use of Castilian with the researcher may be regarded as the transgression of the school version of the Catalan subordination norm. In this case, the unmarked behaviour would be that of using Catalan with him -identified as a member of the school- and switching to Castilian would be the marked behaviour.

As a whole, though, use of Castilian with the interlocutor remained a marked exception, as proved by the discussion about language choice during the interview of the male fifth-graders. One of the two Castilian speakers, namely Jeo, addressed Xvm in Castilian without any structured discourse motivation once again, probably due to his limited competence in Catalan. This behaviour contrasted with that of the other interviewees, who made predominant use of Catalan for this function in spite of their using Castilian to address each other. At a given point, Dev required Jeo to speak Catalan with a simple argument: the interaction was a "class of Catalan language arts". In a cool, almost indifferent tone, his petition was more of a reminder than a command. He was immediately contradicted by Xms: the interaction was not a class of Catalan language arts, but rather... a class of Castilian language. Strikingly enough, Xms, a Castilian dominant subject, made the comment in Catalan.

(113) Reproaching undue use of Castilian.

XMS  DCV  (..) {(@) anda_ io también le conozco}
XVM  JEO  (..) i tu_ Jordi/
JEO  XVM  mi madre es de Campillo de Arena(s')
XVM  JEO  (..) Campillo de Arenas'
XVM  JEO  (..) i eh_ a Granada
JEO  XVM  no_ Jaén
XVM  JEO  Jaén
XVM  JEO  (..) casi_
JEO  XVM  {(@) te hemos pillado_}
XVM  JEO  [home_ io no conec_]
JEO  XVM  [mi padre_] (..) [2 es de [Santa Coloma de Gramenet]}
DCV  JEO  [2 Jordi_es parla en catala}

^73^Castilian image for "cunt".

^74^Cast. huevo duro = "boiled egg", litterally "hard egg". Egg is the Cast. equivalent for "balls".
DCV  JEO  és una classe de català \_
XMS  DCV  (...) no\è és de ca(s')tellà xx 
XVM  DIV  (...) aquí\è aquí no és una classe\ 
XVM  DIV  aquí podeu parlar com vulgueu\ 
XMS  {(F) ((emet s\i.labes sense sentit))} 
DIV  {(F) ((emeten s\i.labes sense sentit))} 
NKU  {(F) hol\à soy italiano\} 
XMS  {(F) ((emet s\i.labes sense sentit))} 
XVM  XMS  Xaví\_
XVM  XMS  (...) apago\_
XVM  JEO  (...) m'estaves explicant d'ont és la te(v)ja família\ 
XMS  XVM  el seu pare és de: Santa Coloma\_
XMS  XVM  i la seva mare és de Jaén\ 
XVM  XMS  no\ 
XVM  XMS  {(F) ell} m'estava explicant d'on és la se(v)ja família\ 
XMS  XVM  (...) {(P) ah sí!}
JEO  XVM  eh:\ mi madre es de Campillo de Arena(s')\_
JEO  XVM  y: mi padre es de Santa Rosa\ 
XMS  DCV  (...) {(@) oh_ I know him as well\} 
XVM  JEO  (...) what about you/ Jeo/ 
JEO  XVM  my mother is from Campillo de Arena(s')\ 
XVM  JEO  (...) Campillo de Arenats'\ 
XVM  JEO  (...) and er: in Granada\ 
JEO  XVM  no\_ Jaén\ 
XVM  JEO  Jaén\ 
JEO  XVM  (...) almost_ 
JEO  XVM  {(@) we caught you: _} 
XVM  JEO  [well_ I don't know it_] 
JEO  XVM  [my father\_] (...) [2 is from [Santa Coloma de Gramenet]\ 
DCV  JEO  [2 Jordi\_ we speak in Catalan\ 
DCV  JEO  this is a Catalan language class\_ 
XMS  DCV  (...) no\è it's a Castilian xx\ 
XVM  DIV  (...) this_ this is no class\ 
XVM  DIV  you can speak as you like\ 
XMS  {(F) ((syllables without meaning))} 
DIV  {(F) ((syllables without meaning))} 
NKU  {(F) hello\è I'm Italiani\} ((sic)) 
XMS  {(F) ((syllables without meaning))} 
XVM  XMS  Xms\_
XVM  XMS  (...) I switch it off_ 
XVM  JEO  (...) you were telling me where your family comes from\ 
XMS  XVM  his father is from: Santa Coloma\_
XMS  XVM  and his mother is from Jaén\ 
XVM  XMS  no\ 
XVM  XMS  {(F) he} was telling me where his family is from\ 
XMS  XVM  (...) {(P) oh yes!} 
JEO  XVM  hey: my mother is from Campillo de Arena(s')\_
JEO  XVM  and my father is Santa Rosa\ 
(§ 2286)

As in the previous interview, the attempt to impose a given language choice makes use of arguments which are at least partially misleading: contrary to what his words let understand, Dcv’s comment was not actually reproaching Jeo’s use of Castilian, but his inadequate use of Castilian with the researcher, i.e., his breaking of the school version of the Catalan subordination norm. As a matter of fact, Dcv and Xms spoke Castilian to each other and to Jeo non-stop during the interview, notwithstanding it being "a class of Catalan language".

b. The language used with peers: Catalan preeminence norm intrusions. The school version of the Catalan subordination norm was undoubtedly applied in these interviews. The
presence of Castilian as the language of interaction was so important that even an example was recorded of the brief violation of the ingroup use of Catalan. Conversely, occasional choice transgressions were detected in which some subjects used Catalan to address their peers in front of the researcher even against their customary language; nevertheless, these cases were quickly rectified.

(114) Talking about the bus.

XVM JBC ah bueno [si:_]
JBC XVM [i moltes] vegades quan esté a Caldes agafa l’autobús, vinque aquí i puc fer lo que vulgu
MCG JBC ah_o sigui a veure quan quedem i ens (en) anem pa(ra) allà els dos
JBC MCG sí_ @@@
MCG JBC ? tu autocar es el: trece _ a que sí/
JBC MCG ? xxx\ MCG JBC de Fabra i Puig\ MCG JBC el: de que va: a_
JBC MCG sí\ MCG JBC el que va xxx\ MCG JBC sí_ es la parada trece\ MCG JBC el trece\ MCG JBC el mio es el catorce\ JBC MCG io (o) agafa el treze\ JBC MCG bueno _ la parada és [el treze]\ MCG JBC que va el treze\ MCG JBC la parada trece\ MCG JBC io vaig {(AC) a la catorze\ MCG JBC nò: el trece es el que pasan más\ XVM ARC i tu Toni_
ARC XVM io què/

XVM JBC ah all right [if:_]
JBC XVM [and very] often when I’m in Caldes when I’m in Caldes I take the bus _ come here_ and I can do whatever I want\ MCG JBC ah _ so _ we should make an appointment and go there together_
JBC MCG : yes_ @@@
MCG JBC ? your bus is number thirteen_ isn’t it/
JBC MCG? xxx\ MCG JBC from Fabra i Puig ((place))
MCG JBC the: one which goes : to_
JBC MCG yes\ MCG JBC the one which goes xxx\ JBC MCG yes_ it’s the stop number thirteen\ MCG JBC thirteen\ MCG JBC mine is number fourteen\ JBC MCG I take number thirteen\ JBC MCG well_ the stop number is [thirteen]\ MCG JBC the one at which number thirteen goes\ MCG JBC stop number thirteen\ MCG JBC I go {(AC) to number fourteen}\ JBC MCG nò: number thirteen is the one by which more busses pass\ XVM ARC and what about you Arc_
ARC XVM I what/
(z 6287)

No clear discourse-related reasons seem available for the successive switches. The switches to Castilian may be explained as produced by the pressure of the dyadic unmarked language, while the switches to Catalan could be regarded as the attempt to redirect the conversation to the researcher’s field.
The phenomenon of Castilian-speaking dyads briefly using Catalan was more frequent in the mixed group interview. These switches to Catalan can be regarded under different lights: first, they can be regarded as the intrusion of the Catalan preeminence norm, i.e., as the maximal acceptance of the school’s, or the interviewer’s, normative system. This was especially the case when the subjects took the responsibility to make the interview progress by asking each other questions as if adopting the interviewer’s role. On the other hand, switching to Catalan for peer-communication was often seen as a mockery and therefore felt inadequate by the majority of subjects, who usually refused by switching back to Castilian. In the last case, the switching to Catalan was reinforcing the feeling that the subjects were making fun of him, and therefore his angry reaction.

IV The application of the Catalan predominance norm: eighth-grade female subjects

The female eighth-graders interviewed did not form a specially cohesive group. Two of them (Esg and Mpm) were extremely shy and seldom uttered a word, while the other two subjects were more talkative and tended to monopolize the conversation. From the interviewer’s point, this was probably the most laborious conversation, for the subjects hardly took the initiative of intervening, limited their roles to that of answering questions, and let the interaction rest upon the researcher’s script. As a consequence of the highly interviewer-centred speech, little peer-conversation was produced. In fact, the subjects collaborated with each other to produce the answers to the questions and often connected their short answers, but they took little initiative, as the following excerpt shows. From a linguistic point of view, Catalan clearly dominated the whole interview, with Castilian reaching a strikingly modest place. Not only did the subjects use Catalan systematically to address the interviewer. The subjects applied the Catalan preeminence norm, i.e., they used Catalan to address each other as well. See for instance how Esg and Acb interact in Catalan with each other.

(115) Speaking about Esg’s brother.
ACB   XVM   ["fa efe-pe"]
Esg   XVM   fa primer de efe-pe
ACB   Esg   i aprova/
Esg   Acb   {(@) home: normal}
Esg   Acb   alguna

ACB   XVM   [he studies vocational training]
Esg   XVM   first grade of vocational training
ACB   Esg   and does he pass/
Esg   Acb   {(@) well: regular}
Esg   Acb   some subject matters
(y 3317)

It is not just Acb who applies the Catalan preeminence norm. All the subjects seem to coincide to a certain extent in this practice; even the two Castilian-speaking subjects interact in Catalan.

(116) Talking about the subjects’ kindergarten.
Mpm   XVM   a: @@ {(@) pe quatre no me’n recordo bé on era: _}
Mpm   XVM   era pagat.
The application of the Catalan preeminence norm led some subjects even to self-correction when they realized they had relapsed into Castilian, their habitual unmarked language. Note how Acb reformulates her words in the last line in the following excerpt:

(117) Talking about swimming.

XVM DIV sí
ACB XVM [sí]
GBG XVM [m’agradaria] anar a nedar o:
XVM GBG t’agradaria anar a nedar,
ACB XVM [a la platja]
GBG XVM [pero a la;]
GBG XVM o anar a la platja
ACB GBG {(!??) pues el año pasado no xx -ras_ no hi eres_} 

XVM DIV yes
ACB XVM [yes]
GBG XVM [I would like to] go swimming or:
XVM GBG you would like to go swimming_
ACB XVM [to the beach]
GBG XVM [but to the:]
GBG XVM or going to the beach
ACB GBG {(!??) but last year you -re not xx_ you were not there_}

Of course, the girls kept switching for a number of functions, such as translation for better understanding and rhetoric uses of code-switching, such as quotations:

(118) Retelling a conversation

GBG XVM i si sXXx @ @ @
ACB XVM sXXx ens posem al mig a mirar_
ACB XVM i llavors la la la dona una [vella]
GBG XVM [una senyora] comença_
ACB XVM i em diu_
ACB XVM eh tú_ niña_ a qué esperas_
ACB XVM y yo dije_
ACB XVM a mi amiga Manuela\
ACB XVM dice_
ACB XVM que te duele la muela_
ACB XVM digo_
ACB XVM no\’xx idiota_
ACB XVM a mi amiga Manuela\
ACB XVM y va y dice_
ACB XVM i llavors la dona_
GBG XVM i va començar_

75Kindergarten, four year old children.
GBG XVM que habéi(s’) fuma(d)ø do(s’) porros o qué_ que miráis tanto_
GBG XVM i així êh_
GBG XVM i nosaltres_
GBG XVM {(EV) te los habrás fuma(d)ø tú_}
GBG XVM no sé qué\}
ACB XVM y diciéndome_
ACB XVM guarra_
ACB XVM qué hija puta_ i tof\ @@_
GBG XVM {(EV) te los habrás fuma(d)ø tú_
ACB XVM no sé qué
GBG XVM y diciéndome_
ACB XVM guarra_
ACB XVM que hija puta_ i tof\ @@_
GBG XVM {(EV) te los habrás fuma(d)ø tú_}
ACB XVM no sé qué
GBG XVM and if xXx x@ xXx
ACB XVM xXx and we go there and watch_
ACB XVM and then the the woman_ an [old woman]
GBG XVM [a lady] starts_
ACB XVM and tells me_
ACB XVM hey you_ girl_ what are you waiting for_
ACB XVM and I told her_
ACB XVM my friend Manuela\ 
ACB XVM she says_
ACB XVM does your hurt_
ACB XVM I say_
ACB XVM no\ xx idiot_
ACB XVM my friend Manuela\ 
ACB XVM and she goes and says_
ACB XVM and then the woman_ 
GBG XVM and she sarted_
GBG XVM have you been smoking joints_ or why are you watching_ 
GBG XVM and so on_ you know_
GBG XVM and we_
GBG XVM {(EV) it's you who must have smoked them_
GBG XVM I so on\} 
ACB XVM and she told me_
ACB XVM pig_
ACB XVM what a bitch_ and all that\ @@
GBG XVM {(EV) la senyora xXx}\ 
(4867)

Notice that the Acb, a Castilian speaker, shows the same inability at switching according to change of voice noted for other Castilian-speakers. Acb does not switch following the purported speaker, for once she has switched to Castilian she keeps speaking that language in spite of the multiple narrator's interventions: y yo dije... dice... digo... va y dice... Contrary to her, Gbg (bilingual) seems more capable of alternating according to speaker.

Despite the clear dominance of Catalan, the girls' usual unmarked language of communication popped up from time to time. In a short number of cases, tension between both norms provoked rapid switching between both languages:

(119) The tape recorder.
 ACB XVM xXx quan io el portava ia ho sabia_
 XVM ACB no no p(e)rò_
 Gbg XVM p(e)rò quan io ho portava també_
 ACB XVM ho sabia\ 
 Gbg es que esta se entera de todo\ 
 ACB Gbg clar:: es que yo soy cotilla\ 
 ACB XVM xXx when I carried it I already knew it_
 XVM ACB no no but_
 Gbg XVM but when I carried it as well_
 ACB XVM I knew it\ 
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As a whole, the interview with female eighth-graders was interpreted by the subjects as requiring Catalan as the general unmarked language, that is, they adapted their behaviour to the Catalan preeminence norm. The subjects understood the interview as a researcher-centred speech event and therefore seem to have assimilated it to a class more than to free interaction. It should be borne in mind that Esg and Gbg formed one of the switching dyads and were therefore used to switching languages for their particular needs.

V Interviews: a global interpretation

The five interviews offer an excellent sample of language norm management with different results. Leaving aside interview y, no significant difference has been traced in the formality or spontaneity between the interviews. Yet, the subjects decided not to apply the same norms to the interaction.

The bulk of subjects understood that Catalan was the language to be used with the researcher, and therefore attributed to Castilian the role of marked code for those purposes. Some Castilian speakers fell short in applying this rule, due to their lack of linguistic abilities and were reminded by their class-mates of the need to use Catalan for this purpose (Jeo in the male fifth-graders' interview). In the female fifth-graders' interview, though, these subjects found their mates' support to challenge the school-instilled norm of converging to Catalan, and succeeded in imposing a norm more favourable to their own linguistic capacities. In this second case, Castilian became the girls' unmarked language during the interview, and Catalan the exceptional, marked code.

Most subjects did not find it necessary to modify their customary unmarked language of communication with their peers. Therefore, Catalan was maintained in those dyads who usually spoke it, and Castilian remained the majority language of peer-interaction. Only the girls interviewed in text y judged it necessary to adopt Catalan for these purposes as well and attributed to Castilian a more marginal role. Globally speaking, thus, most subjects' behaviour fits with the normative set which I have synthesised as the 'school version of the Catalan subordination norm': the standard Catalan subordination norm plus the need to speak Catalan to school staff and related personnel.

These recordings witness some of the dangers group interviews may entail for accessing 'spontaneous' language norms: group interviews seem to allow for some degree of peer pressure, to the extent that participants in the interview may see their spontaneous behaviour modified for the sake of group coherence. Thus, Erl was forced to speak Castilian with the researcher against her will. Conversely, group interview veiled the actual nature of personal relationships between female eighth-graders, for it hid the fact that Castilian was their customary unmarked language in most cases. Even during the other interviews, some switches
to Catalan had to be understood as the researchers’ pressure on customary unmarked language.

A significant finding which reminds of other international situations is that of Castilian speakers’ apparent inability to switch languages with the same accuracy as their Catalan and bilingual peers. Rapid, appropriate intersentential code-switching probably demands a level of competence and practice which is so far not possessed by these subjects. I will come back to this issue in chapter 6.
5.3 Synthesis: norms of language choice and code-switching

The combined application of quantitative and qualitative analyses of code-switching and language choice has led us to describe the norms governing these phenomena in the school researched. The unmarked language of interaction for a considerable number of dyads has been identified, and the major influences of personal and situational constraints on the subjects reviewed. Transgressions of the established norms have also been analysed.

As a result of this analysis, it has been proposed that language choice and switching among the subjects are basically governed by two factors, speaker and addressee, with a third one, domain, playing a secondary role. The different patterns of language use have been synthesised in a relatively new linguistic norm: the 'school version of the Catalan subordination norm'. This language use norm retains most of the traditional Catalan subordination norm characteristics in that it requires that dyads have an unmarked language of interaction chosen on the basis of the speakers' linguistic group: Catalan for dyads formed by Catalan speakers including most bilinguals, Castilian for all the others. Nevertheless, this new version includes a modification which sets it apart from the traditional Catalan subordination norm: due to the pressure exerted by school, the norm requires children to speak Catalan with teachers, irrespective of the children's first language.

The transformation of the traditional Catalan subordination norm does not represent a noticeable change for most Catalan speakers, since the normative basis supporting the latter remains unchanged. Indeed, the "one person - one language" principle and the reluctance towards intrasentential code-switching and language mixing in general persist intact. Castilian speakers, on the other hand, see how their position in the norms game is slightly modified, for now they are compelled to speak Catalan, something they were not expected to do under the previous norms. Nevertheless, this modification only affects a single category of addressees, that of teachers, i.e., a small number of adults with higher status and direct power over them.

The inclusion of such an 'exception clause' in the normative system constitutes a significant but not radical departure from the traditional norms. Indeed, as schools like the one researched here spread, from now on Castilian speakers will be expected to be able not only to understand Catalan but also to speak it. This new bilingual ability may facilitate some increase in the discourse-related exploitation of transcodic markers in general. Some examples of this have already been analysed in the text. It will also permit Castilian speakers to actively use Catalan when they feel the need to, and will facilitate Catalan speakers who so desire to avoid converging towards Castilian. In fact, some instances of switching to Catalan in otherwise Castilian interactions has been detected. Nevertheless, Castilian speakers' ability to code-switch seems to lag behind that of their Catalan-speaking counterparts, and at least some of them seem to lack the necessary skill to use it adequately for the functions it serves in this context.
The bulk of the normative building remains ahead, and seems difficult to transform from the school. Reluctance against language mixing probably favours that Catalan speakers keep converging towards Castilian, for their competence in this language continues to be uniformly higher than that of Castilian speakers in Catalan. Only in one case, that of Jcv, did we encounter a consistent exception to this behaviour in that he seemed to apply the school-proposed Catalan preeminence norm, which confirms the school's beneficial influence in enlarging the margins of manoeuvre for bilingual interaction.

From a more theoretical perspective, we have seen that conversational code-switching non related to social (i.e. language group) or individual (i.e. ability-related) characteristics remains weakly exploited by these subjects. As a consequence, code-switching analysis has to rely more on extra-conversational characteristics (e.g. who is speaking to whom) rather than on purely sequential analysis.
6. Data analysis: structural perspectives on transcodic markers
In chapter 5, I have reviewed the quantitative and qualitative aspects of transcodic markers, focusing on language choice and code-switching, from a social and interactional perspective. Results confirm that norms of language use have not been significantly transformed by the school action, thus supporting my initial hypothesis that school action has a limited reach on language use.

It is now time to discuss the most relevant language contact phenomena in the speech of our subjects from a structural point of view in order to check whether these remain similar to those usually found in Catalan and Castilian as spoken in Catalonia, or rather experience transformations due to the school system. The main questions underlying this section can be synthesised in the following terms: are the subjects' Catalan and Castilian varieties significantly different in structural terms from those used by the mainstream society? To what extent can signs be detected that the subjects' Catalan and Castilian are being modified by the use of Catalan as the main language of instruction?

To answer these questions, the chapter will first consider the difficulties in classifying language contact phenomena in a situation of linguistic proximity and widespread bilingualism. It will be suggested that in the case of Catalan and Castilian, the prescriptive norms for each standard language can function only as a baseline, and that supplementary criteria are needed when dealing with everyday, spoken language. Some of these criteria (frequency of appearance, integration into the recipient language) will be explored, with special attention to lexical issues. The hypothesis of a borrowing-switching continuum will be tested with the material from the corpus. Only then will we be in conditions to analyse the contact phenomena present in the corpus, first in general terms, and second in relation with the subjects' social variable.

Two main aspects have been selected for language contact analysis: lexical and grammatical (both morphological and syntactic) features in Catalan and Castilian. Due to recording conditions and material possibilities, language contact phenomena on phonetic and phonological aspects have not been systematically considered but only as far as they influenced the two other linguistic levels analysed here.
6.1 Normative¹ language and the notion of transcodic markers

6.1.1 Normative language as a baseline for the analysis of language contact

It is probably a universal that all languages have incorporated features from other languages at one time or another. Some of these features have become so deeply embedded in the recipient language that only highly specialised etymological studies may unveil their former alien origin. According to a lax interpretation of the term ‘transcodic markers’ (see chapter 2), these features should be included among the items that suggest the meeting of two or more linguistic systems. Such a perspective may be productive when dealing with small samples of speech from a qualitative perspective, since highly elaborated analysis may be provided for each independent transcodic item; but a quantitative analysis requires more comprehensive categories. It would be simply counterproductive to jumble together all sorts of transcodic markers irrespective of their (dis)similarities, for such an option would mask internal dynamics by confusing present and past trends.

In fact, Lüdi (1987) himself warns that the label ‘transcodic markers’ constitutes an etic concept which has to be applied on a continuum going from the most integrated items to the most unintegrated ones. Based on objective criteria (e.g. standard dictionaries, frequency of appearance, etc.) the researcher is expected to draw an imaginary border between ‘transcodic markers’ and former transcodic markers which have become fully integrated and are no longer to be regarded as foreign. The problem is where to establish such a limit and what arguments are to be used for its justification.

6.1.2 Operationalizing normative language

Normative acceptance does not guarantee either full integration or even loss of conscience that an item is foreign⁷⁷. Nevertheless, it may be wise for practical reasons, to take normative acceptance as a baseline for rejecting the most widespread and established transcodic markers.

---

⁷⁶ English-speaking readers may feel puzzled by the use of ‘normative’ in this chapter in contexts where they might have expected ‘standard’. This lexical choice derives from the existence of two prescriptive institutions, namely the Institut d’Estudis Catalans and the Real Academia Española, charged with setting the official linguistic norms. Catalan linguistics has established a clear distinction between ‘normative language’, i.e., that which is explicitly accepted by the officially sanctioned dictionary and grammar, and ‘standard language’, i.e., the language variety used on formal occasions and settings such as education or mass media. In spite of the obvious overlap between both, significant differences exist: ‘normative language’ includes many archaisms, regionalisms, technicisms, and other that are not used by the standard variety, while this often incorporates a number of lexical and morphosyntactic features, and, among them, a number of transcodic markers not yet officially accepted. The same applies to Castilian. In this chapter, I will retain this distinction.

⁷⁷ An example: normative acceptance of musical terms such as piano, forte, allegro, etc., in Catalan has probably not altered their being regarded as foreign; in fact, they keep their original Italian pronunciation. See, for instance, the opposition between adv. piano [pjano] and noun piano [pjana].
Thus, in the present research transcodic markers accepted by the normative systems (prescriptive grammars and dictionaries) have not been included in the analyses, irrespective of their degree of phonological or even morphosyntactic integration. The adoption of a normative perspective for an initial analysis of language contact phenomena seems coherent with the official purpose of schools as standard language dispensers.

The actual operationalization of this criterion is not without difficulties. It is not self-evident whether a number of features should be regarded as normative and therefore excluded from the analysis or not. In fact, what 'normative' exactly means is not always clearcut (cf. Solà, 1994: 7-17 for Catalan). In the case of Catalan, the institution officially charged with language prescriptive tasks is the Institut d'Estudis Catalans. The Catalan normative corpus is made up of a normative grammar (Fabra, 1918/33), and dictionary (Fabra, 1932), which has been recently updated (Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 1995). The Institut has also produced several guides regarding standard phonology (Secció Filològica de l'Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 1990) and morphology (Secció Filològica de l'Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 1992). Catalan enjoys a remarkable tradition of (para-)normative treaties discussing the genuineness of contact phenomena and the pertinence of their acceptance into Catalan.

While there exists a wealth of descriptive research on Castilian, prescriptive work has been more restricted, probably due to the fact that Castilian is clearly established (in Lamuela's (1994) sense) and not threatened by another code. Therefore Castilian speakers can rely on customary social use, and prescriptive institutions accomplish a role which is more symbolic than practical. The Real Academia Española's official dictionary is thus clearly insufficient for our purposes here, and has been complemented by two other dictionaries, Moliner (1966) and Alvar (dir)(1987), which enjoy a high, quasi-normative prestige in the Spanish-speaking world. Regarding grammatical aspects, Alarcos (1994) was used as a para-normative grammar for Castilian.

6.1.3 Convergence and genuineness

One of the main problems produced by the adoption of a prescriptive baseline for the analysis of transcodic markers is that of convergence. In language contact contexts, it is not at all unusual that a feature in language A cannot be undisputedly attributed either to internal trends or to convergence (Appel and Muysken, 1987: 154) or confluence (Payrató, 1985a: 91) towards another language. In Catalan, this situation has often led to discussions regarding whether a particular lexical, syntactic, etc., feature is to be attributed to (Castilian-)induced language change rather than to natural change -i.e., not externally triggered- (Argente, 1991: 83). Given the prejudices against language contact phenomena usually held by Catalan and Castilian prescritivists, the opposition is significant in establishing language norms. Quite often polemics remain unsolved, and contradictory views are expressed by prescriptive scholars.

The (alleged) decrease in the use of purer vocabulary in Catalan provides an example of this situation. The appendix Genuïnitat i tipisme in Ruaix (1993b: 139) points to this elusive form
of cross-linguistic influence:

"pila de mots i expressions ben genuïns i típics que contribueixen a crear la fisomia d'una llengua. (...) els quals, massa sovint, hom oblida en benefici d'uns altres que, tot i ésser admesos, tendeixen a ésser emprats en exclusivitat, gairebé sempre pel fet que s'assemblen més als corresponents al castellà." “a heap of [Catalan] very genuine and typical words and expressions which contribute to create a language's physiognomy. (...) which are too often forgotten in favour of others which, although accepted by the normative, tend to be used on exclusive terms, practically always due to the fact that they resemble their equivalents in Castilian.” (my emphasis)

Simultaneously, there exist a number of linguistic phenomena which, while not strictly due to language contact in Castilian, are sometimes said to be more frequent in the Catalan Countries due to their coinciding with their Catalan equivalents. For instance, both the periphrasis of obligation se ha(n) de + INF (in front of hay que 'it is necessary that') and the elision of prepositions de, a, con, in contact with conjunction que (ex.: estoy seguro (de) que...'I am sure that...'), may be favoured by the fact that Catalan structures coincide with the first variants (respectively, s'ha de + INF and estic segur que). The (alleged) wider extension of these phenomena in Castilian spoken in the Catalan Countries would be due to the effect of Catalan reinforcement of one of the variants.

The analysis of such forms of cross-linguistic influence is well beyond the possibilities of the present research, since I did not have at my disposal comparable corpora of monolingual speakers to adequately analyse the quantitative significance of convergence. As a practical decision, in cases where no agreement has been arrived at by scholars, the feature has simply not been analysed. Obviously, this is not to say that such appreciations are totally unfounded, but rather to acknowledge that they deserve a particular study which cannot be included here. Two examples of potential convergence may be useful here. The first is furnished by the distribution of verbs ser, estar, haver-hi, in modern Catalan. The distribution of these verbs (covering the semantic field of the English verbs to be, to stand, to lie and related ones) is not at all clear (cf. Solà, 1994: 126ff). On the one hand, dialects do not coincide with each other; normative proposals have often preferred solutions closer to those of conservative dialects, but even here disagreement is not uncommon. On the other hand, the distribution of the Castilian and French equivalent verbs by no means coincides with traditional Catalan usages, and both languages seem to have exerted some pressure, hard to quantify, on the dialects under their respective influence. In Castilian, estar enjoys ampler use than in Catalan, while in French there exists no equivalent for estar. Synthetically, two opposite trends compete nowadays in spoken Catalan: on the one hand, estar is currently invading areas previously reserved to the other verbs; simultaneously, hypercorrection provokes further disadjustments, including the usage of ser for uses traditionally reserved to estar in Catalan. Several proposals have been launched to organize the distribution of these verbs, some more reluctant toward new uses, others more prone to accept them, even if only partially (cf. Solà, op. cit.). Notwithstanding the vast gulf which separates some proposals from others, they share a number of points on which most authors agree. Solà's (op. cit.) proposal constitutes what he himself considers a "proposta de mínims" (Solà, 1994: 137), i.e., a normative proposal identifying a few clearly unacceptable uses and giving ample room for existing variation. In the present research, Solà's proposal was
used as the dividing line between normative use and non-normative use.

A second example of potential convergence between Catalan and Castilian is the article personal. Most dialects of Catalan use particular definite articles (masc.: el, en; fem.: la, na; distribution may vary slightly according to dialects) before person's names, as shown in the examples.

(1) Catalán
Lit. translation
English

l’Albert diu que...
The Albert says that...
Albert says that...

(2) Catalan
Lit. translation
English

la Maria hi anirà
The Mary will go there
Mary will go there

These articles constitute a very widespread, informal phenomenon which creeps into standard language, although they tend to be avoided in formal speech.

The article personal is also frequent in spoken Castilian (cf. Moliner, 1966: "artículo, q"), although it probably does not appear as often as in Catalan; contrary to what happens in this language, these determiners are looked down as extremely vulgar, and heavily marked as non-standard in Castilian.

In my corpus, use of personal articles before proper names is almost categorical in both languages, with only the odd exception. Given the impossibility to ascertain whether this is due to cross-linguistic influence rather than the result of mere coincidence in two closely related languages, this potential language contact feature has not been included in the analysis.

The features most frequent in the Catalan utterances in the corpus which could be attributed to convergence towards Castilian, but which have not been included in the analysis due to disagreement about their actual nature, are the following ones (in the examples, a: the allegedly Castilian-influenced feature; b: the allegedly 'genuine' equivalent; literal English translations below each example)78:

1. Semantic distribution of ser(-hi), estar(-hi/-se), haver-hi and related verbs (see above).

2. Pleonastic use of dative 3rd pronouns:

(3) a: 

(lí diré a la senyoreta que...
I will tell her the teacher that...

b: 

diré a la senyoreta que...
I will tell the teacher that...

3. Continuative periphrasis with the verb seguir + gerund instead of continuar + gerund, lit. 'to

78 Some of the main bibliographic sources used to prepare these sources were Ruaix (1993) and Solà (1994) for Catalan, and Szigetvári (1994) and Blas Arroyo (1992) for Castilian.
On the other hand, the features in the Castilian utterances gathered in the corpus which could be attributed to convergence towards Catalan, but which have not been included in the analysis due to disagreement about their actual nature, are the following ones:

1. Presence vs. absence of personal articles (see above).

2. Impersonal periphrasis of obligation with *haber*: se ha(n) de + INF instead of *hay que*:

   (5)  
   a: se ha de empezar  
   b: hay que empezar

   we have to start

3. Personal periphrasis of obligation with *haber que* vs. *tener que*:

   (6)  
   a: hemos de ir  
   b: tenemos que ir

   we have to go

4. Agreement between *haber, hacer*, and other allegedly impersonal verbs and following noun phrases:

   (7)  
   a: habían muchas cosas  
   lit.: there were many things

   b: había muchas cosas  
   lit.: there was many things

5. Elision of prepositions *a 'to', con 'with', de 'of', en 'in', before conjunction que 'that':

   (8)  
   a: estoy seguro que podemos  
   lit.: I'm sure that we can

   b: estoy seguro de que  
   lit.: I'm sure of that we can

6. Possessive instead of prepositional phrase after preposition:

   (9)  
   a: le dejó detrás suyo  
   b: le dejó detrás de sí

   he left him/her behind himself

7. Postposition of clitic personal pronouns to auxiliary verbs rather than the main verb:

   (10)  
   a: me ha encantado volverse a ver
   b: me ha encantado volver a verte

   I was delighted to see you again

Finally, the exact delimitation of what constitutes a normative item has to face the problem.

79It is discussed whether the noun phrases should be regarded as either direct objects or as subjects.
posed by linguistic items that, on the one hand, are included in the normative corpus, but, on the other hand, are resented by the speech community as strange to one of the languages. This is the case of lexical items such as Cat. terminar 'to finish', Cat. dar 'to give' or Cat. saber a 'to taste of'. Although all are included in the Catalan normative dictionary, they are clearly interpreted by the community as signs of language incompetence and as inadequate borrowings from Cast. terminar, dar, saber a. Given the sociolinguistic circumstances of our subjects, a (short) number of these units were regarded as transcodic markers and counted as calques or borrowings irrespective of their presence in the normative dictionary.

---

80The use of saber a 'to taste like' in an advertisement in the autumn of 1995 provoked a number of newspaper articles blaming the firm responsible for inaccurate language in publicity, until a reader pointed out that this expression was indeed genuine in Catalan, although totally absent from modern standard Catalan in Catalonia. Solà (1996a, b) discusses this issue.
6.2 Classifying lexical transcodic markers

6.2.1 Classification of non-normative transcodic markers

Normatively accepted markers will not be dealt with again in these pages. But normative criteria only set a first limit between a few 'accepted' transcodic markers and the rest of 'non-accepted' phenomena. Non-normative language contact features still include a wide variety of phenomena in what can be seen as the transcodic markers continuum (cf. chapter 2). Language academies always lag behind speakers in their acceptance of incorporations from other languages. Bilingual communities create their particular norms which do not necessarily coincide with those from the monolingual areas. Norms in bilingual communities often include a number of transcodic markers as the usual, unmarked linguistic items, while the genuine alternatives may remain as marked -as formal or foreign to the bilingual community-, or even unknown options. These non-normative transcodic features are often universally practised by native speakers (e.g., in Catalan, non-deletion of prepositions before conjunction que, or use of a neutre article lo instead of the masculine el; loanwords such as bueno, vale, algo) and cannot be regarded as transcodic except in a diachronic perspective.

At the opposite end of the transcodic markers continuum other features remain clearly marked as unacceptable by the community as undue transcodic markers (see the examples subir-se in section 5.2.6.3 or quitar-se in section 6.6). In between, the management of bilingual repertoires is based on extremely nuanced knowledge and complex competences, as section 5.2 has shown.

The analysis of language contact should establish distinctions between all these phenomena. The problem remains of what arguments can be applied, and what sort of borders have to be designed, for they are not necessarily straightforward. Some of these criteria, will be explored in the following sections, with special attention to the loanword vs. one-word continuum.

In the present study, the thorough bilinguality of the subjects, all of whom possess a different, but anyway substantive productive competence in both languages, complicates the analysis. One of the habitual criteria to distinguish between switching and borrowing, namely unavailability of code-switching to monolingual speakers, loses its significance here. Two main criteria have been used to classify the lexical transcodic markers found in the corpus (cf. section 2.2). On the one hand, their formal characteristics, and, on the other, their frequency of appearance.
The distinction between calques and borrowings was discussed in section 2.2.2. As Pompeu Fabra, the father of Catalan language standardisation, pointed out at the beginning of this century (cf. Fabra, 1983: 1), widespread Catalan-Castilian bilingualism makes it often hard to recognize calques. In spite of the traditional penchant towards ‘borrowing-chasing’ displayed by Catalan lexicographers, some calques may pass unnoticed for decades before they are detected - and usually condemned. Thus, there remains the possibility that some of these have skipped the task of identification carried on in the present research. Haugen’s warning that ‘(...) it must not be inferred from the confidence with which such lists [of loans] are put forward that it is always possible to isolate loan material in each given case.’ (Haugen, 1950: 227) remains applicable here.

A particular problem for identifying calques is posed by Castilian deixtics. As English, Catalan the deictic system opposes first and second person to third person (cf. appendix 3): aquí vs. allà (‘here’ vs. ‘there’); aquest vs. aquell (‘this’ vs. ‘that’). Castilian opposes first person to second person and to third person: aquí vs. ahí vs. allà (‘here’ first person vs. ‘here’ second person vs. third person ‘there’); este vs. ese vs. aquel (‘this’ first person vs. ‘this’ second person vs. ‘that’). Catalans often reduce the Castilian system by suppressing the second person deictic, so that ahí and ese are said to have totally disappeared form Catalonia, replaced by aquí and este (e.g. Szigetvári, 1994: vii).

As far as my data is concerned, this last claim is clearly exaggerated. In the corpus, the three elements of the Castilian system are widely present, even in the mouths of Catalan and bilingual speakers.

(11) ICE DIV cambio esto por lo que sea (!) [excepto por eso y lo del Far] 
ICE DIV I exchange this for anything else (!) [except that and the thing Far has!]
(o 4446)

Nevertheless, the presence of these second person deictic forms in the corpus does not exclude the possibility that the Castilian system is somehow influenced by Catalan among some, if not all, speakers. There are a number of examples in which this is indeed the case, and, as such, they were included in the analyses as calques. Unfortunately, on most occasions, and due to their deictic, i.e., context-bound, nature, there is no way to clearly discern whether the use of first person forms is adequate according to monolingual standards or interfered by Catalan. Therefore, some uses of deictics which may be considered calques of Catalan may have passed unnoticed.

81Pujante (1985: 482) confirms this point by showing that even a Catalan-Castilian dictionary inadvertently included some instances of syntactic calque.
6.2.3 The opposition between borrowing and switching

I The switching vs. nonce borrowing issue

Two main approaches can be identified regarding the borrowing vs. one-word switch issue (cf. section 2.2.3). On the one hand, variationist approaches such as those proposed by Poplack, Sankoff and associates (see, among others, Sankoff and Poplack, 1987; Poplack, 1990; Sankoff, Poplack and Vanniarajan, 1991; also from a psycholinguistic perspective, Grosjean, 1990: 108) argue that code-switching and borrowing constitute two related, but fundamentally distinct processes of language contact; code-switching is understood to imply the total activation of a second language and, thus, switched items should appear syntactically and morphologically unintegrated into the recipient language. In this line of reasoning, borrowing should be distinguishable because of its morphosyntactic integration into the recipient language. Non-recurrent lexical items morphosyntactically adapted to the recipient language are therefore regarded as borrowings - not switches - and subsumed under the label nonce borrowing.

Other scholars, on the contrary, have argued that both phenomena are part of a continuum without fundamental differences setting them apart, for both phenomena are considered as steps in a single path leading towards potential integration (cf. Gardner-Chloros, 1987: 107; Myers-Scotton, 1990, 1993b; Eastman (ed), 1992: passim). According to this approach, morphological and syntactic integration cannot serve to distinguish between switching and borrowing. Therefore, this perspective has to rely on frequency of appearance as the guide to make the difference between both phenomena, and downgrades the theoretical significance of such an opposition.

In spite of its tendency to correlate with long-term integration (Poplack, Sankoff, Miller, 1988), phonetic aspects have proved to be unreliable for the distinction between both phenomena. Thus, neither approach considers phonetic integration as a determinant evaluating both phenomena.

The data from the corpus researched contain a number of one-word transcoding markers of ambiguous status. In the next sections, the different criteria will be applied to them so that a conclusion regarding their status can be reached. These lexical units are presented in appendix 6.

II One-word versus multiple word switches

The analysis of potential one-word switches is in our case hindered by a difficulty not encountered when dealing with typologically distinct languages. Linguistic proximity makes a number of words in both languages totally or partially homophonous. In some cases, it is complex to determine whether the item should be regarded as a one-word or rather a multi-word switch.

Homophony does not constitute a problem when dealing with utterances which do not contain
any lexical transcodic markers, such as in the following case:

(12) FSG   tú duermes en una caravana_
       you sleep in a caravan_
       (d 1384)

In such cases, it would make no sense to regard tú, una or caravana as single-word switches, in spite of their coincidence with their Catalan equivalents tu, una, and caravana.

But problems for classification arise when these homophonous words appear in contact with some lexical transcodic markers. In such cases, the possibility to discriminate whether the homophonous items should be regarded as belonging to language A or language B often become tenuous.

(13) XMS   este ha dit_
       this one has said_
       (j 2176)

There is no doubt that este belongs to Castilian (cf. Cat. aquest) and that dit corresponds to the Catalan past participle of dir (cf. Cast. dicho, infinitive decir). But there are few empirical arguments to discern whether the auxiliary ha should be regarded as Catalan or Castilian. In the following example the analysis of the code-switch may be entirely different depending on the attribution of és and un to Catalan or Castilian.

(14) AOS   perquè és un: un deber_ ciu-
          because it is a: ci-
          (b 2061)
          ciudadà
duty

Similar arguments apply to dozens of cases. In fact, they constitute more than one third of all tokens of the units eventually regarded as intrasentential code-switches.

Table 6.1. Frequency of appearance of intrasentential switches according to their one-word / multiple-word status before potential one-word switches were analysed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort of intrasentential switch</th>
<th>Absolute frequency</th>
<th>Relative frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undoubtful one-word switches</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>31.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential one-word switches preceded by coincidental items</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>38.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple intrasentential switches</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>30.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis may become even more troublesome when the switch involves more than one clear transcadic marker. Many multiple-word switches may be classified in at least two completely contradictory ways, depending on how these mostly function words which are formally coincident in both languages are analysed. Let us compare the following cases:

(15) DGS [da igual_] **m’he canviat de pis**
    
    DGS [never mind_] **I’ve moved to another flat**
    
    (e 3449)

(16) XMS XVM {[(F)] que diga el **nom**} [ke ‘òdvə el ‘nom]
    
    XMS XVM {{(F) que diga el **nom**} [ka ‘òðval ‘nom]
    
    XMS XVM {[(F)] (that) he says the **name**}
    
    XMS XVM {(F) (that) he says the name}
    
    (j 3089)

The two examples come from Castilian dominant imbalanced bilinguals in interactions in their weak languages. In both cases the analyses suggested by the bold, italic and standard letters correspond to the most plausible interpretation. In example 15, Dgs’s switching point is proposed to take place after the frozen expression *da igual*, and intonation seems to reinforce this hypothesis; nevertheless, one could also claim that *m’he* ‘I have’ is to be understood as Cast. *me he*, thus implying that the switching point is to be found between the auxiliary and the verb; it could also be argued that [*’kambj*] and even [a] correspond to the Castilian lexeme *cambiar* and not to its Catalan homophonous equivalent *canyar*, and it is only the past participle morpheme [-t] that belongs to Catalan; one could also say that the switching point is to be found before *igual*, which is roughly coincidental in both languages (Cat. [*i:vwal*] and Cast. [*i:vwal*]; finally, one could argue that no switch at all has taken place, for we have seen that the verb *dar* ‘to give’ appears quite often in the corpus82, and could therefore be interpreted as an established borrowing; in this case, *da igual* would be better regarded as a calque.

Xms’s case (ex. 16) is even more complex to diagnose, for there is practically no way to distinguish where each language starts. Versions of each language would be Cat. *que digui el nom* [ka ‘òdvɪ ɪnɔm] or, in a more dialectal version [ka ‘òdvɪ ɪnɔm] or [ka ‘òdvɪ al ‘nɔm]; and Castilian *que diga el nombre* [ke ‘òdvə el ‘nombre]. This analysis maintains that Catalan requires phonological neutralizations (el > [əl]). Nevertheless, it could be claimed that these rules do not always apply in the varieties spoken by this subject (and others), and thus no difference in linguistic attribution could be found between the first and the second utterance. In fact, it should not be forgotten that the utterances were addressed to the researcher, and can be assumed to be *intended* to be in Catalan.

Less competent bilinguals as Xms are definitely less able to combine the different linguistic

82 In fact, *dar* ‘to give’ does exist in Catalan, but it is nowadays an old-fashioned word which is no longer used by middle-aged and young speakers in the area studied here. Its resemblance with Castilian may have something to do with its decline in spoken Catalan.
knowledge at their disposal, and it would be at least risky to take phonological realization as a clear-cut, decisive criterion. On the contrary, competent bilinguals seem more capable to maintain phonological differences in spite of linguistic proximity. For example, in the two following cases one-word switches can be hypothesised on the basis that de is pronounced with shwa and el with [e]:

(17) ANA  

[1 té cara de pueblo]  

[‘te ‘kaɾə de ‘puueblo]

(18) ICE  

[va a haber el vui(t) y el vació]  

[ba ‘βər el ‘βwi ɾ el ‘βu’oio]

Phonological criteria may be used to attempt the identification of switching point in a number of cases where the speaker was highly competent in both languages. Nevertheless, phonological criteria may lead to ambiguity. In example 19, Ana, a competent bilingual, provides an excellent example of conflictive linguistic assignation:

(19) ANA  

el Guardiola és que tiene una cara de bon home.  

[əl ‘ɡwar’ðiola ‘es ke ‘tjene una ‘kara de ‘βɔn ‘əmə]

(20) ANA  

Guardiola ((Barcelona F.C. player)) has such a good man face.

From a phonologic point of view, the noun phrases el Guardiola and bon home seem undoubtedely Catalan, tiene una cara de seems to be produced in Castilian, and és que remains a doubtful fragment, for this speaker -as many other in the school- tends not to neutralize [e] into [a] in que, so we do not know whether it is Catalan or Castilian. Many objections may be raised to such an analysis, though: Guardiola is a proper name that may be seen as invariable, and thus added to Castilian (see a). The distinction between [ə] and [a] may be judged too tenuous in Ana's case, and una cara might be judged doubtful or even attributed to Catalan (see b); in such a case, the attribution of de to Castilian on the sole basis of phonetic realization becomes considerably weakened.

The contradictory phonological treatment given to transcodic markers in Catalan and Castilian described in section 6.2.3.3 makes phonological criteria even more difficult to adopt.

Thus, the criteria eventually adopted were as follows: in cases of one (or more) coincidental items preceding or following a single lexical transcodic marker, the coincident items were considered as belonging to the recipient language unless clear opposing reasons (intonation, pauses, etc.) existed. A majority of these dubious cases involved single names preceded by coincidental determiners or prepositions and were analysed as one-word switches. In the following example, the preposition a could be regarded as either Catalan or Castilian, but was
eventually considered as belonging to Catalan, the recipient language, and the switch classified as one-word switchnig.

(21)  
SCP això a ell no li importa_
SCP this he he doesn’t care_

On the contrary, a few cases were considered plurilexical switches, as in the case of some frozen expressions:

(22)  
ARC [y una] mierda li ha tocat al Jms\ ARC bullshit it fell to Jms\ (o 3739)

The same goes for a few cases where intonation, hesitation or reduplication before the coincidental items established a noticeable border between the noun (or other) phrase and the rest of the utterance.

In a number of utterances, it was impossible to decide whether they should be attributed to either one language or the other, and even to decide whether they were one-word or multiple word switches, since features of both appeared deeply intermingled and could may be considered as Catalan or Castilian depending on the criteria used. Therefore, these remained as either multiple word switches or, in a few utterances made up of two words, as one-word in doubtful language utterances. In both cases, they were discarded from one-word switches vs. loanwords analysis.

The final result of the classification into one-word and multiple word switches is shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Switch type</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Relative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-word in Cat. or in Cast. utterances</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>61.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-word in doubtful lang. utterances(^\text{83})</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple word</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>34.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The criteria debated here should be borne in mind when analysing multiple intrasentential switches (sections 6.6 and 6.7.3), for a different approach (such as considering that functional coincident words belonged to the donor language) might have modified the results.

\(^{83}\) These also include utterances formed by two words, one from each language.
Once one-word and multiple-word intrasentential switches clearly discriminated, the habitual criteria can be applied to analyse whether one-word switches and borrowings may be empirically differentiated. The goal now is to evaluate the productivity of different criteria for distinguishing between established borrowings (or loanwords) and momentary, idiosyncratic creations (be they nonce borrowings or one word code-switches).

As Romance languages, and despite their objective differences, Catalan and Castilian share substantial features so that many criteria usually available for genetically unrelated languages become practically useless. Even if they exist at a number of levels, syntactic differences between Catalan and Castilian are relatively minor. Besides, spoken varieties show signs of mutual syntactic convergence, although it is undoubtedly Catalan that has taken the biggest steps towards the other language. Syntax is therefore of little help in distinguishing between switching and borrowing in the case of Catalan and Castilian.

Although recording conditions were not always ideal for the study of phonetic and phonological integration, data analysis confirms that it does not cast much light on the issue of whether an item is established or not. Reasons are different in the case of integration into Catalan and in that of integration into Castilian.

In the Catalan case, longstanding bilingualism has provoked that many Castilian items enter spoken Catalan retaining their original Castilian pronunciation, even if in deep disagreement with Catalan phonologic patterns. This is the case of vale ['bale] and cel-lo [θelo], among many others, where final -e and -o contradict the Catalan vocalic neutralization rules, and the interdental subsists despite its non existence in the Catalan phonological inventory. Simultaneously, some on the spot integrations invest Castilian words with Catalan phonological appearence by means of 'conversion rules': col·lègio [ku'λɛʒiu] transforms Cast. [ko'leʒjo] by applying the equivalence Cast. [χ] = Cat. [ʒ] and neutralizing the [o] into [u]). See also the one-word switch corta ['kɔrta], where Cast. [u] is replaced by [ʒ], inexistent in Castilian. Finally, items from other languages are either integrated into Catalan (e.g. stop [stɔp]), adopted with a Castilianized pronunciation (e.g. zombi 'zombie' [θombi]), or in a mixture of both (e.g. hobby, [χɔβi])\(^{84}\). Thus, in the case of lexical incorporations into Catalan, phonological adaptation constitutes no safe guide to integration, for a wide variety of treatments allows for the coexistence of alien patterns next to on the spot integration.

Castilian shows a different pattern, for total integration is the norm, and preservation of original pronunciation the -rare- exception. The data recorded in this corpus indicate the almost categorical nature of this trend: very few cases of transcodic lexical units inserted into a Castilian utterance can be said to escape it. Almost four out of five loanwords / one-word

\(^{84}\) This phenomenon witnesses the interposition of Castilian between Catalan and the other languages denounced by Aracil (1983: 176ff).
switches show total integration into Castilian phonic patterns. This trend is by no means limited to well established loanwords: even the most obvious one-word switches pronounced by Catalan speakers and family bilinguals are more often than not pronounced according to Castilian phonological rules.

(23) Preparing a poster
  JBC en una mano_ impostos_ [im’postos] instead of [im’pɔstus]
  JBC in one hand_ taxes_
  (n 2324)

(24) Talking about relatives.
  DCV (..) qué cusín de mi_ [ku’sin] instead of Cat. [ku’zi]
  DCV (..) what cousin of mine_
  (j 1805)

This trend towards integration produces some conflictive situations. In the following example, Esg strives to find a satisfactory way out between the obvious Catalan nature of setè 'seventh grade' (Cast. séptimo) and pressure to adapt it phonetically to Castilian.

(25) Visiting an exhibition on Southern America prepared by school children.
  ESG {(??) estamos aquí_}
  ESG (..) y a(ho)ra_ (..) a setè [se’te]
  ESG (..) setè_ [sə’tɛ]
  ESG (..) {(??) dónde está} setè [se’tɛ]
  ESG {(??) we’re here_}
  ESG (..) and now_ (..) to seventh\
  ESG (..) seventh_\n  ESG (..) {(??) where’s} seventh\n  (t 5800)

In the middle of a stretch of Castilian speech, Esg integrates Cat. [sə’tɛ] into the Castilian vocalic system by pronouncing [se’tɛ]. As a Catalan native speaker, though, a contradiction arises for her between this pronunciation and its actual form, so she repeats the word, now totally in Catalan... only to fall into the same trap some seconds later when she inserts the item again into a Castilian utterance.

The difference between Catalan and Castilian in what phonological integration of lexical transcodic markers is concerned is shown by table 6.3.
Table 6.3. Number of one-word lexical transcodic markers (LTM) in each language according to their degree of phonological integration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number of LTM with phonology from</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donor language</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Catalan utterances</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Castilian utterances</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference becomes more evident once the items with coincidental or unknown phonetics are removed from the table. As the following graph shows, the trend towards phonological integration into Castilian clearly overrules all other considerations.

The Chi square test confirms that the phonological treatment applied by Catalan and Castilian to lexical transcodic markers is statistically significant.

Table 6.4. Phonological integration in Catalan and in Castilian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Min E.F.</th>
<th>Cells with E.F. &lt; 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.84972</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>42.376</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.90368</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>(Before Yates Correction)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Missing Observations = 0

In synthesis, in the case of Castilian, phonological integration seems to be unreliable as a criterion to adequately discern between established and non-established lexical items for different reasons than was the case in Catalan: in the latter, there are numerous widespread loanwords that preserve their original Castilian pronunciation, whereas some nonce creations adopt Catalan forms; in Castilian, on the contrary, phonological integration is the norm for all

---

85The Chi square only takes into account the lexical items with either donor, mixed or recipient language phonology. Due to their reduced number and for calculation reasons, mixed terms were added to donor language.
items irrespective of their frequency of apparition.

The actual cause for such different behaviour remains difficult to prove. While different linguistic structures may be partially responsible for this discrepancy between Catalan and Castilian, it is nevertheless appealing to attribute the greater permissivity of Catalan to the traditional bilinguality of Catalan speakers, and the reticence shown by Castilian to the traditional monolingualism of its speech community. Such an explanation coincides with the argument that Catalan is more permissive with language norm transgressions, while Castilian is only starting to develop mechanisms to deal with bilingualism, as discussed in chapter 5. The fact that it is only Castilian phonological features such as phonemes [x] or [θ] that are retained in Catalan\textsuperscript{86}, while those from other languages are systematically adapted, seems to strengthen this hypothesis.

\textbf{IV Morphological integration}

With syntactic and phonological integration deprived of any role, morphology remains the sole structural feature which may be helpful to discern potentially distinct cases of one-word transcoding markers. This is also the criterion favoured by Poplack and her associates in their defense of the 'nonce borrowing' notion.

Catalan and Castilian have both rich verbal inflective morphologies. While a number of verbal forms may coincide, many others are clearly divergent and set both language apart (see appendix 3). Conversely, Catalan and Castilian nominal morphology only include morphemes of number (plural) and gender (masculine and feminine), and these are partly coincidental.

Gender in nouns and pronouns is considered to be 'inherent' or 'intrinsic', while gender for determiners and adjectives depends on syntactic agreement (Cast.: Matthews, 1980: chap. 3; Varela, 1992; Carratalá, 1980; Cat.: Mascaró, 1985: 100). It is therefore expectable that these items will show different behaviours in the process of being borrowed. Nevertheless, the actual nature of gender inflection in Catalan and Castilian remains a debated issue between morphologists. Polemics arise from a number of facts\textsuperscript{87}:

\begin{enumerate}
\item In both languages there exists a number of endings which do not belong to the nominal radicals (since they do not reappear in derived forms). For Catalan masculines we have -0 ('ull 'eye'), -a ('mapa 'map'), -i ('bigoti 'moustache'), -s (temps 'time'), etc.; feminine -a ('casa 'house'), -0 ('flor 'flower'), -i ('dosi 'dose') -u ('tribu 'tribe'), etc. The same can be said for Castilian (examples from Lloret, 1995). There is no one-to-one relationship between these endings and gender, and the same endings may be encountered for both masculine and feminine
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{86}The extent of this acceptation is such that it has even been proposed that [X] is being incorporated into the Catalan phonological system (Payrató, 1985a: 99-103; cf. also Veny, 1993).

\textsuperscript{87}This section follows Lloret's (1995) discussion on the issue.
b. There exists a quantitatively significant trend favouring the association of some endings (Cast. -o, Cat. -0) with masculine forms, and between other endings (Cast. -a, Cat. -[*]) and feminine forms. These have been termed 'regular' gender endings by Viaplana and Lloret, in opposition to the rest or more 'marginal' endings.

Since it is obvious that these endings do not belong to radicals, their actual nature remains unclear. Do they all constitute gender inflectional markers, and how are they then attributed to the radicals? Should regular and marginal -in Lloret's terms- endings be differently regarded as "regular gender markers" opposed to "additional formatives"? Is there any gender marker at all in Catalan and Castilian?

Traditional approaches to the issue have made the assumption that grammatical gender in these languages is organized in two different categories, namely masculine and feminine. These approaches have often referred to the -a ending (Catalan) and -o, -a (Castilian) as the main distinctive markers between both genders (cf. Badia, 1994: 141; Alarcos, 1994: 60), though pointing out the difficulties to establish straightforward regularities between these endings and each gender.

Generative approaches have produced a number of theoretical proposals to account for these endings that can be grouped according to their treatment of the opposition between regular and marginal endings. One line of analysis has regarded all these endings as gender markers irrespective of their quantitative association. Mascaró's (1985) analysis of Catalan corresponds to such a view.

Another line of analysis has established a distinction between regular and marginal endings. Harris (1992) has emphasised the non-existence of a one-to-one relationship between potential morphs and gender and has proposed to consider the endings as the lexically assigned formal markers -such as Latin declensions- of five word-classes. One of the endings, though, would be rule-assigned (-a for {feminine}), while (-o) would be assigned by default.

Aronoff (1994) has proposed to interpret that Cast. -a and -o are assigned by means of morphological rules, while the other endings would be lexically attributed. Finally, Lloret and Viaplana (1992) and Lloret (1995) have also argued for a distinction between regular endings, regarded as rule-assigned, and lexically-specified marginal endings.

As it stands, most interpretations would not regard marginal endings as gender markers, but rather as formal class markers (Harris, Aronoff) or formatives (Viaplana and Lloret). They would also argue for a looser -i.e., rule-governed- link between regular endings and their radicals, qualitatively different from a stronger -i.e., lexically specified- link between marginal endings and their radicals.

Given the discrepancy existent in the analysis of the lesser common endings, only items
carrying one of the two regular endings were taken into account in the analysis of gender inflectional morphology. Thus, only Castilian nominal items with the masculine marker -o and feminine -a, and Catalan nominal items without gender marker for masculine forms and with -[*] for feminines were analysed.

Thus, in general terms, it can be said that Catalan shows no morph for masculine while Castilian has -o; both languages have -a (pronounced as [ə] or [a] in Catalan) as the main morph for feminine. Therefore, the possibility of cross-linguistic coincidence between feminines is potentially much higher than between masculines.

Table 6.5. Masculine and feminie nominal morphology in Catalan and Castilian. Examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalan</th>
<th>Castillan</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cansat, cansada</td>
<td>cansado, cansada</td>
<td>'tired'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>porter, portera</td>
<td>portero, portera</td>
<td>'janitor', 'goalkeeper'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let us now turn to the data from the corpus. Morphological integration was evaluated according to the presence of nominal and verbal inflectional morphemes. According to this criterion, several groups were established:

1. Morphologically unintegrated items, i.e., those carrying the inflection from the donor language instead of that from the recipient language (in table 6.7 below, coded as D). Ex.: Cat. *gordo* (from Cast. *gordo* 'fat'); Cast.: *japonesos* (cf. Cast. *japoneses* 'Japanese')

2. Morphologically mixed items, i.e., those showing a combination of inflectional features from both languages (coded as M). Ex.: Cat.: *psicòlogue* (cf. Cat. *psicòleg*, Cast. *psicólogo* 'psychologist').

3. Morphologically integrated items, i.e., those carrying the adequate inflection from the recipient language (coded as R). Ex.: Cat.: *apretar* in *apretem a córrer* ('we start running'); Cast.: *petar* in *me estoy petando* ('to be splitting one's sides laughing').

4. Units that are non pertinent for a morphological analysis from an inflectional point of view, due to a variety of reasons:
   a. Morphologically undistinguishable items, i.e., those carrying morphs that are homophonous in both languages (coded as I). Ex.: Cat.: *gorda* 'fat'.
   b. Items that do not carry inflectional morphs (coded as A), including those from non-inflectional languages such as English nouns. Ex.: Cat.: *borde* (Cast. *borde*, 'bastard'); Cast.: *gear* (from Eng. 'gear'), *pin* (from Eng. 'pin').

This perspective does not take into account the processes of morphophonological integration already defined as *automatic conversion formulae* by Weinreich (1953: 2) which adapt
borrowed / switched items by means of non-inflectional means.

Table 6.6. Examples of non-inflectional morphophonological integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor language</th>
<th>Recipient language</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cosí</td>
<td>[ku’zi]</td>
<td>cusín [k’usin] (From Cat. to Cast.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>melocotón</td>
<td>[meloko’ton]</td>
<td>melocotó [malukuto] (From Cast. to Cat.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of these conversion rules are not totally absent from the corpus, but they were left outside the morphological analysis due to their actual scarcity.

The analysis of the inflection adopted by each lexical transcodic marker shows a striking difference between verbal and nominal (including nouns and adjective) items. Verbal morphology shows a remarkable trend towards integration, while nominal morphology displays a high reluctance against it. Feminines are hardly evaluable, for their inflections are basically coincidental in both languages.

Table 6.7. Number of lexical transcodic markers according to syntactic category and degree of morphological integration to Catalan. Tokens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of integrat.</th>
<th>Syntactic category</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, C, I</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAL</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degree of integration: A, C, I = non-pertinent from a morphological point of view; D = donor language morphology; M = mixed morph.; R = recipient language morph.; CAL = calque.

Synctactic category: V = verb; AF = adjective, feminine; AI = adjective, invariable; AM = adjective, masculine; NF = noun, feminine; NN = noun, neuter; NM = noun, masculine.

The actual differences between degrees of integration are better perceived when only the items with morphology clearly belonging to either one language or the other are taken into account.

It is certainly striking that adjectives follow so closely nouns in their retention of original markers. In fact, given the dependance of adjective gender on syntactic agreement, one would expect them to come closer to verbs rather than to nouns. The Chi square test confirms that the difference between masculine nominal (adjectives + nouns) and verbal inflectional

---

88 Tokens, not types, were used to analyse morphological integration, for the same type may -and in several cases does- appear with different degrees of adaptation.
So far it has been assumed that -o stands for a Castilian morphological marker. An alternative possibility to this analysis would be that the massive borrowing of masculines ended in -o might be transforming the Catalan morphological markers distribution, to the point that -o [u] acquires a new role as gender marker. This morphological borrowing would be supported by the fact that Cat. masculine nouns and adjectives ended in [s] form their plural by adding [us] to the singular, as in the cases of feliç, plural feliços, 'happy'; pastís, plural pastissos, 'cake'; or revés, plural revesos, 'setback'. This alternative explanation would account for the fact that a large majority of nouns and adjectives preserving their Castilian morphology nevertheless show phonological integration (i.e., the -o is pronounced [u], according to Catalan vocalic reduction rules). Nevertheless, this explanation should still explain the handful of masculine lexical items encountered in the corpus that show integration into Catalan precisely by deletion of final -o.

While the first item is totally unusual, the second one is a widespread loanword\textsuperscript{89}. Another

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{89}In fact, pasteler could also be regarded as a unit derived in Catalan itself from the non-normative borrowing pastel from Cast. pastel, Cat. pastís 'cake'.

```plaintext
Table 6.9. Castilian one-word switched nouns with Catalan masculine inflection (morph = 0).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Castilian</th>
<th>Switch</th>
<th>Catalan</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>apellido</td>
<td>apellit</td>
<td>cognom</td>
<td>'family name'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pastelero</td>
<td>pasteler</td>
<td>pastisser</td>
<td>'confectioner'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
Catalan lexical item, *pallaso* 'clown' undergoes a similar process of -o deletion and becomes *pallàs* in Jbc's mouth, probably on the erroneous assumption that it constitutes an 'undue' borrowing from Cast. *payaso*.

On the whole, retention/deletion of nominal morphology does not seem to maintain a consistent relationship with degree of integration in the Catalan-Castilian language pair. Widespread items such as *gordo* 'fat' or *sombrero* 'hat' retain their Cast. original morphological marker when borrowed into Catalan, while some clear momentary mixed items such as *apellit* 'family name' do not.

The same seems to apply to verbs. There is no relationship between adoption of recipient language inflectional morphs and their degree of spread. Only in a small number of occasions do speakers retain the donor language morphology, and in such cases it is clear that this is produced by mistake or even by sheer linguistic incompetence to produce a difficult form, as in the following instance:

(26) Speaking in class.

\[
JRG \text{que si: } (\ldots) \text{ que si: no hubiera ehem ehem } \{(??) \text{ núvols}_ \} \text{ haguessin: } \{(AC) \text{ hubiera anat} \} \text{ el } \\
\text{Songoku a la terra \ haguessin enviàt el Rabit}_
\]

Conversely, even some of the most clearly occasional verbs, those which are immediately rejected by the speakers themselves as undue language mixing, adopt the recipient language inflection.

(27) Talking about a friend during the interview.

\[
JCR \text{ el Justo: e: } \text{ va quita' } \{(w 475) \text{ se quitó} \} \\
\text{instead of Cast. } \\
JCR \text{ Justo quitó} \\
\]

Thus, inflection does not seem to constitute a reliable criterion to classify verbs into two different processes.

### V Synthesis: borrowings and switches as a continuum

The previous sections have explored the structural criteria usually employed to distinguish between sorts of lexical transcodic markers, paying special attention to the possibility that borrowing and one-word switching may constitute two different processes. The analysis of the lexical material from the corpus has not found substantial evidence in favour of the nonce borrowing hypothesis from phonological, morphological or syntactic analysis.

The distinction between nonce borrowings and one-word switches proposed by Poplack and associates rests on the assumption that nonce borrowing may eventually lead to established loanwords, while a switch does not (Poplack, Sankoff and Vanniarajan, 1992: 186). In the
Catalan-Castilian case, where nouns, adjectives and verbs are equally borrowed (cf. table 6.25), different morphological treatment does not confirm such an assumption. If, according to the line of reasoning defended by Poplack and associates, we accept that recipient language inflectional morphology indicates the status of a borrowing, then the Catalan - Castilian language pair does not apply the same process to verbal and nominal items. Verbs would be systematically borrowed; masculine nouns and adjectives, on the contrary, would be systematically switched (or no criterion would be available for them); finally, feminine items would remain in an undefined territory. The existence of large numbers of widespread established loanwords of verbal, nominal and adjectival category in spite of the clearly divergent patterns of incorporation they follow refutes the hypothesis that a radical distinction between one-word switching and borrowing can be established. On the contrary, the alternative hypothesis of the switching-borrowing continuum seems to be supported by the data.

VI The frequency criterion

It was mentioned in section 6.1.2 that a number of transcodic markers do eventually become firmly established in the community, in spite of their status of normatively non-accepted borrowings. In the corpus, a number of items appear very frequently (i.e., more than 50 times) in the corpus: buena 'well' (113 tokens); lo 'neuter article' (91); pero 'but' (258); pues 'then, so' (89); tio 'guy' (82). These and other items must be regarded as loanwords already established in the community irrespective of prescriptive criteria, and in opposition to clearly occasional one-word switches of different nature such as curso ['kursu] 'grade' (Cat. curs, Cast. curso) or subirme 'to get on top of' (Cat. enfilar-se, Cast. subirse) in Catalan. There arises, then, the need to operationalize the criterion of frequency.

Unfortunately, a glimpse at the lexical transcodic markers frequency table (appendix 6) makes it plain that in spite of its more than 33.000 utterances, the corpus remains too small for a real quantitative analysis about the frequency of appearance of particular words. In the first place, the material transcribed is clearly biased towards a number of subject matters (e.g. education, children's personal relations, holidays and interests) and towards a register (youngsters' slang), as proved by the anomalously high frequencies reached by some items such as efe-pe 'vocational training', guai 'fantastic' or nòvio/nòvia 'boy/girl-friend.

Secondly, some apparently frequent loanwords should be regarded with maximal suspicion. Some of them reach a certain degree of frequency just because the very speaker or his/her peers reject them and make explicit comments on the item that include it just after its production. A couple of examples may serve to exemplify this point: the verb subir-se appears on three occasions; nevertheless, according to the very subjects' explicit reactions in front of these units, they are clearly refused as unacceptable (e.g. subir-se in section 5.2.6.3). The case of etxar, from Cast. echar -Cat. fer- 'to project, to screen a film' is comparable in that it is recorded twice due to the contemptuous imitation of Dgs after Aos utterance:
In the third place, low frequency of appearance in the corpus does not necessarily preclude items from being widespread loanwords: to mention only three, acabar amb (1 token), disfrutar (1), and forrar (2) have all been recorded only once or twice in the corpus, but they are so widespread that their inclusion in the Catalan normative dictionary has sometimes been required (cf. Grup d'Estudis Catalans, 1992). Other units seldom encountered in the corpus such as jabalí have long historical recordings in Catalan going back more than 100 years.

As a consequence, while widespread use in the community constitutes a major difference between established loanwords and occasional ones, frequency of appearance in the corpus studied remains just an indicator for the status of a lexical item, and had to be complemented by case by case evaluation.

How then can frequency be operationalized? In the operationalization of the frequency criterion it became convenient to make use of the abundant lists of 'incorrect borrowings' or barbarismes. These lists, with a long history in the Catalan lexicographic tradition, include widespread borrowings which according to normativists should be rejected. Leaving aside their theoretical and practical peculiarities, these lists stand for useful auxiliary instruments in that they usually record precisely those transcodic markers felt to be widespread. Thus, in our case, lexical items included in these lists were usually considered widespread borrowings, irrespective of their actual frequency of appearance in the corpus.

There has been more research on Castilian effects upon Catalan than the other way round, and numerous references discuss language contact phenomena from a variety of perspectives, and it is beyond the scope of this research to offer a synthetic list of the literature on the subject (cf., among others, Bruguera, 1984; López del Castillo, 1976; Marvà, 1982; Payrató, 1985a; Pey, 1982; Pey, 1989; Ruax, 1989, 1993a, 1993b, 1993c; 1994; Solà, 1994). The number of authors and scientific / normative work explicitly dealing with Catalan influence on Castilian is not so extensive. Both Solà (1980) and Szigetvári (1994) constitute useful synthetic lists of items of Catalan origin ever recorded in Castilian speech, and they were used as a check list in the process of verifying language contact phenomena.

Beyond the lexical items recorded in these lists, the issue of where to place the borders between frequent and infrequent loanwords for those items appearing more than once in the corpus but not mentioned by lists of barbarismes remained unsolved. Taking an admittedly
arbitrary criterion, lexical units recorded in more than three different situations\textsuperscript{90}, or in only two or three situations but produced by more than three subjects, were considered established loanwords. Items appearing in less than three recordings and produced by less than three subjects were considered one-word code-switches, i.e., non established lexical transcodic markers.

In this research, then, the distinction between borrowing and switching will be regarded as one of degree and not of nature. Loanwords and one-word switches will be distinguished only on the basis of their frequency of appearance -in the corpus and across the community-, and not according to their syntactic, morphological or phonic integration into the recipient language.

The difference between widespread, established, and occasional, non-established transcodic markers is not necessarily limited to the opposition borrowing-switching. Calques can also be classified according to their frequency of use in the community. Unfortunately, and probably due to their more unnoticed nature, there is less information available about calque frequency in Catalan and Castilian, and, in this research, the low frequency rates achieved by the vast majority of calques made useless such an opposition.

The consideration of borrowing and code-switching as being along a continuum makes it easier to analyse a number of anomalously mixed lexical items present in the corpus. These lexical blends constitute idiosyncratic attempts at integrating Castilian words into Catalan linguistic patterns, with the particularity that they appear only once in the corpus and were produced mostly -although not exclusively- by the least balanced bilinguals.

Table 6.10. Some formally mixed one-word switches encountered in the corpus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual blend</th>
<th>Catalan</th>
<th>Castilian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>folla</em></td>
<td><em>full</em></td>
<td><em>hoja</em></td>
<td>leaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>deret</em></td>
<td><em>dret</em></td>
<td><em>derecho</em></td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>carcu</em></td>
<td><em>quelcom</em></td>
<td><em>algo</em></td>
<td>something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cllave</em></td>
<td><em>clau</em></td>
<td><em>llave</em></td>
<td>key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>quiè</em></td>
<td><em>qui</em></td>
<td><em>quien</em></td>
<td>who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>jamàis</em></td>
<td><em>mai</em></td>
<td><em>jamás</em></td>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{90}For practical purposes, 'situation' is here understood as equivalent to 'recording'.

---
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6.2.4 Classifying lexical transcodic markers: a synthesis

Lexical transcodic markers constitute a continuum ranging from the oldest, most widespread and integrated loanwords to the most occasional ones. While there exists consensus that the two ends of this continuum should be kept distinct, discrepancies arise regarding the intermediate phenomena.

Section 6.2 has examined several of the criteria habitually used in the literature to distinguish between these phenomena. First, multiple switches have been discerned from one-word switches. After that, the criteria of syntactic, morphological and phonetic/phonological integration have been reviewed. None of them satisfactorily supports the difference allegedly existing between one-word switches and so-called nonce borrowings, for different reasons. Thus, the switching-borrowing continuum hypothesis has been adopted. During this process, Catalan and Castilian have been detected to treat alien vocabulary according to different patterns.

Only frequency of appearance has been found to be useful for distinguishing between established and non-established loanwords. Due to the limitations of the corpus researched, auxiliary bibliographic references have been used to classify the lexical material in one-word switches and established borrowings.
6.3 Lexical transcodic markers in the corpus

6.3.1 Most frequent lexical transcodic markers

Table 6.11 below confirms that lexical contact traces in the subjects' Catalan were by far more abundant than in their Castilian.

Table 6.11. Number of transcodic markers at lexical level in Catalan and Castilian (tokens and types) including calques, loanwords and one-word switches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient language</th>
<th>Tokens</th>
<th>Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1806</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numeric significance of lexical transcodic markers in each language can be more clearly appreciated when compared to the total number of words in Catalan and Castilian utterances. Table 6.12 shows the percentages obtained by markers in relation with the total number of words included in Catalan and Castilian utterances.91

Table 6.12. Number of lexical transcodic markers (LTM) over total number of words in each language (including utterances with one-word switches). Tokens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>N. LTM</th>
<th>N. words</th>
<th>Percentage of LTM over N. words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Catalan utterances</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>42819</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Castilian utterances</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>52645</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1806</td>
<td>95464</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

91 Including all words found in Catalan utterances, in doubtful utterances eventually attributed to Catalan, and in Catalan utterances containing a one-word switch.
Catalan utterances include a percentage of lexical transcoding markers that is clearly higher than that of their Castilian counterparts, i.e., as a whole, Castilian utterances are considerably much freer of lexical impact from other languages than are Catalan. The high Chi square (1171) obtained implies that the difference between Catalan and Castilian is statistically significant (p ≤ 0.0001); i.e., the difference in number of transcoding markers encountered in Catalan and Castilian is not random.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Min E.F.</th>
<th>Cells with E.F. &lt; 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1171.19173</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>810.055</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1172.82716</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Before Yates Correction)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The striking fact in this case is that these results come from children whose language of instruction is almost exclusively Catalan. It would seem reasonable to expect that Catalan-medium education should produce the opposite results, and all options must be explored in order to explain these findings.

One possible explanation could be that, in comparative terms, Catalan normativists were more reluctant to accept features of foreign origin in general, and of Castilian origin in particular, than their Castilian-speaking counterparts. Could the figures showed above be attributed to a different treatment of lexical transcoding markers? This hypothesis does not seem to be applicable to the vocabulary. Normative Castilian includes an extremely reduced number of Catalan borrowings, and (Catalans') particular uses of Castilian are simply ignored by Castilian norms. Thus, not even widespread calques such as enganchar 'to stick', from Cat. enganxar (Cast. pegar), or widespread loanwords such as plegar 'to finish working', from Cat. plegar (Cast. terminar de trabajar) are accepted as Castilian-regional normative forms. This behaviour is probably understandable from the point of view of linguistic prescriptivism, but its actual effect is that most Castilian transcoding markers of Catalan origin remain unaccepted. Thus, the hypothesis of different degrees of reluctance against foreign words seems to be refutable.

Given that this result is unlikely to constitute an artifact of a potentially differential treatment of alien words by normative texts, it has to be concluded that the impact of Catalan language-teaching and the official policy of Catalan language spread as a whole remains comparatively low on the lexical level, for it has (still?) not even equalled the pressure historically exerted by Castilian on Catalan.

To what extent do these results coincide with other measures of language contact phenomena in the Catalan Countries? Given the basic addressee-specification function of code-choice, it would make little sense to compare interactions with different numbers of participants and
ethnolinguistic backgrounds; on the contrary, intrasentential code-switching seems more amenable to comparative perspectives.

Table 6.14. Rates of intrasentential code-switching\(^{92}\) for middle-class bilingual speakers in Barcelona in 1983-84 in two situations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Dinner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JG = Judith Gonzales, the American researcher herself

Table 6.15. Number of lexical transcodic markers in Catalan speech (without proper names)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N. LTM</th>
<th>N. of words</th>
<th>LTM over words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>484</td>
<td>31815</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Vila, in press.

It should noted that while Gonzales' interview included mostly Catalan utterances, her dinner conversation mixed Catalan and Castilian switched utterances. In any case, it would be difficult to argue that the results of 1.89% of loanwords, calques, one-word switches represent a significant departure from previous social norms in quantitative terms, especially when "dinner" is considered; even if the 0.43% of utterances of dubious language assignment including multiple-word intrasentential code-switches were added, the figures remain substantially low. More significant is the difference with Vila (in press), a much smaller corpus including several samples of Catalan as spoken in formal events and settings by people trained to use formal Catalan (e.g. Catalan TV and radio announcers and lecturers at the university, among others).

Hence, no significant departure seems to be detectable in the amount of lexical transcodic markers encountered among the subjects in relation with the varieties used in their surrounding. Again, the influence exerted by the school does not seem to dramatically transform the children's linguistic practice.

Few surprises appear in the table of most frequent lexical transcodic markers in Catalan and Castilian (cf. table below and appendix 6). The most frequent lexical transcodic markers in Catalan coincide with those detected in related literature. The following table illustrates to

\(^{92}\) Including code-switches and borrowings.
what extent other quantitative studies arrive at comparable conclusions.

Table 6.16. Most frequent lexical transcodic markers in three quantitative studies. Absolute and relative frequencies of appearance over total number of transcodic markers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>algo</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bueno</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>43.13</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>donar</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estar</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hala</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pero</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pues</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>24.28</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tio</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vale</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>47.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calques such as *donar, estar* were not included in Vila (in press) and probably not detected and/or included in the analysis by Gonzales (1993) (cf. section 6.2.2); loanwords such as *hala, tio* are closely related to (respectively) children and children to youngsters speech, and could thus not be detected in the other studies, concerned primarily with adults.

The only significant novelty in the table is the high relevance obtained by *pero* 'but' (Cat. *però*). This loanword has been recorded in previous researches (cf. Boix, Payrató and Vila, *in press*), but its quantitative importance in the present research suggests that it may be related to the new generations and/or the spread of Catalan as a second language.

### 6.3.2 Donor and recipient languages

The largest majority of transcodic markers at the lexical level encountered in Catalan utterances are of undisputed Castilian origin, while most of the items recorded for Castilian are of Catalan origin. Only a handful of items come from other languages, mostly English. This was expected given the community's language contact history. It is remarkable, though, that (still) unaccepted English loanwords reach an appreciable percentage of Castilian transcodic markers. It should be noted that most of these English items are shared by Catalan, although they may not appear in the corpus. It is therefore not implied that Castilian has higher contact with English than Catalan does; both languages seem to be equally influenced by English, as the roughly similar number of English types and tokens recorded for each language suggests (see appendix 6). On the contrary, it is their relative weight on the total number of items that makes the difference: Catalan utterances include loanwords from Castilian and one-word switches to that language in a much higher proportion than Castilian does the other way round. Therefore, in relative terms, English accounts for fewer interlanguage phenomena in Catalan than in Castilian.
Results in graph 6.3 confirm the well established fact that, in general, comparative terms, Catalan has exerted and exerts lower pressure on Castilian than the other way round in terms of lexical borrowing, i.e., Catalan has borrowed more from Castilian than the other way round. This differential reluctance of Castilian vis-à-vis the other environmental language is nevertheless not found when foreign languages are included in the picture: both Catalan and Castilian incorporate a comparable amount of lexical terms from other languages.

The Chi square test confirms that in comparative terms, Castilian and Catalan follow different strategies in the incorporation of lexical material from other languages: foreign languages have a significantly larger role in Castilian than in Catalan because of the higher reluctance of Castilian to include Catalan words.

Table 6.17. Incorporation of lexical transcodic markers into Catalan and Castilian according to donor language (other official language vs. foreign languages). Tokens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Min E.F. Cells with E.F. &lt; 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89.01923</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>7.724 None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.80272</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>(Before Yates Correction)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Missing Observations = 0

Results are comparable when types are analysed, pointing to the high consistence of this trend.

Table 6.18. Incorporation of lexical transcodic markers into Catalan and Castilian according to donor language (other official language vs. foreign languages). Types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Min E.F. Cells with E.F. &lt; 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.87846</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>7.213 None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.60365</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>(Before Yates Correction)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Missing Observations = 0

The interpretation of these results should probably be found in two related factors: on the one hand, Catalan is a second language for most subjects in the sample; on the other hand, the historical relationship maintained by both languages is not balanced. At least during the last 50
years, Castilian speakers in Catalonia were allowed to remain monolingual in their language, and they usually did not go beyond receptive bilingualism. Catalan speakers, on the contrary, were expected to thoroughly bilingualise and were deprived from contact with formal varieties of their language. Thus, it is not at all surprising that the degree of lexical incorporation from Castilian into Catalan is dramatically higher than the other way round. On the contrary, foreign borrowings have not undergone different treatments and have been incorporated along a similar path into Catalan and Castilian. Their relative weight has to be higher in Castilian, where they find less ‘competitors’, than in Catalan, where Castilian items abound.

### 6.3.3 Calques versus loanwords and one-word switches

Another difference between both languages is caused by the procedure adopted by transcodic markers to enter the recipient language. When tokens are analysed, loanwords predominate in Catalan utterances, while calques abound more than other phenomena in Castilian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient language</th>
<th>Calques</th>
<th>Switches</th>
<th>Loanwords</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>1527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>425</strong></td>
<td><strong>183</strong></td>
<td><strong>1198</strong></td>
<td><strong>1806</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between the procedures encountered to incorporate lexical tokens into each language is statistically very significant, pointing to a consistent trend.

Table 6.20. Procedures used to incorporate lexical transcodic markers into Catalan in comparison with Castilian. Tokens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Min E.F.</th>
<th>Cells with E.F. &lt; 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>288.33822</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>28.271</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types analysis modifies these results somewhat. While loanwords remain predominant in Catalan, loanwords and calques become now practically equal in Castilian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient language</th>
<th>Calques</th>
<th>Switches</th>
<th>Loanwords</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>144</strong></td>
<td><strong>196</strong></td>
<td><strong>423</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, it is highly unlikely that this distribution is random (p ≤ 0.0001).
Table 6.22. Procedures used to incorporate lexical transcoding markers into Catalan in comparison with Castilian. Types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Min E.F.</th>
<th>Cells with E.F. &lt; 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.92876</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>22.173</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Missing Observations = 0

These transformations point to the higher diffusion of loanwords in Catalan in comparison with diffusion of loanwords in Castilian, and also in comparison with calques. Catalan token-to-type loanwords maintain a relationship of 6.76 (1136:160), while the same relationship only reaches 2.21 (148:62) in Castilian. This is to say that in Catalan each loanword type occurs more than 6 times in the corpus, while Castilian types only go slightly beyond 2. Calques, on the other hand, do not show such a difference: 5.23 (277:53) for Catalan to 4.93 (148:30) for Castilian.

To confirm that these results are not the by-product of our distinction between switches and loanwords (cf. section 6.2), the proportion can be found for one-word switches plus loanwords.

Table 6.23. Token-to-type proportion for calques, loanwords and loanwords plus one-word switches in Catalan and Castilian utterances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Calques</th>
<th>Loanwords</th>
<th>Loanwords + one-word switches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Catalan</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Castilian</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results again confirm the difference between Catalan and Castilian. Thus, it can be said with fair confidence that, according to our data, loanwords in Catalan are more spread across the informant than their Castilian counterparts.

In synthesis, the subjects' Castilian appears more reluctant than Catalan to incorporate lexical items from other languages, particularly Catalan, and seems to grant less diffusion to its loanwords.
6.3.4 Categories affected by language contact phenomena

Items of most syntactic categories seem to have been affected by language contact in both directions at the lexical level, as shown in tables 6.24. and 6.25.

Table 6.24. Categories and gender used to classify borrowings and one-word switches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Cat.: gorda 'fat'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cast.: consecutiu 'consecutive'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cat.: pero 'but'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cast.: doncs 'so'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Cat.: lo 'the' (neutre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cast.: este 'this' (calque)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>Cat.: almenos 'at least'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cast.: a más 'moreover'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idioms</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Cat.: entrar en raó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cast.: querer decir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse marker</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cat.: bueno 'well, O.K.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cast.: nen 'you guy'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Cat.: cónsola 'console'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cast.: tornavís 'screw'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Cat.: algo 'something'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cast.: esto 'this' (calque)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantifier</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Cat.: un montón 'a lot'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cast.: --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Cat.: por 'by'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cast.: a sota 'under'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Cat.: aceptar 'to accept'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cast.: enchegar 'to start an engine'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In comparison to Catalan, Castilian lexical borrowing and one-word switching seems not only reduced in number but also in categories, for only four of them go beyond 10 tokens. Several categories hardly appear among language contact phenomena in Castilian speech. This is not the case for Catalan, for more than ten tokens are recorded for all categories.
Table 6.25. Number of lexical transcodic markers per category. Tokens. Absolute and relative frequencies of appearance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Absolute frequencies</th>
<th>Relative frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>Castilian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idioms</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse marker</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantifier</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between Catalan and Castilian in this aspect is extremely significant, as shown by the statistical analysis in table 6.26, indicating that the differences between both languages cannot be random.

Table 6.26. Difference between the distribution of lexical transcodic markers according their syntactic category in each language. Tokens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Min E.F.</th>
<th>Cells with E.F. &lt; 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>121.78126</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>13.2286</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Missing Observations = 0

When types are analysed, result are quite different, as shown in table 6.27. A number of categories -determiners, discourse markers, conjunctions- lose most of their relevance when analysed in terms of types, for their weight is due to the extraordinary abundance of a short number of very common items: *lo, bueno, vale, pues*, etc. (cf. appendix 6).

---

In order to carry out the analysis, the following categories had to be added: DV+ID, P+Q+R+C.
Table 6.27. Number of lexical transcoding markers per category. Types. Absolute and relative frequencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Absolute frequencies</th>
<th>Relative frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>Castilian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idioms</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse marker</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantifier</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistical analysis confirms the independence of variables, i.e., contrary to the case of tokens, the differences between Catalan and Castilian types are not significant.

It is difficult to interpret these results. They seem to point to the fact that Catalan tokens include a very high number of conjunctions and determiners which, in fact, are reduced to a couple of types. Thus, in terms of types the differences between the two languages would not be large, but these would be bolstered in terms of tokens due to the high frequency of *lo*, *pero*, and similar function words.

In order to analyse the relationship between types and tokens, an index was produced dividing the number of tokens by the number of types and multiplying the figure obtained by 10. The more the result approaches 100%, the closer the type-token relationship comes to a one-to-one ratio. The result of such an operation is shown in graph 6.4. The graph shows that Castilian achieves higher results for most cases, i.e., the relationship between types and tokens approaches more the one-to-one ratio, as expected from results in table 6.25. In the present context, this result seems to suggest that the items affected by borrowing / switching are probably not only less frequent in absolute terms, but also remain apart from the core vocabulary. Transcoding markers in the subjects’ Castilian seem more ancillary than those in Catalan, for they do not appear often in their conversations..
6.3.5 Lexical transcodic markers: a synthesis

The lexical transcodic markers detected in the corpus researched do not introduce significant novelties in relation with the mainstream society. Most of them have been repeatedly described in the related literature, and the most frequent items here recorded do not differ from those in other studies. On the whole, percentages of this language contact phenomenon are low (2% of tokens), but the difference between those encountered in Catalan (3.57%) and Castilian (0.53%) is found to be significant. In any case, these percentages do not go much beyond those found for other comparable researches in Catalonia, suggesting that the pupils’ behaviour regarding these words is not remarkably different from that of the rest of the society.

As expected, most lexical markers come from the other enviromental language, i.e., Catalan for Castilian and Castilian for Catalan, while very few have their origin in other languages. Nevertheless, a significant difference was found in that Castilian utterances incorporate lower numbers of Catalan words, in relation to other-origin words, than Catalan utterances do. This result seems to correspond to the historically different roles played by both languages in Catalonia, where Castilian could remain relatively free of Catalan influence.

Lexical transcodic markers are not incorporated in the same way by Catalan and Castilian. Catalan has a considerable number of well-established loanwords, while switches and calques account for a minor part of markers. Castilian seems to prefer calques and does not grant the same diffusion to its transcodic markers. A possible explanation for this phenomenon is that its Castilian lexical incorporations do not affect core vocabulary, while some of Catalan do.

Finally, a short number of very frequent lexical items boosts the participation of some categories in Catalan transcodic markers, and make differences between Catalan and Castilian highly significant. Types analysis, though, shows that this difference is to be attributed mostly to these few, but very frequent, words.
6.4 Language contact phenomena at the morphosyntactic level

6.4.1 Catalan

Although Catalan and Castilian share a considerable amount of morphosyntactic patterns, discrepancies between both languages do exist in a number of areas (cf. appendix 3).

Some of the language contact phenomena recorded can be interpreted as either morphosyntactic convergence between both languages, or as unilateral morphosyntactic calques. In Catalan, these signs of language contact can be synthesised in a number of areas:
1. Non-standard use of unstressed personal clitic pronouns (pronoms clitics)
2. Morphosyntactic calques in verbs and nouns.
3. Syntactic calques in the use of numerous connective particles.
4. Lack of mandatory vocalic elision of articles el and la to l’ and preposition de to d’ when followed by vowels.

1. Non-standard use of unstressed or ‘weak’ personal pronouns (’pronoms clitics’): Catalan and Castilian pronominal systems are considerably different in a number of aspects; furthermore, spoken varieties—especially in the case of Catalan—contain a number of distinctive features with regard to standard varieties. According to the data encountered in the corpus, the Catalan pronominal system as spoken by our subjects shows clear signs of convergence towards that of spoken Castilian. The main characteristics of this convergence are:

1.1. Non-standard use of adverbial pronouns en, hi (cf. en, y in French). These pronouns may replace uncountable direct object (en) and prepositional phrases (en, hi). Modern Castilian does not have any pronominal equivalent to these pronouns. Our subjects often fail to use these pronouns in obligatory contexts and, on the other hand, use them in contexts where they are superfluous according to the standard language.

(29) JCV instead of on n’hi ha:: pilotes
     on hi ha:: pilotes
     JCV (c 4057) where are some balls

(30) MCG quan (hi) puc anar pues: (..) (hi) vaig
     MCG (z 5838) when I can go (there) then: (..) I go (there)

1.2. Confusion in the use of accusative ho -without equivalence in Castilian-, supplanted -or replaced- by accusative el, la -following Castilian lo, la-.

(31) JRS pero: als dibuixos podrien fer que: eh: llavons de ("en comptes de") de matar-los_ ho
     ("els") pod(r)iBen ficar a la presó_
     JRS but: in the cartoons they could arrange it so that: er: instead of killing them_ they could
     put it ("them") in jail
     (c 3442)
1.3. Rearrangements in the use of dative and accusative of third person singular and plural forms. This is a particularly unstable area in standard Castilian (cf. Alarcos, 1994: 202ff), where, among other phenomena, the sing. dative le 'to him, to her' seems to be advancing at expenses of dative plural les 'to them', and accusative masc. lo, los 'him, 'them' and feminine la, las 'her 'them'.

Catalan as spoken by the informants shows signs of convergence along the same lines: singular dative li adopts the function of (spoken) plural accusative els hi and of accusatives el, els, la, les.

(32) DLA si li donaven cops de cops de pilota ((a les nenes))
and if they hit to her ((the girls)) with the balls
(a 119)

(33) FGB per assustar-li
FGB to scare to him
(e 4057)

The trend to reduce dat. pl. els hi to li is so strong that it reaches pronominal combinations: that, spoken forms such as els hi (DO pl + IO) is also sometimes replaced by l’hi.

(34) GBG pero io crec que l’hi diria als’ meus pares
instead of pero io crec que els hi diria al(s’) meus pares
GBG but I think I would say it to my parents
(y 4121)

Also a (relatively) new analogic form lis (cf. Cast. les) is occasionally used for dative plural instead of colloquial els hi or standard els.

(35) DCV i_ el va tallar el cap
instead of i_ li va tallar el cap
DCV and_ he cut him his head
instead of and_ he cut his head
(j 2152)

Convergence accounts only for part of the phenomena: the converse trends are also detected, with the use of accusatives (e.g. el, els, la, les) instead of dative li:

(36) NAK [1 si a ells lis agrada_]
instead of [1 si a ells els hi agrada_]
NAK [1 if they like it_]
(c 4090)

1.4. Calque in pronouns combination on the basis of Castilian patterns: this phenomenon affects primarily the combination of 3rd. sing./pl. dative pronoun + 3rd. accusative pronoun. Spoken Catalan in Barcelona these combinations are simplified in els hi. Some subjects of this study often created analogic forms on the Castilian pattern: s’ho (cf. Cast. se lo), se’l (cf. Cast.
se lo), se’ls (cf. Cast. se los), etc.

(37) VGO no pero perquè s’ho hauran dit
    Instead of l’hi hauran dit
    VGO no but because they may have told him
(c 3997)

Regarding the frequency of occurrence of each phenomena, graph 6.5 and appendix 6 confirm that irregularities concerning pronouns en, hi account for a majority of cases.

![Graph 6.5. Catalan 'weak pronouns' affected by language contact. Percentages](image)

It should be pointed out that the irregularities described above include both non-standard pronominal deletion and pronominal overuse. While the high percentages reached by irregularities concerning en, hi may result somewhat surprising, these results may seem explained by their high frequency of occurrence in spoken Catalan in comparison with their absence from Castilian.

Despite these results, standard uses also appear in the corpus. Thus, it is a fact that a certain degree of variation is allowed to the speakers in this field. Only research expressly focussed on pronominal issues may discover the current processes of language change.

2. Calques affecting verbs and nouns: A variety of phenomena approach Catalan as spoken by our subjects to Castilian.

2.1. A number of verbs change from one conjugation to another under the influence of their Castilian counterpart, such as admitir instead of admitre (Cast. admitir) 'to admit'

2.2. Some transitive verbs become intransitive verbs, as in the cases of aprofitar 'take advantage'; entrenar 'to train'.

(38) XMS [io vaig a: entrenar_]

XMS [I train_]
2.2. Some verbs become pronominal, according to their Castilian equivalents: *quedar-se* (cf. Cast. *quedarse*) 'to remain'; *parar-se* (cf. Cast. *pararse*) 'to stop'; *trobar-se* (Cast. *encontrarse*) 'to run into / to meet someone’.

(39)  

JEO  (... pero m’he parat allà_  
JEO  (... but I stopped there_  

(40)  

FSG  i tenim que jugar\  
FSG  and we must play\  

(41)  

IKU  perquè hi ha que votar\  
IKU  for it must be voted\  

2.4. Choice of prepositions governed by a number of verbs and nouns. Ex.:

(42)  

MCP{(®) perquè fa molta pudor a vomitat_  
MCP{(®) because it stinks to vomit_  

2.5. Castilian-patterned distribution of verbal forms is not rare in the Catalan used by the subjects. Some of these cases are widespread among the Catalan-speaking language community, such as the use of future to express probability instead of a verbal periphrasis with the auxiliary *deure*:

(43)  

JBC  sí_ si l’hauràs sentit la Guinguia (”cònsola") per la tele de la Sega\  
instead of sí_ si la deus haver sentit la Guinguia per la tele de la Sega\  
JBC  yes_ you have probably heard of it Sega’s Guinguia ((a console") on the T.V.\  
(w 2267)

Other cases are not so widespread as in the case of calquing a near future on the Castilian pattern *ir a + INF* 'to be going to + INF’, non-existent in (standard) Catalan.

(44)  

EBG  (... què vas a fer a les vacances_  
instead of (..) què faràs_  
EBG  (...) what are you going to do on holidays_  

(45)  

JCV  com vem quedar/  
instead of com hem quedat/
Finally, a number of cases correspond to deficiencies in proficiency (or, alternatively, to slips of the tongue):

(46) SLJ no has agafat res res res/ instead of no has agafat res res res/
     SLJ you have not taken anything at all/ instead of you have not taken anything at all/
     (u 7786)

(47) JEO quan eh: (ens n') anàven a les cinc/
     (j 2630)

2.6. In a few cases, it is the nouns’ gender that is transformed according to the Castilian model, such as in the case of *el dent* (masc.) instead of *la dent* (fem.) (Cast. *el diente*) ‘tooth’

3. Calque / convergence in the use of a number of prepositions

3.1. Non-deletion of prepositions *amb* ‘with’, *de* ‘of’, *en* ‘in’ before conjunction *que*.

(48) ERL que: no estic_ que: no estic d’acord amb que_ amb lo que ha dit el Amp_ th:t I do not agree with the fact that_ with what Amp has just said_
     (c 3148)


(49) ANA [triga] molt en fer els altres temes_
     ANA [it takes him] too much to explain the other themes
     (w 148)

3.3. Use of preposition *a* ‘to’ to introduce direct object.

(50) EBG felicitem a la Nmf_ la Ejc i la Ncp\ we congratulate Nmf_ Ejc and Ncp\
     EBF (a 38)

3.4. Deletion of preposition *de* in its functions as a partitive.

(51) XMS un (de) gran i un (de) petit\ a big one and a small one\
4. **Lack of mandatory vocalic reduction**: Articles *el* and *la* to *l*’ and preposition *de* to *d’.*

(52) ICE  
el idioma no dic que s’assembli_
I’m not saying that the language looks alike_
(51355)

(53) ACB  
l’última de divendres_
Friday’s last one_
(u 7331)

(54) DGS  
perquè de una fulla_
because_ from a leaf_
(c 3556)

5. **Other phenomena**: Other language contact phenomena reach lower proportions:

5.1. Lack of contraction of preposition and article in *per + el > pel* -cf. Cast. *por el* ‘by the’.

5.2. Use of determiners and prepositions in a number of locutions, such as in *al terra* instead of *a terra* ‘on the floor’, (Cast. *en el suelo*); *en broma* instead of *de broma* ‘for fun’ (Cast. *en broma*); *pel mati* instead of *al mati* ‘in the morning’ (Cast. *por la mañana*).

(55) MCG  
deixa-ho al terra\leave it on the ground\(z 5908)

5.3. Changes in the word order. Ex.: *la teva casa* instead of *casa teva* ‘your home’.

(56) ICE  
[a sobre] que t’aguanta a la teva casa_  
[on top of that] she puts up with you at your home_
(s 2426)
Table 6.29. Morphosyntactic phenomena of language contact in Catalan utterances recorded 5 or more times\textsuperscript{94}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Tokens</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>vanar a + infinitive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>què vas a fer a les vacances_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>canviar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>i me cànvio d'escola_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>ho instead of la</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ho tornaran a donar_ ((una sèrie))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>per instead of a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>i per la tarda/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>future instead of deure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>no sé si t'ho hauran explicat_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>verbal person</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>i io li vas ((sic)) dir que era l'Alberto_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>imperfect of indic. instead of conditional</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>pues io: agafava i els tirava la cartera\_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>el instead of li</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>i_ el va tallar el cap\_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>en instead of a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>en el istiu_ (...) puè::s_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>hi superfluous</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>aque(s)t any hi vaig a Salamanca\_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>l'hi instead of els hi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>pero io crec que l'hi diria al(s') meus pares_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>estudiar</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>i estudía\_ no sè_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>ho elided</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>per això (ho) pots fer_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>s'ho instead of li ho</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>no s'ho diràs/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>a introducing a direct object</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>el que he vist és que a les filles les protegeixen...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>de partitive, elided</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>no_ un (de) més fàcil_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>li as a direct object</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>això li li fereix molt/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>li as a plural dative</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>què li ha [passat a aque(s)t] a(r)bres_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>caure's instead of caure</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>però no es va caure sense voler_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>en superfluous</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>sí_ n'hi han bosses allà_ encara\_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>la + vowel</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>[2 tu dius que la violència és la única manera_]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>el + vowel</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>però si el altre diu_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>tenir que</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>la tens que buscar_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>hi elided</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>(...) que io una que io una estona (hi) he jugat_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>en elided</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>i no ens (en) anem_</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C: syntactic categories affected by the phenomenon (see section 6.3.3.2; CT = prepositions and conjunctions); Tokens number of tokens.

\textbf{6.4.2 \hspace{1em} Castilian}

Morphosyntactic transcodic markers of Catalan origin in Castilian are much rarer, and most of

\textsuperscript{94}Types are described in relation with their standard equivalents. Thus, 'superfluous' implies that it should not be used in that context according to prescriptive criteria, and 'elided' means 'unduely elided according to the standard norms'. Nevertheless, these descriptions should not be taken as evaluations of the items 'correctness' or 'adequacy', for this issue is simply beyond the scope of the present research.
them appear only once or twice in the corpus. Three areas seem to be the most relevant:

1. Use of grammatical connectives.
2. Verbal morphology
3. Nominal morphology

1. **Use of grammatical connectives**: Some of the subjects display non-standard patterns of language use regarding prepositions and conjunctions.

1.1. Some tokens of interrogative expletive particle *que*.

(57) NAK que hay palos_
instead of hay palos_

NAK are there any sticks_
(f 5507)

1.2. Introduction of expletive *que* in exclamations.

(58) MCG qué tonto [1 que eres]
instead of qué tonto [1 eres]

MCG how stupid [1 you are]
(s 3152)

1.3. Non-standard deletion of preposition *a* to introduce direct object.

(59) ZMR{(EV) ah sí sí y encontramos (a) unos japoneses_ (..) que eran [1 muy simpáticos_]

ZMR{(EV) oh yeah\ and we met some Japanese_ (..) who were [1 very kind_]
(i 165)

It should be remembered, though, that this phenomenon is not unknown outside the Catalan-speaking territories.

1.4. Confusion between prepositions *a* and *en*, and between *en* and *con*.

(60) ESG eh_ la Mmu se ha quedado a la tienda\n
ESG hey_ Mmu stayed in the shop\n(s 2777)

2. **Verbal morphology**

2.1. The most significant phenomenon is the quasi systematic use of *ves*, imperative 2 singular 'go' (Cat. *vés*) instead of standard Cast. *ve*. This use reaches such proportions that can be considered the standard form for this verb in the community -if not in the whole of Catalonia-.

2.2. Two tokens of a potential transcodic marker are of remarkable interest: it is the agreement in gender between past participle and D.O. weak pronoun, a phenomenon which is nowadays
receding in Catalan and has no currency in Castilian.

\[(61)\] NKU \(...\) la has hecho/
instead of \(...\) la has hecho/
\[\text{NKU} \quad \text{(...)} \text{ have you done (FEM) it (FEM) instead of \(\text{(...)} \text{ have you done (MASC) it (FEM) (g 6971)\)}

\[(62)\] SFB \(...\) que: que ellas no la han plantado_
instead of \(...\) que: que ellas no la han plantado_
\[\text{SFB} \quad \text{(...)} \text{ that they have not left (FEM) her alone instead of \(\text{(...)} \text{ that they have not left (MASC) her alone (h 8257)\)}

While it is true that this agreement is still alive in Catalan and is promoted by the normative language, it is also true that these two instances do not constitute enough evidence to clearly state this is a sample of Catalan impact on the subjects Castilian.

3. Nominal morphology: The case of gender change presented by the use of la calor -feminine- instead of el calor, Cat. la calor was included among potential language contact phenomena. Nevertheless, this feature is by no means an undoubted transcodic marker, for this usage is not at all unknown in non-standard Castilian of monolingual regions.

Table 6.30. Morphosyntactic phenomena of language contact in Castilian utterances recorded 5 or more times.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Tokens</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a introducing direct object, elided</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>y:_ y encuentras (a) una sola persona\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ves instead of ve</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(...) Quico ves pintando\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qué... que instead of qué + 0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>{(P) qué subnormal que eres}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.3 Comparative relevance of morphosyntactic interference

Syntactic resemblance limits the points at which convergence and/or interference may take place. Thorough bilinguality among the subjects further reduces their possibilities. Thus, it is not at all surprising that the amount of types and tokens of morphosyntactic interference do not reach large proportions.

Table 6.31 makes evident that morphosyntactic transcodic markers abound more in Catalan than in Castilian, to the point that the latter language appears largely immune to these phenomena.
Table 6.31: Number of morphosyntactic language contact phenomena in each language according to their syntactic category. Tokens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Determiner</th>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Connect.*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubtful</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Connectives include prepositions, conjunctions and one adverb.

The categories affected by language contact are notably different in each language: pronouns are by far the most deeply modified morphosyntactic elements in Catalan, while they do not seem to be affected at all in Castilian; on the contrary, it is prepositions and conjunctions that undergo the most significant transformations in Castilian, although they remain considerably below the score obtained by Catalan connectives. Finally, verbs experience a roughly comparable influence in both languages in relative terms. Percentages are illustrated in graph 6.6.

The Chi square test shows that the probability that these differences are random are extremely small ($p \leq 0.0001$).

Table 6.32. Difference between Catalan and Castilian regarding morphosyntactic language contact. Tokens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Min E.F.</th>
<th>Cells with E.F. &lt; 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>147.85996</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>8.445</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Missing Observations = 0

These results become even more evident when morphosyntactic contact phenomena are analysed in relation with the whole corpus. Thus, the percentages of Catalan-influenced Castilian utterances and Castilian-influenced Catalan utterances reach the percentages displayed in table 6.33. As in the case of vocabulary, comparison between types and tokens of both Catalan and Castilian items of language contact at the morphosyntactic level leave little doubt about the predominant weight and direction of language contact. In fact, and according to these data, the subjects' Castilian seems significantly untainted by the other language
pressure, while this is by no means the case the other way round.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Morphosynt. markers</th>
<th>Total number of words</th>
<th>Percentage of TM over words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>42819</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52645</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>95464</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical results point to a highly significant difference: it is not random that Catalan utterances include more lexical items carrying morphosyntactic transcodic markers (p \( \leq 0.0001 \)).

Table 6.34. Lexical items affected by morphosyntactic contact phenomena in Catalan vs. Castilian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Min E.F.</th>
<th>Cells with E.F. &lt; 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>830.07084</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>395.160</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>832.03274</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>(Before Yates Correction)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Missing Observations = 0

Two points should be underlined here: (a) Most morphosyntactic transcodic markers are by no means exclusive to these subjects, but rather widespread and even predominant among native speakers in the area of Barcelona. A majority of items included in numbers 2, 3, 4 and 5 and practically all the phenomena described for Castilian belong to this category. It is due to prescriptive arguments that they are regarded as transcodic markers (cf. section 6.2). Other phenomena, as those in 1, while not unknown among native speakers, are often seen as confined to speakers of Catalan as a second language (especially 1.4 and 2.5); although their extension has not yet been assessed, they seem to be spreading among the younger generations. These considerations substantially reduce the actual significance of cross-linguistic morphosyntactic impact described in this chapter as a whole. A good deal of the features described as divergent from prescriptive criteria integrate the actual standard varieties in Catalonia today, and should only be regarded as consequences of cross-linguistic influence in diachronic terms. Only studies specifically addressed to this features could establish the difference(s) among subjects.

(b) There is no single item pointing to lack of competence in Castilian morphosyntax in the whole corpus; rather, it could be claimed that the sole significant discrepancy encountered (\textit{ves} instead of \textit{ve}) should be better regarded as the Castilian standard form in Catalonia.

Conversely, a number of Catalan utterances in the corpus include morphosyntactic phenomena that bear testimony of the speaker’s feeble competence in this language:
Other examples are *havria* (cf. Cast. *habría*) instead of Cat. *hauria* 'there should be', or *cos* (cf. Cast. *cose*) instead of Cat. *cus* 'he sews'. These cases have nothing to do with the widespread morphosyntactic interferences mentioned above that are rooted in the community, have often been discussed in the relevant literature, and could be compared to established loanwords in the sense that they do not call for the activation of any Lb. The example in example 64 and others point to a limited mastering of Catalan and, as was the case with the lexical level, witness an unbalanced situation in which it is Catalan the language which not only contains more signs of language contact, but also the one in which there are more signs of incomplete L2 acquisition.

6.4.4 **Language contact at the morphosyntactic level: synthesis**

Section 6.4 has reviewed the most significant transcodic markers at the morphosyntactic level. As a general characteristic, it has to be noted that these phenomena only affect a minor percentage of utterances. The difference between languages has turned out to be highly significant: Catalan is by far the language including more phenomena of this sort, while Castilian as spoken by the subjects hardly includes an appreciable amount of them.

Regarding the nature of these phenomena, it has to be noted that most of them are by no means exclusive to the subjects, but rather general among the wider community. Most of them could even be considered standard, non-normative Catalan or regional Castilian features. One of the areas with the heaviest disturbances in comparison with the standard language is that of personal weak pronouns in Catalan. Special attention will have to be devoted to this area, for signs of increasing convergence towards Castilian are clearly apparent in the trends displayed by the subjects.
6.5 Intrasentential code-switching

Section 6.2.3 showed the distribution of clear one-word switches and multiple-word switches, and the criteria to distinguish switching from borrowing. Typologic proximity offers *a priori* ample room for intrasentential code-switching of the smoothest types, for little syntactic incongruence would arise, were speakers to engage in such a practice. Nevertheless, intrasentential code-switching achieves minor relevance from a quantitative point of view in the corpus researched. In spite of linguistic facilities, less than 1.4% of the utterances may be said to include intrasentential code-switches of any sort (see table below).

![Table 6.35. Number of utterances including intrasentential codeswitching (ICS).](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N. of utter. including ICS</th>
<th>N. of utterances</th>
<th>% of ut. with ICS over N. of utter.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>21897</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When only multiple-word code-switches are taken into account, the percentage is even smaller: 103 utterances with multiple-word intrasentential switches represent just 0.43% of the total amount of utterances produced by the subjects. Thus, in spite of the ample structural possibilities, in the context here studied intrasentential switching constitutes a clear transgression of the rule which requires utterances to be monolingual.

The syntactic categories affected by intrasentential multiple-word switches are shown in table 6.36 below. Leaving aside the considerable percentage of switches for which no clear conclusion could be arrived at regarding switching point, the rest of the table offers no big surprises.

![Table 6.36. Number of intrasentential multiple-word switches according to syntactic categories. Absolute and relative frequency of appearance.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Relative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourse markers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun phrases</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositional phrases</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective subordinate clause</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbial subordinate clause</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun Subordinate clause</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Phrase</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubtful</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NPs predominate, followed by VPs, PPs and ADV Subordinate clauses. It should be
remembered here that conjoined sentences were classified whenever possible in different records, so they now stand as intersentential switches and do not appear in this table.

Most multiple-word switches in the corpus appeared at constituent borders, but not all of them. A number of switches took place between auxiliary and main verb, determiner and noun, such as in:

(64) MCG aunque no haya **ficot la mà al foc_ sempre ha dit alguna cosa_ ia_**

MCGalthough he ha not **put his hand in the fire_ he's always said something**

(z 6910)

Examples such as this one may contradict some hypothesis of grammatical constraints. Nevertheless, the study of grammatical constraints *per se* not being a goal of the present research, it will not be pursued here.

The transgressional nature of intrasentential code-switching is made clear by its functional analysis. When classified from a functional point of view, intrasentential utterances serve the same purposes as intersentential ones described in chapter 5.3. Only a few functions, such as choice rectification, should be incorporated to the list:

1. Discourse-related reasons:
   1.1. Choice rectification:

(65) JCV DGS (...) me pasai(s') el ne: - no no no\el taronja/ JCV DGS (...) can you give me the blak- no no no\ the orange one/

(e 2420)

1.2. Linguistic game:

(66) JBC má(s') *mulucud°\(<$ Cast. melocotón x Cat. phonological rules) JBC more peach/

(o 4592)

1.3. Lexical and discourse cohesion:
   1.3.1. Internal to the interaction:

(67) Ana and Jbc talking about the school council in which Jbc's actions were being judged. JBC ANA **va_ va dir al Rpt_** JBC ANA bueno va_ po(s') bajamos\ *JBC ANA vale_ po(s') bajamos\ *ANA JBC pero no és qüestió de bajamos\ *ANA JBC bajamos\ *ANA JBC y tú detrás\ *JBC ANA (...) va dir detrás\ *JBC ANA pero no delante_ pe(r')iquè sí no_ ANA JBC pero va_ [pero tu_ a ve(u)re_ XXXx] tu va_ vés a parlar amb l'Eva\
JBC ANA he told he told Rpt_
JBC ANA OK let’s go_ so let’s go downstairs\n*BNC ANA right_ so let’s go downstairs\n*ANA JBC but it’s not a question of let’s go downstairs_
*ANA JBC let’s go downstairs_
*ANA JBC and you behind\n*JBC ANA (...) he said behind_
JBC ANA but not before_ for in that case_
ANA JBC but all right_ [but then you_ let’s see_ xXXx] you come on_ you go to talk with Eva_
(v 11298)

1.3.2. External to the interaction:

Some minutes after the monitor has explained in Catalan that each group of pupils should prepare only one leaf
ICE <2> {<P cuàntas fulle(s’) cada uno_} 
ICE <2> {<P how many leaves for each one_} 
(s 2892)

Cohesion includes mockery of other subjects’ linguistic mistakes:

Talking about sports.
DGG el meu germà_
JCR XVM el Jst: es va quitar\"(“se salió”)
DGG XVM (...) es va quitar_
MCP [es va quitar_] 
JMS [també (hi) anava_] 
IKU [2 es va quitar_] 
MCP [2 es va quitar_] 
DGG my brother_
JCR XVM Jst: quitted\ 
DGG XVM (...) quitted_ 
MCP [quitted_] 
JMS [be used to go as well_] 
IKU [2 quitted_] 
MCP [2 quitted_] 
(w 474)

2. Non-discourse related reasons

2.1. Conscious switches for self-facilitatory purposes in cases of hesitation, lack of self-confidence, etc.

Discussing in class about violence on TV cartoons.
JRG MONque: si_ (..) que si: no hubiera ehem ehem {(!?) núvols_} haguessin: {(AC) hubiera anat} el Songoku a la terra haguessin enviat el Rabit +_
JRG MONhac: if_ (..) that if: there were ehem ehem {(!?) clouds_} they would had: {(AC) they would had gone} Songoku to the earth_ they would had sent Rabit +_
(c 3604)

2.2. Unconscious switches, both due to lapsus linguæ and to lack of proficiency.

VGO que: xXXx poden gust- ehh: agradar_ 
VGO que: xXXx they may beli- er: liked_
(c 3370)
These switches can be corrected by the speaker him/herself or by peer-pressure (as in the first *quitar* in 1.3.2 above), but they can also go unnoticed - or at least left uncorrected - by the speaker and his/her interlocutors.

(72)  

To synthesise, in more than one third of intrasentential multiple word switches it is not possible to determine exactly where the switch starts and what its actual dimension is, for homophonous words mask the borders between one language and the other. This coincidence should nevertheless not lead to believe that coincidence *promotes* switching: from a quantitative point of view, intrasentential code-switching constitutes a phenomenon of secondary importance. This low frequency probably underlines its transgressive nature.

Noun phrases are the most frequently switched constituents, followed by verbal and prepositional phrases, and by adverbial subordinates. The other instances only achieve marginal results.
6.6 Transcodic markers and family language groups

6.6.1 Lexical transcodic markers and family language group

We have so far assumed that Catalan and Castilian as spoken by the subjects studied here follow coherent norms, but it should not be forgotten that these subjects include native speakers of either language as well as family bilinguals, and they comprehend speakers highly skilled in both Catalan and Castilian next to imbalanced bilinguals. Now that the characteristics of both Catalan and Castilian in terms of language contact phenomena have been described, it is high time to scrutinize whether significant between-group differences may be discovered.

I Lexical transcodic markers according to family language group

A significant question in the analysis of the subjects' transcodic markers is the extent to which they share the same trends in their use. In other words, do subjects use language contact phenomena in different proportions? Table 6.37 tries to give an answer to this question.

Table 6.37. Number of lexical transcodic markers in each language according to the speakers' family language group (FLG). Tokens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLG</th>
<th>In Catalan</th>
<th>In Castilian</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>1806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chi square test confirms that the difference in the total number of lexical transcodic markers in Catalan and Castilian according to the speakers' family language is indeed significant ($p \leq 0.0001$).

Table 6.38. Difference in the appearance of lexical transcodic markers in Catalan and Castilian between Catalan, bilingual and Castilian speakers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Min E.F.</th>
<th>Cells with E.F. &lt; 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.51867</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>59.792</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Missing Observations = 0

This significance is confirmed when the total number of lexical transcodic markers produced in Catalan and Castilian by each family language group is compared with the total amount of words (cf. table 6.38).
Table 6.39. Difference in the appearance of lexical transcoding markers in relation with non-transcopic markers (in both Catalan and Castilian) between Catalan, bilingual and Castilian speakers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Min E.F.</th>
<th>Cells with E.F. &lt; 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94.02491</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>356.115</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Number of Missing Observations = 0

Hence, there exists a difference between both family language groups when both languages are considered together. Does it persist when each language is considered separately? Let us take each language at a time.

## II Lexical transcoding markers in Catalan

The analysis of the number of lexical transcoding markers in Catalan disconfirms the hypothesis that any language group produces a significantly larger number of lexical transcoding markers than the others in its Catalan speech.

Table 6.40. Difference in the appearance of lexical transcoding markers in relation with non-transcopic markers in Catalan between family language groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Min E.F.</th>
<th>Cells with E.F. &lt; 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.05552</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.0798</td>
<td>398.248</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Number of Missing Observations = 0

Does this mean that Catalan, bilingual and Castilian speakers share exactly the same strategies in their management of lexical transcoding markers? Not necessarily. A more nuanced analysis may lead to discover relevant differences in the sort of markers used by each family language group. Note what happens when lexical markers are divided into calques, switches and loanwords.

Table 6.41. Number of lexical transcoding markers in Catalan utterances according to the speakers’ family language group (FLG) Tokens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLG</th>
<th>Calques</th>
<th>Switches</th>
<th>Loanwords</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>1527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There appears to be a difference between groups, for one-word switches -i.e. lexical units of
Castilian origin with a very low rate of occurrence- are much more frequent in Castilian speakers' Catalan utterances. This is seen in graph 6.7: Although the difference is small, Catalan speakers' transcoding markers include more established loanwords than their Castilian peers.

A Chi square test allows to assess the significance of such differences.

Table 6.42. Difference in the use of calques, one-word switches and loanwords in Catalan between family language groups. Tokens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Min E.F.</th>
<th>Cells with E.F. &lt; 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.08809</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>25.592</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Missing Observations = 0

Table 6.43. Difference in the use of calques, one-word switches and loanwords in Catalan between family language groups. Types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Min E.F.</th>
<th>Cells with E.F. &lt; 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.13421</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.0012</td>
<td>18.390</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Missing Observations = 0

The difference turns out significant for both tokens and types: Catalan, bilingual and Castilian-speaking subjects present significant differences in the use they make of the different strategies to incorporate lexical transcoding markers, with Catalan speakers using fewer switches than bilinguals, and these alternating less than Castilian speakers.

III Lexical transcoding markers in Castilian

The amount of transcoding markers in Castilian speech is much lower than in Catalan, as proved by table 6.43.
Table 6.43. Number of lexical transcoding markers in Castilian utterances according to the speakers’ family language group (FLG). Tokens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLG</th>
<th>Calques</th>
<th>Switches</th>
<th>Loanwords</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of the subjects’ Castilian confirms the lack of statistical significance of the difference existing between subjects according to their family language group and their use of lexical transcoding markers (p ≥ 0.05).

Table 6.44. Lexical transcoding markers in Castilian and family language group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Min E.F.</th>
<th>Cells with E.F. &lt; 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.68397</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.1585</td>
<td>34.215</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Missing Observations = 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, distinguishing lexical transcoding markers into calques, loanwords and switches may unveil between-group variation that was masked by the global analysis (see graph 6.8) Calques clearly predominate in all three groups; again, it is the group a priori less competent in this language (in this case, Catalan speakers), the one in which switches reach higher proportions. Nevertheless, it should not be forgotten that we are always talking about percentages well below 1% of the total.

The Chi square test applied to the analysis of tokens finds a significant difference between the strategies of lexical incorporation developed by Catalan, bilingual and Castilian-speaking subjects. Nevertheless, this difference is considerably less than in the previous case, and,
importantly enough, it is not supported by the analysis of types. This results suggest that differences in Castilian are by far smaller than in Catalan.

Table 6.45. Difference in the appearance of calques, one-word switches and loanwords in Castilian utterances between the family language groups. Tokens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Min E.F.</th>
<th>Cells with E.F. &lt; 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.34078</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.0063</td>
<td>9.403</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Missing Observations = 0

Table 6.46. Difference in the appearance of calques, one-word switches and loanwords in Castilian utterances according to family language group. Types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Min E.F.</th>
<th>Cells with E.F. &lt; 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.45465</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.1677</td>
<td>5.600</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Missing Observations = 0

IV Most frequent lexical transcodic markers.

With regards to the most frequent lexical transcodic markers -i.e., the most widespread loanwords-, no apparent difference is detected. All groups share practically all the most frequent transcodic markers with few discrepancies.

Table 6.47. Lexical transcodic markers recorded more than 10 times per FLG. Tokens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalan</th>
<th>Bilingual</th>
<th>Castilian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pero</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estar</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bueno</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pues</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tio</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vale</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Después</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hombre</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>mol(^{96})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the first five items are completely coincident, and that the rest of the list

\(^{95}\) tio = noun: el tio aquell... ‘that guy...’ ; tio 2 = discourse marker: para, tio 'hey you stop that'.

\(^{96}\) Instead of gaire.
is highly congruous. The most surprising result may be that of finding pero 'but' (Cat. però) at the top in the three lists, for this is not one most frequently cited in the literature; this lexical item has indeed experienced a stunning expansion among these subjects, and, although it has still not completely displaced the standard variant, seems to be gaining currency among the younger generation.

Conversely, some classic 'barbarismes' such as hombre 'guy', después 'after, later', lo 'neuter pronoun', achieve much lower results than expected, and are restricted to a sole group -in fact, to a reduced number of speakers. It is possible that the school's insistence has succeeded in promoting the standard alternatives home, después, el, which are quite frequent among the subjects.

Turning to Castilian, no lexical transcodic marker achieves a minimum of 10 tokens in all three family language groups. In fact, only one of them, the discourse marker éh, a question tag comparable to 'isn't it?', 'am I?', etc., from Cat. [E] or [e], reaches a significant presence: 21 tokens in bilinguals' utterances and 44 in Castilian speakers' utterances.

V Lexical transcodic markers and family language group: conclusions

Several comments are pertinent on these results. The presence of lexical transcodic markers is homogeneously low, and no quantitative difference can be detected between Catalan, bilingual and Castilian-speaking subjects in the total amount of lexical transcodic markers for any of their two languages. Nevertheless, significant differences appear when the sorts of markers employed by each group are analysed, especially regarding Catalan utterances.

The interpretation of these results is not straightforwad. They suggest that, at a lexical level, first language does not produce large differences, although minor differences can indeed be detected. In other words, first languages do not favour dramatic increases / decreases in the global number of transcodic markers, but differences between groups still exist in that subjects use more one-word switches when speaking their second language, be it Catalan or Castilian. This is to say that, in the context studied here, second language speakers tend to incorporate more lexical items from their respective L1 into their L2. Differences between L1 and L2 speakers seem considerably more significant in Catalan speech than in Castilian.

It should be pointed that no dramatic gap exists between groups in any language. How can this be combined with the certainty that Catalan standards among these subjects were considerably lower than Castilian standards? It might be argued that the data come from naturally occurring situations in a highly bilingual context where the subjects felt relatively free to use whatever language they preferred and/or to remain silent if they preferred so. That is, apart from the interviews -in fact, not even there, as proved by section 5.3- no speaker was forced to speak a language he/she did not feel comfortable enough with; even the fifth grade teacher's encouragement to speak Catalan in class was effectively resisted by Map (section 5.3, ex.36) without much tension, and no such circumstance was encountered outside the class domain. As
a consequence, subjects with a dominant/preferred language could maintain this language. Thus, each language was only spoken by subjects with a fair competence in it, and it is not surprising, then, that results show similarities in the appearance of transcodic markers.

The high coincidence found in the most frequent transcodic markers used by the subjects from all groups confirms that their varieties are not diverging from each other, at least as far as transcodic markers are concerned. From the point of view of lexical transcodic markers, no Catalan-as-a-second-language variety, or ‘immersion-Catalan sociolect’ seems to be developing. In fact, the subjects’ Catalan-and most probably their Castilian—does not constitute a particular school variety, but rather contains the same vocabulary, and therefore, the same calques and loanwords, as that of the mainstream society.

6.6.2 Morphosyntactic contact and family language groups

I Catalan

The distribution of morphosyntactic transcodic markers in each language according to the family language group shows some relevant patterns. In absolute numbers, Castilian speakers more than double the scores of Catalan and bilingual speakers.

Table 6.48. Morphological markers (MTM) in relation with total number of words in Catalan utterances, according to Family language group (FLG).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects' FLG</th>
<th>N. MTM</th>
<th>N. words</th>
<th>% N. MTM over N. words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>12583</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>11640</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>18596</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>42819</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As expected, Castilian speakers produce a higher percentage of morphosyntactic language contact phenomena than any other group. The difference between Catalan, Castilian and bilingual speakers is substantially significant, as witnessed by the table below.

Table 6.49. Morphosyntactic language contact phenomena in Catalan according to family language group. Tokens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Min E.F.</th>
<th>Cells with E.F. &lt; 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37.85930</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>211.493</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Missing Observations = 0

Regarding categories, the items affected by morphosyntactic contact phenomena do not show important differences between the family language groups, as table 6.50 makes clear.

Table 6.50. Number of morphosyntactic transcoding markers in Catalan utterances according to the speakers' family language group (FLG). Tokens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLG</th>
<th>Determiners</th>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Connect.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of differences confirms that they are clearly not significant from a statistical point of view (p ≥ 0.05).

Table 6.51. Difference of appearance of morphosyntactic language contact phenomena in Catalan for each syntactic category according to family language group. Tokens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Min E.F.</th>
<th>Cells with E.F. &lt; 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.55836</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.3636</td>
<td>16.743</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Missing Observations = 0

Turning to the most frequent morphosyntactic phenomena in each group, it is evident that a number of morphosyntactic contact phenomena seem to be globally widespread among the three language groups, as proved by the following table.

97Nouns were added to determiners for the sake of the analysis.
Table 6.52. Morphosyntactic transcoding markers recorded more than 4 times in at least two family language group (FLG).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Speakers' FLG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catalan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>article la + vowel</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superfluous weak pronoun en</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>article el + vowel</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak pronoun hi elided</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal periphrasis tenir que</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak pronoun en elided</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are few discrepancies between bilinguals and Catalan speakers. Castilian speakers, on the contrary, diverge from their peers in that many of their transcoding markers seem clearly determined by their first language, and are not necessarily shared by their classmates.

Table 6.53. Morphosyntactic transcoding markers recorded more than 4 times among Castilian speakers (including those in table 6.52).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preposition en instead of a</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undue verbal person</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superfluous a introducing direct object</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de partitive, elided</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak pronoun s'ho x li ho</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superfluous weak pronoun en</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak pronoun li as a direct object</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak pronoun li dative plural</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronominal verb caure's</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article la + vowel</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article el + vowel</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak pronoun hi elided</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal periph. tenir que</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak pronoun en elided</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides this clearly divergent pattern, all morphosyntactic irregular tokens that were considered as the result of lack of competence in Catalan (see section 6.6) are to be attributed to Castilian speakers. Thus, some of the features as vicut instead of viscuit, past participle of viure, 'to live' or havria instead of hauria, conditional of haver 'auxiliary to have' (Cast. habria), produced by Castilian speakers with weak competence in Catalan, denounce their lack
of competence in spoken Catalan.

(73) MFV que: és com si nosaltres vol- vol- driaem ((CONDITIONAL)) ressuscitar els nostres amics_ instead of volguéssim ((SUBJUNCTIVE))

MFV that it is as if we wa- wa- would want to ressuscitate our friends_
(c 3596)

(74) MAP i io li vas ((3rd pers.)) dir que era l’Aop_ instead of vaig ((1st pers))

MAP and I told him it was Aop_
(a 850)

'Weak pronouns' constitute again a pertinent field of analysis to check between-groups variation. Table 6.54 and graph 6.9 show clearly that the three family language groups coincide in the most significant trends: serious irregularities in the use of *en*, *hi* and frequent instances of irregularities in the use of the 'weak pronouns'.

Table 6.54. Number of Catalan *weak pronouns* affected by irregularities according to the speakers’ FLG. Tokens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Catalan</th>
<th>Bilingual</th>
<th>Castilian</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>en</em></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hi</em></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another point of minor between-group discrepancy is found in the higher use of the sing. dat. *li* -and combination *l’hi* instead of the corresponding plural forms among Castilian speakers than in the other groups (see graph 6.9 below). Nevertheless, the phenomenon is not unknown among Catalan and bilingual speakers.

The data suggest that Castilian-speakers not only produce most of the irregularities in the pronominal system, but are also the only group where several of the most divergent forms are encountered. Forms such as *les* (ac. fem. pl.) instead of spoken Cat. dat. pl. *els hi* (cf. Cast. *les*),
and combinations such as s’ho, se’l, se’ls calqued on Castilian equivalents (se lo, se lo, se los) instead of spoken Cat. l’hi / els hi are only produced by Castilian speakers.

Thus, a potential distinction arises from the wide variety of pronominal irregularities and morphosyntactic language contact phenomena in general as detected in the corpus. On the one hand, and at least in the cases such as those of en, hi, -and perhaps also in the incipient adoption of sing. dat. instead of pl. and the use of dat. pl. lis instead of spoken Cat. els hi-, the spread of pronominal irregular use to Catalan and bilingual speakers suggests that unilateral language convergence from Catalan towards Castilian is in progress. In this case, the subjects’ Catalan might be approaching the trends described for spoken Castilian.

On the other hand, other phenomena of lower frequency and exclusively produced by (some) Castilian-speaking children may be better regarded as facilitatory first language transfer. On the whole, though, the corpus remains too small to obtain definitive conclusions on the issue of pronominal contact.

II Castilian

The examination of Castilian utterances yields a completely different picture. Leaving aside the much scarcer number of transcodic markers detected in the corpus, table 6.55 below makes it clear that there are few differences across groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLG</th>
<th>MSM</th>
<th>N. words</th>
<th>N. MSM over N. words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7263</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10026</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35356</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52645</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chi square test confirms the non-relevance of between-group differences (p ≥ 0.05).

Table 6.56. Morphosyntactic language contact phenomena in Castilian according to family language group. Tokens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Min E.F.</th>
<th>Cells with E.F. ≤ 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.78447</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6755</td>
<td>7.174</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Missing Observations = 0
The small amount of morphosyntactic transcodic markers encountered in Castilian utterances makes it futile to attempt an analysis of their quantitative distribution of each syntactic category across the community. As table 6.57 shows, there is little difference between the three groups in the distribution of items, which, as expected from tables in the previous sections, show their maximal scores in nexes (conjunctions, prepositions and one adverb) and verbs.

Table 6.57. Number of morphological transcodic markers in Castilian utterances according to the speakers' family language group (FLG) and.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLG</th>
<th>Determiner</th>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Connect.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III  Morphosyntactic transcodic markers and family language group: conclusions

When dealing with morphosyntactic transcodic markers, each language requires an independent comment. On the one hand, Catalan records significant between-group differences. Castilian speakers are set clearly apart from the other groups in that (a) they produce more items, and (b) they produce transcodic markers that are not shared with their class-mates, markers that can be usually related to their own L1. Thus, although transcodic markers at the morphosyntactic level are not absent from the utterances produced by Catalan and bilingual speakers, these groups remain clearly different from their Castilian speaking class-mates.

Castilian utterances show a totally different aspect. Morphosyntactic language contact phenomena are rare, and predominantly associated with a regional norm. No significant between-group difference is detected.

6.6.3  6.6.3. Intrasentential code-switching and family language group

Section 6.5 supported the hypothesis that intrasentential switching constitutes a transgression of the monolingual utterance principle. But, is it possible to detect differences in the use of intrasentential code-switching among groups?

The distinction between discourse-related and non-discourse-related intrasentential code-switching sheds light on the different patterns of language combination used by each language
group. Discourse-related switching is here understood as language alternation purposively used to organize the conversation, i.e., exploiting the meanings associated with norm transgressions in order to convey supplementary information that is relevant to the interpretation of the utterance. Non-discourse related is here understood not only in a restricted sense as pertaining to self-facilitatory switching, but also including apparently non-discourse motivated switching. Table 6.58 makes it clear that Catalan and bilingual speakers make more ample use of discourse-related switching. On the contrary, switching among Castilian speakers remains dominated by non-discourse-related reasons (cf. section 6.6.1.).

Table 6.58. Number of non-discourse-related intrasentential switches (NDS) according to the speakers' family language group (FLG).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLG</th>
<th>N. switches</th>
<th>N. NDS</th>
<th>% N. NDS over N. switches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>50.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>41.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chi square test of significance turns negative (p = 0.0002), so the null hypothesis is rejected: there is a significant difference regarding the exploitation of discourse-related switching according to family language group.

Table 6.59. Exploitation of discourse-related vs. non-discourse-related intrasentential code-switching in both languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Min E.F.</th>
<th>Cells with E.F. &lt; 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.58852</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>17.788</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Missing Observations = 0

These results can be further refined by considering the base language of the utterance. According to what was said in section 6.3.3.2, utterances including one-word switches were attributed a base language, while utterances including multiple word switches remained classified as dubious. The trends are displayed in table 6.60.
Table 6.60. Number of non-discourse-related switches in each language according to family language group (FLG).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLG</th>
<th>In Catalan</th>
<th>In Castilian</th>
<th>Dubious language</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>10.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>10.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>70.51</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>81.48</td>
<td>71.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Castilian speakers are responsible for a majority of non-discourse-related intrasentential switches not only in Catalan but also in Castilian and in utterances of dubious assignment. Graph 6.10 depicts this situation in percentual terms:

![Graph 6.10, Non-discourse-related switches produced by each FLG. Percentages](image)

The statistical analysis of the between-groups difference turns useful in assessing these quantitative distances.

Table 6.61. Differences in exploitation of discourse-related vs. non-discourse-related intrasentential code-switching in Catalan of Catalan bilingual and Castilian-speaking subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Min E.F.</th>
<th>Cells with E.F. ≤ 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.93103</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>4.660</td>
<td>1 OF 6 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Missing Observations = 0

The test is well below the level of significance (p = 0.0001). The difference in the quantitative exploitation between Catalan, bilingual and Castilian-speaking subjects is significant. Unfortunately, results for Castilian and for utterances of doubtful base language were below the number of cases necessary for statistical analysis.

What interpretation can be advanced for such results? It is obvious that a significant percentage
of these non-discourse-related switches, especially in the case of Castilian speakers' Catalan utterances, has to be interpreted in terms of lack of competence in the second language, a language that is not used by many subjects beyond the teacher-pupil interactions. A significant difference may be detected among groups: not only Castilian speakers make ampler use of non-discourse-related intrasentential switching, but also, their competence-related switches concern linguistic items of a more basic nature than those which cause Catalan and bilingual speakers to switch. Thus, some Castilian speakers may switch for elementary items such as *quitar-se* 'to leave' or *curso* 'grade', while Catalan and bilingual speakers' lack of competence in Castilian affects subtler notions such as *sangtraït* 'particular sort of) bruise'. Occasional slips of the tongue are also produced in each one's first language (*e.g.* *subir-me*), but immediately corrected.

Nevertheless, a small number of instances escape this straightforward interpretations, especially in the case of Castilian speakers' use of Castilian. What is the function of switching to Catalan *grumoll* in an interaction where even the monitor has been speaking Castilian exclusively for quite a long while?

(75) Preparing coloured paper at a workshop
ICE  MCG  ya está_
ICE  MCG  está guay_
NAK  (...) [({P} xxx Mcg)]
DIV  [xXXx]
*ICE  MCG  [ahí ahí_ ahí tienes un grumoll]
SLJ  ICE  dónde está_
SLJ  MCG  déjalo_
FAR  MCG  aquí te has dejado_
IKU  MCG  (...) ah_
ICE  DIV  como se mueve_ esto\_
ICE  DIV  que ha movido el barreño alguien/
FAR  [({P} xxxl)]
NAK  ICE  [{!?}?P se ha movido con} la mesa\]
JBL  MCG  así así queda guapo_ [Mcg]\]
MRD  MCG  [{(P) quita_} quita esto]\]
NAK  MRD  [({P} el qué_]
MRD  (...) ya está_
NAK  MCG  ha quedado(ch)o chuli_ [tíol]
MPF  [qué guay\]
NAK  (...) recomos eso_

ICE  MCG  that's it\]
ICE  MCG  it's nice_
NAK  (...) [({P} xxx Mcg)]
DIV  [xXXx]
*ICE  MCG  [there there_ there you have a lump!]
SLJ  ICE  where is it_
SLJ  MCG  leave it_
FAR  MCG  here you left some_
IKU  MCG  (...) there\_
ICE  DIV  this is moving quite a lot_ this\]
ICE  DIV  has anyone moved the basin/
FAR  [({P} xxxl)]
NAK  ICE  [{!?}?P it's been moved with} the table\]
JBL  MCG  like like this\) it looks terrific_ [Mcg]
MRD  MCG  [{(P) take away_} take that away]\]
No apparent discourse-related function seems to determine this switch; it cannot be attributed to competence-related reasons, for the speaker has been using the Castilian equivalent *grumo* a couple of times only some minutes ago; and it would be difficult to consider it a slip of the tongue, for neither corrections nor comments are produced by the speaker or the other participants. The same speaker repeats this operation some minutes later with the word *bombolla*, Cast. *burbuja* 'bubble'.

(76) Preparing coloured paper at a workshop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IKU</th>
<th>JCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;2&gt; xx Jcr_ cuidado_</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESG</th>
<th>ICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>oye una cosa_</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICE</th>
<th>ESG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pero esto lo hacemos cada uno uno_</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESG</th>
<th>MRD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no: lo hacemos cada dos uno:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MRD</th>
<th>ESG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>si: [esto lo hacéis_]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICE</th>
<th>JCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2&gt; [que haceis_]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESG</th>
<th>MRD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cada uno/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ICE* JCR <2> Jcr_ ha(s') de reventar la(s') **bombolas** _eh_/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESG</th>
<th>MRD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cada uno_ ha dicho/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IKU</th>
<th>JCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2&gt; Jcr_ [..] sXXX: ((DL))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESG</th>
<th>MRD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[esto es cada uno:]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NKU</th>
<th>JCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2&gt; Jcr_ metelo má(s') pa(ra) dentro: ((DL))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESG</th>
<th>DIV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xt_ xt_ cada uno tenemos que hacer uno_</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICE</th>
<th>ah_</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NKU</th>
<th>JCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>que lo chafe(s') más:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NKU</th>
<th>JCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>coge más pintura:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JBL</th>
<th>JCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hala_ qué guay:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MRD</th>
<th>JCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mira_ esto_ espera:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NKU</th>
<th>JCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(...) ese_ mira_ ese te está saliendo:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IKU</th>
<th>JCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2&gt; xx Jcr_ be careful_</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESG</th>
<th>ICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>listen_</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESG</th>
<th>ICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>but each one of us is doing it_</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICE</th>
<th>ESG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n:: every two of us:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESG</th>
<th>MRD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no: it's each one of us that should do it_ isn't it/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MRD</th>
<th>ESG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[you do it_]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ICE* JCR <2> [what are you doing_]|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESG</th>
<th>MRD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>each one/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ICE* JCR <2> hey Jcr_ you've got to burst the **bubbles** _|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESG</th>
<th>MRD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>every one_ did she say/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IKU</th>
<th>JCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2&gt; Jcr_ [..] sXXX: ((DL))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESG</th>
<th>MRD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[this belongs to everybody:]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NKU</th>
<th>JCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2&gt; Jcr_ push it further inside: ((DL))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESG</th>
<th>DIV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xt_ xt_ cada uno should do one_</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICE</th>
<th>oh_</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NKU</th>
<th>JCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>flatten it more:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NKU</th>
<th>JCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>take more paint:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JBL</th>
<th>JCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>waugh_ how nice:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MRD</th>
<th>JCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>look_ this_ wait:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(458)

These results seem to point again to a subtle difference in the ability of Catalan and Castilian speakers to keep languages apart. It might be surmised that they do not attribute the same value to language separation. The following interaction exemplifies this
Here-as elsewhere, in fact- Ice proves that he is widely familiar with swearing in Castillian, but, still, he switches to Catalan in *emprenyar* 'to get pissed off' in an otherwise Castillian monolingual interaction. Significantly, Esg, a Catalan-speaking girl, does not follow him in this move: she sticks to the monolingual utterance principle and uses *enfadar*, a Castilian synonym also more standard. As shown by this example and corroborating the results displayed above, Catalan speakers maintain the distinction between both languages with a higher degree of accuracy than Castilian speakers. While both groups incorporate similar amounts of transcodic markers into their speech, Catalan speakers seem to be more aware of the transgressive nature of this behaviour and therefore make a more purposive use of that resource; thus, their non-discourse-related use of transcodic markers remains comparatively low. Castilian speakers, on the contrary, do not seem to regard language separation so highly as Catalan speakers and include a number of non-discourse-related switches whose equivalent they seem to know perfectly. Hence, we might hypothesise a certain trend to the (restricted) unmarked use of intrasentential switch might be developing among some Castilian speakers, for these switches do not serve for calling the participants' attention on the message.
6.7 Summary: catalan-castilian language contact phenomena

The linguistic corpus gathered during this research has allowed the analysis in structural terms of Catalan and Castilian as spoken by the pupils. In doing this, two main goals have been pursued: first of all, to arrive at a clear understanding of the language contact phenomena that characterize their linguistic repertoire, so that its particularities can be identified against the mainstream community; second, to study to what extent the subjects present features may set them apart in different groups according to their first language.

The first goal has been accomplished by means of a detailed analysis of the lexical and morphosyntactic contact phenomena in the speech of the subjects. Several main conclusions have been arrived at:

1. While the amount of transcodic markers is comparatively low in both languages, Catalan contains a significantly higher number of types and tokens of lexical and morphosyntactic features than Castilian. In fact, the percentages of lexical transcodic markers in Catalan were slightly higher than those encountered in a corpus of mainly Catalan native speakers (Vila i Moreno, in press).

2. The transcodic markers detected in the corpus do not significantly differ in qualitative terms from those encountered outside the school and described in the literature. Most of them are well-established and widespread in Catalonia. A handful of items (basically pero and some pronominal innovative solutions) seem to be over-represented in comparison with the mainstream society, while signs of regression for some traditional transcodic markers are also detectable. Signs of morphosyntactic convergence with Castilian beyond the mainstream varieties were detected.

3. A number of the language contact phenomena detected in the corpus clearly reflect self-facilitatory strategies to overcome incomplete language acquisition: one-word switching for difficult vocabulary, irregular use of some verbal tenses, anomalous pronominal forms and combinations, etc., make it evident that Catalan remains a weak language for a number of subjects. No such phenomena were encountered in Castilian utterances.

The search for differences between the three family language groups in terms of language contact phenomena was accomplished by comparing the amount of transcodic markers detected in their speech. Several conclusions were arrived at:

4. Little quantitative difference was encountered in the amount of lexical transcodic markers produced by Catalan, bilingual and Castilian speakers in both Catalan and Castilian; nevertheless, significant differences were traced in the
comparative use of calques, loanwords and switches. Switches were more frequent among second language speakers, i.e., in Catalan speakers' Castilian utterances and in Castilian speakers' Catalan utterances. Catalan recorded a wider gap between groups than Castilian. Divergence among groups was higher in morphosyntactic than in lexical aspects.

5. Significant differences between groups were found regarding morphosyntactic contact: Castilian speakers produced more contact items, and a number of their language contact phenomena, related to their L1, were not produced by Catalan and bilinguals.

6. Castilian speakers produced a higher number of non-discourse related switches in comparison with the other groups. Quite a lot of these switches were self-facilitatory, especially in their Catalan utterances, but not all. A hypothesis was advanced regarding the different sensitivity towards unmarked code-switching between Catalan, bilingual and Castilian speakers.

These results have been explained by a combination of contextual variables and the data-gathering methodology: in a highly bilingual environment such as the one studied here, code-choice rules do not force any speaker to make use of a language in which he/she does not feel confident enough. Thus, a vast majority of the utterances included in the corpus were produced by subjects who felt comfortably installed in the language or languages they were using. In this sense, it is significant that most of the self-facilitatory strategies were detected among young Castilian-dominant speakers in class interaction and/or during the interview, where they experienced a stronger pressure to accommodate to the teacher/interviewer's Catalan. In other words, the globally small amount of transcodic markers does not necessarily point to a high productive competence in both languages for all subjects; had an experimental methodology like an exam been adopted, a significant difference would have probably appeared among groups, at least regarding Catalan. The relative freedom to speak, and to speak in whatever language one wanted, has made it possible to obtain our results.

On the whole, thus, two main conclusions can be obtained: on the one hand, in spite of some minor morphosyntactic phenomena of language contact that are shared by all three language groups, Catalan as spoken by the subjects does not seem to be experiencing transformations that set it apart from the trends in progress in the speech community at large; even more, Castilian-speaking children seem to be acquiring a spoken variety of Catalan which is not significantly distinct from that of their Catalan counterparts, including their established loanwords and calques, although their morphosyntax (still?) shows significant Castilian influence. Thus, no Catalan school-dialect or similar seems to be appearing, as has been described for Welsh (Thomas, 1991) or Irish (Maguire, 1990) in roughly similar conditions of bilingual education.
On the other hand, Catalan influence on the subjects' Castilian seems quantitatively negligible at all the levels analysed. In other words, there exist very few empirical traces of language contact on the subjects' Castilian, and serious doubts subsist that even these few traces can be attributed to the school, for they are shared with the rest of the community. In this sense, it is ironical that the only lexical transcodic marker spread among the subjects is the question tag \textit{éh}, of wide currency in Castilian as spoken in the community, and of which no teacher is probably aware at the present.

Obviously, these statements only affect the varieties researched here: spontaneous, unmonitored spoken language, and do not necessarily imply that contact markers would not reach larger proportions in other contexts and varieties such as written, formal language. It is also possible that data from subjects who make little spontaneous use of Castilian would produce different results - but in our case, only Jcv might approach this situation-. Nevertheless, and taking these caveats into account, it can be said that the choice of Catalan as the language of instruction has not significantly affected the subjects' Castilian variety and has not introduced significant differences between them according to family language group.
7. Conclusions
7.1 Aims of the present study

The main goal of this study has been that of answering an apparently simple question: can schools modify linguistic behaviour, and if yes, how and to what extent? While the question may look straightforward, the answer is complex due to the many factors intervening in language acquisition and language use.

Language-in-education-planning and its effects constitute a socially delicate issue, as proved by the fact that assumptions have driven parents and language activists all over the world to engage in costly struggles on personal and even legal levels to have language laws passed and revoked. For many subordinate groups, linguistic rights at school represent one of their major demands.

Yet little is known about language-in-education processes and their consequences on language use. There are many excellent pedagogical, educational and psycholinguistic studies about the effects of both bilingual and monolingual educational programmes, and dozens of case studies about their effects on attitudes, but the links between these programmes and pupils' behaviour remain practically unexplored.

It is precisely these links that have been researched here, taking a Catalan 'conjunction school' placed in a predominant Castilian-speaking town as the case study. This school fulfilled a number of requirements that made it adequate for the purposes of evaluating the outcomes of a language-in-education programme that puts emphasis on the recovery and spread of a subordinate language.

On the one hand, even if the autonomous government is currently promoting Catalan in the whole of Catalonia, and even if a number of native speakers of this language were present both inside the school and on the streets, Santa Coloma de Gramenet remains overwhelmingly Castilian-dominant, and no massive sociolinguistic changes in the norms of spoken language use have been brought about in the city by the official language policy, so that any advances in the knowledge and use of Catalan among the pupils could be unequivocally attributed to school action.

On the other hand, the school's option for Catalan was total and pervasive. The school had been created under parental pressure to have a Catalan-medium school, and Catalan was effectively used as the school language. Thus, it can be convincingly argued that the school staff members' were doing their best in favour of Catalan, at least to the full extent of their resources and knowledge, and taking into account objective conditions. This school offered a relatively clear situation where out-of-school contextual variables favoured one of the languages in contact, while school-related factors promoted the other one.
7.2 Language choice and language contact in the school selected

Results have confirmed that no formal vs. informal functional distribution has been brought about by the use of Catalan as the means of instruction. Both Catalan and Castilian are used for formal and informal purposes, and language choice is primarily governed by person-related factors, not by domain of interaction.

Results have also confirmed the initial hypotheses that, in spite of the school action, neither patterns of language use, nor the frequency and distribution of transcodic markers in Catalan and Castilian, have been substantially modified in comparison with the out-of-school reality. This result is obviously nuanced in a number of senses, but it nevertheless remains central to the findings: the school does not radically transform the out-of-school contextual reality.

Thus, in spite of their being instructed basically by means of Catalan, and in spite of the teachers’ consistent use of Catalan as the language of interaction (not only instruction) with them, almost all pupils in the school routinely apply the *Catalan subordination norm* which is still prevalent in Catalonia as a whole. This means that Catalan is reserved for Catalan-speakers’ (and most family bilinguals) ingroup communication, while Castilian is used for Castilian speakers’ ingroup interaction, and for most cross-group interaction. Only one significant modification to this norm has been detected: Catalan is now the language spoken by all subjects with a particular category of adults, that of teachers. I have suggested to call this norm, which is the product of norm competition and rearrangement, the *school version of the Catalan subordination norm*. This norm is no innovation for Catalan and family bilingual speakers, since they continue to choose languages as an addressee-specification tool. On the contrary, the norm constitutes a significant transformation for Castilian-speaking subjects, who see their traditional monolingual behaviour challenged by the new language choice norms, and find themselves faced with the need of using Catalan productively.

In this research, I have proposed to describe code-switching away from the expected, unmarked choices, in terms of norm transgressions. The choice transgressions detected in this study were not numerous, and most of their functions had already been detected in other studies in Catalonia. These transgressions were mostly connected with the speakers’ momentary adoption of a different personality, what I have called a second voice, and with other discourse-related functions. Competence-related switches were also found, although almost exclusively among Castilian-speakers.

The structural analysis of lexical and morphosyntactic transcodic markers has revealed that, although a number of cross-linguistic phenomena have taken place, Catalan and Castilian remain clearly separate, and transcodic markers do not achieve large percentages in any case. No formal criterion was identified that distinguished borrowing from code-switching, and they
were eventually differentiated in terms of frequency of appearance. In any case, intrasentential code-switching was a very infrequent phenomenon.

When the direction of language influence in the school is analysed, it turns out that Castilian has affected Catalan much more than the other way round. In other words, the historical impact of Castilian on Catalan still exceeds significantly, in quantitative and qualitative terms, that of Catalan on Castilian as spoken by the subjects here researched. It is highly debatable whether the school has had any detectable impact on the varieties spoken by the subjects. In fact, it was hard to identify even a single lexical or morphosyntactic transcodic marker in the informants' Castilian speech that could be unequivocally regarded as deriving from the choice of Catalan as the means of instruction. This result will appear striking to those who believe that language depends very much on school action, but it is fully coherent with the main thesis in this research: not even several years of Catalan-medium education have managed to modify the balance existing outside on the streets.

The analysis of transcodic markers according to the speakers' linguistic background has confirmed that there exist subtle differences between Catalan, bilingual and Castilian speakers in the frequency and type of language contact phenomena. Speaking a second language seems to favour code-switching, especially in the case of Castilian speakers using Catalan, and this is often a self-facilitating resource for linguistic gaps.

To summarise, although minor modifications have been detected in the subjects' norms of language choice and code-switching, the Catalan-medium school analysed here has not significantly transformed its pupils' linguistic behaviour, and the use of Catalan as the means of instruction has not brought about a transformation of the children's spoken varieties. Out-of-school environment seems too powerful to be bent by school pressure.
7.3 Consequences for the 'catalan conjoint school model' and language in education planning in general

7.3.1 A discouraging conclusion?

While the results from this school cannot be immediately extrapolated to the whole educational system in Catalonia, I believe that a number of generalizations may be drawn.

From a demolinguistic point of view, the school researched here was no exception. Dozens of schools in Catalonia have a mostly Castilian-speaking population, and, in many of them, Catalan and bilingual speakers reach even lower proportions. From the point of view of commitment to Catalan, the school analysed in this research was an especially favourable case, since at least part of the teachers and parents had voluntarily preferred that school because it was Catalan-medium. I would argue that we could regard the results from this school as close to the maximal promotion of Catalan language use that can be achieved with the present methodologies in "conjoint" schools where Catalan and bilinguals are a small minority.

As a consequence of this research, we can now claim that, although it may promote some minor changes in behaviour, the adoption of the subordinate language as the means of instruction in linguistically heterogeneous schools seems not to significantly transform the out-of-school sociolinguistic trends. Such a conclusion may appear discouraging to minority language promoters: if a good school in a not totally unfavourable sociolinguistic context cannot transform the norms of language choice, gloomy prospects await other, not so well-off, language communities. At the end of the day, Catalans are one of the non-independent European communities in the best situation for prolonged language maintenance from most economic, political and sociolinguistic points of view, to the extent that their eternal dilemma is whether to be, in Boix's (1995) wording, the mouse's head or the lion's tail.

Yet, nothing is further from my aim here than to be unnecessarily pessimistic about linguistic diversity. In this research I have pointed out a number of factors that although at first sight secondary, hold in my view crucial implications for the Catalan case and for language-in-education as a whole. Some of them will be explored in the following sections.

7.3.2 Ask the school what it can effectively accomplish

It is unfair to require the school to do more than it can reasonably achieve. Fishman (1991: 368-380) has already pointed out that society is loading the school with a burden of moral and educational responsibilities that it cannot fulfill. As one of the few enduring social institutions, the school is thought by many as the almighty tool that will not only teach all sorts of subject matters, but also inform a new ecological awareness, bring about solidarity with the dispossessed, eradicate drugs, implement safe sex, and, in many cases, restore receding
languages. The present study has shown that unless the out-of-school factors are transformed, the school is not able to substantially modify sociolinguistic reality.

In fact, the conclusions from this study support a more utilitarian, pragmatic view of school and language-in-education planning. It is by now fairly established that bilingual education is not in itself harmful for children's development in psychological, educational, and linguistic terms. We also know that it is not the language of instruction that brings about language shift and language maintenance. I suggest that the 'language-rights' perspective, where the choice of a particular linguistic policy is promoted in the name of ethical and moral principles, would much benefit from incorporating a 'language-in-education goals' approach, where attempted outcomes for monolingual / bilingual education would be discussed on the basis of achievable goals on realistic terms. Thus, I would argue that methodological aspects of language-in-education planning (in the sense discussed in chapter 1) be better regarded with a less symbolic, more pragmatic approach than is currently the case. This undoubtedly implies a more flexible approach to the language of instruction policy from all sides, where human rights and national pride are invoked, and more efficient language-in-education policies sought.

7.3.3 Be aware of what can be accomplished in the school

A more flexible approach to language-in-education policy does not mean that the school has to be regarded as neutral in sociolinguistic processes. The school does play a role both in language teaching and in language maintenance, and this role can be enhanced. A critical look at the results may suggest that the Catalan Conjunction Model is currently helping to preserve Catalan as the unmarked choice of Catalan and many bilingual speakers' ingroup interaction. We have seen that for a number of Catalan and bilingual speakers in Santa Coloma de Gramenet, the use of Catalan in their social networks is so weak that they risk total assimilation into the Castilian-speaking majority, and eventual Catalan language loss. Indeed, while some bilinguals in this study scored very high in ingroup Catalan language maintenance, this is not the case for all of them, i.e., some bilinguals do not retain Catalan for ingroup communication. It is highly possible that without the institutional support provided by the school's intensive use of Catalan, the maintenance of Catalan would have been much lower.

The results from the present study suggest that language-in-education planners should pay careful attention not only to institutional language distribution issues, but also, and very importantly, to the pupils themselves as major actors in their language learning and usage. The experiences from 'European Schools', as well as those from Franco-Ontarian or Singaporean schools, among others, where pupils' demolinguistic balances have had a remarkable impact on language competence and language choice practices, recommends that language-in-education planners consider the actual addressees of (bilingual) education. A certain consideration of the pupils' sociolinguistic practices is probably as significant -if not more- for the educational and linguistic outcomes than attitudinal and pedagogical considerations.
In practical terms, what does this mean? I would argue that bilingual education would benefit from careful handling of pupils' norms of language use. To put it briefly, it has already been proved that, in a context such as the one here analysed, Catalan-medium education is not going to transform the current norms of language choice. Thus, with homogeneous second language classes there seems to be little point in expecting the school language to become the language of untutored interaction. In sociolinguistic terms, all the school should aspire to is at bilingualizing its clientèle.

In heterogeneous classes, though, things are not so simple, for there exists a reservoir of language knowledge that should be exploited to the pupils' benefit. In this case, it has been proven that even a number of potential Catalan language users (especially an indetermined number of bilinguals, such as Ana, Ead, Ebg, Far, Jrg) are not fully exploiting their Catalan abilities. This, in fact, probably turns against the rest of the class: the less their peers use Catalan, the less Catalan peer-input / peer-interaction is available for Castilian speakers. The challenge is not that of imposing Catalan on all the very first day, for this is unrealistic and probably counterproductive, as Heller's (1994) Franco-Ontarian example suggests. The real assets for language promotion reside in enabling that those children who already possess some competence in it (Catalan and bilingual speakers) establish Catalan as their unmarked language of relationship among each other as soon as possible. Thus, it is necessary that the minority speakers can 'recognise' each other, and choose the minority language as their unmarked choice on their entrance to the school. It should be emphasised that this identification is not necessarily easy when differences in race or dress are absent. It can nevertheless be achieved by many means, but mostly by grouping them together, be it by making them sit at a common table or getting them to play with one another from the very first day. Practical methodologies will have to be worked out, and they will probably vary from place to place. But the goal should be that minority language speakers in a classroom should have the opportunity to identify each other so that as many as possible of them become part of the 'minority language core'. It is by enabling minority speakers to use their first language with each other that (some) majority speakers will feel compelled to use their bilingual resources.

Of course, alternative ways to increase minority language presence remain feasible for language-in-education planning, although their actual efficacy remains to be empirically proven. One of them is that of increasing the teachers' presence among the pupils, to the point that the minority language becomes almost inescapable during class periods. Anecdotal references from some Catalan-medium schools in Roussillon (Southern France) and in the Basque Country indicate that this method may eventually increase minority language use. Developing the subjects' language awareness may also be attempted as a way to encourage the self-control of language choice norms, as seems to be done in Franco-Ontarian schools. All ways have to be considered in view of the goals, the sociolinguistic situation, and children's and community needs and rights.
In any case, more and more subordinated language communities are coming to realize that it is excessively naïve to expect that children will simply follow their teachers' language choices just because theirs is a fair cause, or because that is the best way to learn a language. Children, as adults, exploit their communicative resources in their best interest, and the parents and school's interests do not necessarily always coincide with children's own perceptions. Thus, the school pressure on the out-of-school social norms may result in a norm rearrangement such as the one described in Santa Coloma, but this is only one of the multiple options open to the subjects, which range from total identification to radical opposition.
7.4 Language contact and code-switching studies: practical and theoretical consequences

Several general conclusions from this research are of theoretical relevance to language contact and code-switching studies.

According to the data analysed here, language choice can be predicted with a fair degree of confidence for a good deal of subjects, on the basis of their social characteristics. That is, even in a bilingual setting where different ages (children and adults), statuses (pupils, teachers, monitors, non-teaching staff), linguistic backgrounds (Catalan, bilingual, Castilian), language competence and abilities (highly skilled balanced bilinguals, variously imbalanced bilinguals, receptive bilinguals) coexist, linguistic behaviour was found to be highly regular. In other words, in spite of individual idiosyncracies, the unmarked language choices could be predicted with a significant degree of accuracy on the basis of the participants' linguistic backgrounds, and even a norm of language choice, the synthetic product of the competition between the two other available norms of language choice, could be described.

Marked code-switching, or choice transgressions, as I have suggested calling them, have also been found significantly linked with a reduced number of functions, i.e., even a majority of choice transgressions were easily integrated into the normative framework which operates in the school. Most of these functions had clear social associations, basically that of expressing the momentary adoption of a second voice by the speaker. For these speakers, choice transgression remains socially loaded, and thus code-switching can be scarcely used as a strictly conversational device. Consequently, sequentiality has not turned out to be so fundamental for the analysis of code-switching as other authors (e.g. Auer, 1992, or Li Wei, 1994) have claimed for other geographical contexts.

This does not mean that speakers were not able to manipulate norms of choice and code-switching at all. I have shown that the school version of the Catalan subordination norm constitutes a normative rearrangement elaborated by the subjects on the basis of the two pre-existing norms, the Catalan subordination norm and the Catalan preeminence norm. I have also shown how these norms were used and adapted by the informants during the interviews as an answer to contextual variables and in order to achieve their social ends. I have also shown that both licit and illicit choice transgressions allow the subjects to display their linguistic abilities to achieve their ends.

But, at least in the context studied here, and despite the high bilinguality of most subjects, these norm manipulations remain quantitatively scarce, i.e., they constitute a marked behaviour. Languages remain strongly associated to social factors, and that is probably the reason that, in spite of increased bilingual competence, code-switching conversational roles do not multiply.
If both my interpretation and those by Auer and Li Wei are correct, this means that two main contexts of code-switching should be distinguished. In one of them, languages remain strongly associated with social groups (or, maybe, particular activities or domains); in the other one, social associations are less significant and language alternation becomes available for more non-social, conversational uses of code-switching. The subjects in the present research exemplify the first type, whereas Auer's Italian-German children and some of Li Wei's British-born Chinese appear to be instances of the second. It would therefore be necessary to identify what societal conditions favour each context, and what are their links with large sociolinguistic phenomena such as language maintenance and shift.

With regard to transcodic markers from a structural perspective, no formal criterion has been encountered to distinguish code-switching from borrowing. Thus, I have suggested that a continuum exists between widespread, established loanwords, and occasional one-word switches.
7.5 A final metaphor

Bilingual studies in general, and language-in-education planning in particular, are already animated by a number of metaphors intended to explain things in graphic terms. Maybe the best known one is that describing education as an ocean where the children are either immersed, submerged, or even abandoned to a sink-or-swim process in a new language.

I would like to propose a new metaphor that substantiates my view of language-in-education planning. Let us assume that language-in-education planning is compared to a banquet, where society at large and parents in particular are the diners, the educational administration and the teachers stand for the cooks, the school programmes are the cooking equipment and techniques, and children constitute the stuff to be cooked. The goal of all cooking is to obtain a particular dish from a number of ingredients (i.e., a student population) and by means of the needed kitchen utensils and cooking procedures (i.e., monolingual or bilingual programmes). Good cooks, i.e., planners and teachers, are obviously essential to take the best from the ingredients they are given. Taking these ingredients into account, cooks can choose among the utensils and procedures depending on the particular dish they are told to prepare. At the end of the day, though, it is neither the cooks, the utensils, or the procedures that will be served to the diners, but rather the cooked ingredients. Boiled peas remain peas, and fried potatoes remain potatoes. Ingredients' tastes may blend and combine with one another in multiple and often surprising forms, but they do not transubstantiate into different ingredients.

The Catalan Conjoint School Model may be compared to a pressure cooker, where two principle ingredients, peas (Catalan-speaking children) and potatoes (Castilian-speaking children), are boiled together so that a bilingual dish is produced. Given the current sociolinguistic situation, the fire has been set at its maximum for the vegetables to be boiled as quickly and thoroughly as possible in the restricted period of primary education. The school is relatively effective in that it boils both ingredients and combines their tastes; pupils attending Conjoint Schools eventually bilingualise. So far, in Catalonia other pots have not been so effective in boiling all the vegetables in the brief time allowed by law, and potatoes used to remain raw when other procedures were employed. As a whole, Castilian-medium education and 50% bilingual education do not succeed in endowing their Castilian-speaking pupils with sufficient competence in Catalan. Therefore, the current school administration has decided to extend this school model to the whole population, i.e., the cooks are using only pressure cookers. Of course, risks exist involving the use of these devices: the cooks should be attentive, since the pressure in the cooker could become dangerous and even burst. But these risks have so far been judged reasonable in comparison with the benefits obtained from the procedure.

During the 'language of instruction polemics' in 1993 and 1994, some diners at Catalonia's banquet felt it not in their interest that peas and potatoes were boiled together, claimed that the cooks would ruin both potatoes and peas, and insisted in having their potatoes boiled separately.
in a different pot. The cooks refused to serve meals à la carte, and accused these diners of refusing to eat peas, i.e., of trying to avoid bilingualisation. In the end, the whole discussion reached the courts. After the Constitutional Court made it clear that the Catalan Conjoint School was legal, the reluctant diners had to accept that the dish was indeed edible, but they insisted in considering it contrary to their human rights to be forced to eat it. By now the polemics have somewhat calmed down, but it remains to be seen until when, for the reluctant diners are campaigning against the official dish and seeking to have them replaced by others.

The present study has supported the idea that, while the cooking procedure used in Catalonia may produce a bilingual dish, it is not transforming the potatoes into peas. Potatoes remain potatoes, and peas remain peas, even if they are currently mixing their tastes at school. It would be foolish to expect magic from a pressure cooker. It is obvious that once boiled they can be more easily mixed, but that is not the school's business.

So far, this has proved to be the best way to achieve a common dish. Alternative recipes may be suggested, and it would be wise to be open to experimentation, for no recipe is ever perfect. Besides that, not all cooks in Catalonia have exactly the same ingredients: in Metropolitan Barcelona they have many potatoes and few peas, while cooks in Girona, Osona or Baix Ebre have more peas than potatoes. But all evidence confirms that Castilian-medium or 50% Catalan-Castilian schools do not thoroughly bilingualise Castilian speakers, and linguistically segregated schools seem to guarantee even less Catalan language learning.

While polemics have so far concentrated on procedures, it is my contention that the main issue here should be that of agreeing on the final outcomes. So far a wide agreement has existed that the Catalan school should produce a common dish made up of highly skilled bilinguals, while simultaneously promoting Catalan, the minority language. Reluctant diners have not convinced the others, either that they aspire to the same bilingual dish by other methods, or that they can legitimately aspire to a different, more monolingual dish. But a different political landscape may encourage them to stand up for what they see as their rights and seek the recognition of their aspiration. As a consequence, today the school model in Catalonia depends on political agreements. It always has.

---

98 Comarques or counties where Catalan speakers are the majority and Castilian speakers the minority.
7.6 Further research

It is customary that a thesis end with suggestions for further research. I would like to think that the present study has pointed to many avenues for both theoretical and applied research lines, and I will restrict myself to those that, in my opinion, should enjoy primary attention. In so doing I will distinguish between those of more local interest for the Catalan community, and those of wider significance.

For a variety of reasons, sociolinguistics has traditionally avoided 'excessive' relationships with the educational world in the Catalan Countries. I believe that it is high time that Catalan sociolinguists join psycholinguists, pedagogues, and other social scientists in their research on language-in-education planning. The Catalan Countries represent one of the most exciting sociolinguistic laboratories in the European Union, and they contain literally dozens of educational experiences that are worth exploring. The increasing presence of European and extra-European immigration in our towns and villages, together with the process of European political integration, with its demands of multilingualism, offer vast opportunities for research that should not be missed. To signal only a few of them: What are the norms of language choice and code-switching in areas where Catalan speakers are the majority? Are they being transformed by the Catalan normalization process? How does peer-teaching affect language choice, and vice-versa? What are the consequences of the primary school catalanization when the pupils arrive at secondary education, where Castilian holds a very strong position? What are the consequences of school catalanization once the subjects abandon the school? What is the role of Catalan and Castilian in the integration of foreign immigrants which are increasingly entering our schools? What norms of language use are these subjects developing? What are the results of the 'immersion programmes' vs. 'Valencian streams' in language maintenance in the Valencian Country? What are the consequences of adopting Catalan as the means of instruction in the Catalan-medium schools in Northern Catalonia (Roussillon) and Andorra?

There is still little systematic research on Catalan-Castilian language contact, especially regarding quantitative aspects, and its scope should be broadened: in comparative terms, a disproportionate attention has been paid to the Barcelona Metropolitan Area, whereas the other major Catalan-speaking areas remain poorly explored, and the other language contact contexts remain practically virgin. At least three major language pairs remain to be explored: Catalan-French (in Northern Catalonia and Andorra), Occitan-Catalan-Castilian (in the Val d'Aran, in the Pyrenees), and Catalan-Italian-Sardinian (in Alghero, Italy). New immigrations (to name only two of them, the Catalan-Castilian-Portuguese-French contact in Andorra, where a numerous Portuguese colony lives, and the Catalan-Castilian-Tamazight-Colloquial Arabic in Barcelona, where thousands of Moroccans live now) have added new language combinations to the other, more traditional language contact situations. Social, conversational, and structural approaches would greatly benefit from such a rich language contact landscape.
Descriptive studies are necessary, but developing new, more powerful theoretical models appears indispensable if social reality is to be adequately understood. Language contact and language choice studies offer a magnificent field for macrosocial, microsocial, conversational and grammatical research. In the present study I have attempted to answer several theoretical questions, and to combine insights from different models, but many doors have remained open that deserve careful attention. I have pledged that socially-related code-switching and conversational code-switching constitute complementary realities, but this opposition should be systematically explored in different contexts. I have argued that in the present study language choice was fairly predictable on the basis of social variables, but there exist other contexts where this seems not to be possible, and this difference should be systematically analysed. Comparison between communities undergoing rapid language shift with others where multilingualism is more stable will undoubtedly enrich our understanding of the links between language and society. We know very little about the transition between alternative language norm sets, the role conversational, non-socially-related uses of code-switching play in them, and about the role code-switching plays in preventing / favouring language maintenance and shift. Answering these and other related questions will significantly increase our understanding of aspects such as social (re)production and negotiation of norms and values, or the dynamics and nature of intergroup processes, to point out only two. Research on these areas will be acutely needed if we are to combine social advance and harmony, increased equality of rights and opportunities for all, and the maintenance and development of the linguistic and cultural heritage, both in Catalonia and all over the world.
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Appendix 1.1

Classification of bilingual education according to Skutnabb-Kangas (1984: 127).

![Diagram showing the classification of bilingual education according to Skutnabb-Kangas (1984: 127).]
Appendix 1.2.

Bilingual education typologies according to Baker (1993: 153)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEAK FORMS OF EDUCATION FOR BILINGUALISM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of program</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMERSION &amp; Struct. Immersion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMERSION with withdrawal Classes/Sheltered English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEGREGATIONIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSITIONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINSTREAM with FL Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPARATIST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONG FORMS OF EDUCATION FOR BILINGUALISM AND BILITERACY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of program</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMMERSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINTENANCE/HERITAGE LANGUAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO WAY/DUAL LANGUAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINSTREAM BILINGUAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (1) L2=Second Language; L1=First Language; FL=Foreign Language.
(2) Formulation of this table owes much to discussions with Professor Ofelia García.
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Appendix 3: Language contact in the Catalan Countries

3.1. A linguistic comparison between Catalan and Castilian

1. Introduction

Although both are Romance languages, i.e., both derive directly from the Latin imported by Romans to the Iberian Peninsula between since the III-II centuries A.C., Catalan and Castilian cannot be regarded as regional variants of a single language, as some uninformed foreign scholars do from time to time. The current political borders, which include most of the Catalan linguistic area in the same nation-state with Castilian, and the nationalistic conception equating nation with state and both with a single language, undoubtedly favour such an erroneous conception.

From a linguistic point of view, Catalan, which has been historically spoken not only in Eastern Spain but also in Southern France (cf. chapter 3), is more closely related to Occitan (Langue d’Oc or Provençal), spoken in the French Midi, than to Castilian, to the extent that up to the XX century most romanists considered Catalan an Occitan dialect rather than an independent language. Indeed, Classical Provençal was the language of poetry for Catalans during part of the Middle Ages, as the vehicle of ‘troubadours’, and strong cultural and emotional links existed between Catalan and Occitan writers during their respective Renaissance periods in the XIX century (Catalan Renaixença and Occitan Felibrisme). Catalan intellectuals themselves used the term llemósí (‘limousin’), actually the name of an Occitan dialect, to refer to Catalan. Linguistic similarities and historical factors have led a number of scholars to regard Catalan as a Gallo-roman language, while others -mostly Spanish- preferred to consider it an Ibero-roman language together with Castilian and Portuguese (cf. Tagliavini, 1973: 578). Linguistic affinity groups Catalan with Occitan more than with Castilian. As Joan Coromines, the Catalan world-wide reputed romanist put it, if all Romance languages are sisters, then Portuguese and Castilian are twins, and Catalan and Occitan are another set of twins (quoted by Sanchis Guarner, 1980: 17)

There exist too many references the reader can resort to in search of general information about the Catalan language. For a brief bibliographic account of language descriptions and language learning methods, see Departament de Cultura (1994), which contains more than 400 references in Catalan, Castilian, French, German, English, Italian and other languages. In this section I will limit myself to a number of points of direct relevance to my discussion

99 At the time of writing this section, though, this list has already become obsolete. Other references the reader can use are Badia (1994).

100 Payrató (1985a) remains the par excellence reference for Catalan-Castilian contrastive analysis. Woolard (1989: 149) offers an excellent brief introduction to the main features of Catalan
It should be noted that the following description is based on Standard Catalan and Standard Castilian. Catalan dialectal varieties differ from each other principally in phonology, verbal inflectional morphology and some vocabulary items, but the small distance existing between them does not prevent easy intercomprehension. Some of these regional features are introduced into Standard Catalan (cf. Secció Filològica de l'Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 1990, 1992 for a thorough description of the prescriptive standard). Castilian as spoken in Spain includes a number of dialects as well, and its standard is mostly based on the dialect of Castile. Leaving aside Castilian as spoken by Catalans, the Castilian dialects more often used in Catalonia are of Andalusian origin.

As it should be clear by now, contact between Catalan and Castilian has produced -and continues to produce- mutual exchanges, convergences and divergences. Therefore, it is not rare at all that features from one language appear in the other in spoken varieties.

2. Phonology and morphophonemics

Catalan and Castilian phonological inventories are quite different in both components and distribution. While Castilian has only five vocalic phonemes /i e a o u/, Catalan has two different vocalic systems: stressed /i e a o u/ and unstressed /i ə u/. Diphtongs and triphtongs are much more common in Catalan than in Castilian.

Consonantic inventaries also contain a number of differences: Standard Catalan does not contain neither the voiceless velar fricative /χ/ nor the voiceless interdental fricative /θ/, two Castilian phonemes. The first one used to be transformed into /k/ or /ʒ/ in borrowings from Castilian (e.g. Cat. *maco, from Cast. *majo, 'nice'), but has also gained some currency in a number of borrowings (such as *halar [za’la] slang 'to eat', *gilipollas [zi’lipo] 'asshole', etc.). In contrast, /θ/ is usually rendered as /s/ (cf. Payrató, 1985a: 99ff).

Catalan has a number of phonemes which are not present in Castilian: fricatives /ʃ, ʒ, z/, and the affricates /ts/, /dz/, /dʒ/. Others, which used to be shared by both languages, such as /ʎ/, have receeded in Castilian but persist in Catalan: cf. *callar 'to shut up' Cat. [ka’ʎa], Cast. [ka’jar]. Finally, others phonemes are shared, but their distribution is not coincident. Castilian is reluctant to admit consonants other than /l, n, r, s, θ/ in an absolute final position, while Catalan accepts a larger number of final consonants in final position. See, for instance, how different borrowings have been adapted in each language:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>Original form</th>
<th>Catalan</th>
<th>Castilian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

in comparison with Castilian for the foreign reader which I have taken as a basis for this section.
This different syllabic structure causes many difficulties to Castilian speakers with basic phonemic oppositions in Catalan:

(2)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written form</th>
<th>Native Catalan</th>
<th>Cast-speakers' Catalan</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vam anar</td>
<td>[bam ə'na]</td>
<td>[ban ə'na]</td>
<td>'we went'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van anar</td>
<td>[ban ə'na]</td>
<td>[bam ə'na]</td>
<td>'they went'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This phenomenon is repeated with nasals /ŋ/ and /ɲ/, lateral /ʎ/, etc.

Catalan does not favour a canonical CV syllable order as strongly as Castilian does, and more consonant clusters are permitted, both in middle and final positions:

(3)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalan</th>
<th>Castilian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tens</td>
<td>tienes</td>
<td>'you have'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acord</td>
<td>acuerdo</td>
<td>'agreement'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>porc</td>
<td>puerco</td>
<td>pig, pork'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gust</td>
<td>gusto</td>
<td>'taste'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptar</td>
<td>acceptar</td>
<td>'accept'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repte</td>
<td>reto</td>
<td>'challenge'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two phonological rules of Catalan are of special relevance here:

a. Vocalic neutralization rules: Catalan unstressed vocalic system is notoriously simpler than the stressed one: only three units, against seven in the stressed system. Stressed /a e e/ become [ə], while /ə o u/ turn into [u], when they become unstressed.

(4)  

| Pau       | [ˈpau]    | 'Paul' |
| peu       | [ˈpœw]    | 'foot' |
| punt      | [ˈpəŋ]    | 'bridge' |
| puntet    | [ˈpʊnt]   | 'point' |
| amb       | [əm]      | 'with' |
| amb ell   | [əmb e̞j] | 'with him' |
| porta tancada | [pɔɾtə ˈtɔŋkada] | 'open door' |
| porta oberta | [ˈpɔɾt əβəɾtə]  | 'closed door' |
| mig       | [ˈmitʃ]   | 'half' |
| mig any   | [ˈmɪdʒəɲ] | 'half year' |
A particular case of morphophonologic liason is that of final -r in infinitives. Catalan verbs in infinitive do not include a final -r (although it is written); this final -r appears when the verb is followed by personal pronouns:

(6) 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Infinitive form</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cantar</td>
<td>[kɔntɔta]</td>
<td>[kɔnta wa k o n’so]</td>
<td>‘to sing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cantar-lo</td>
<td>[kɔntarlu]</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to sing it’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>servir</td>
<td>[sər’βi]</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to serve / help’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>servir el dinar</td>
<td>[sər’βil di’na]</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to serve lunch’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>servir-lo</td>
<td>[sər’βirlu]</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to serve it’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apart from phonological differences, there are at least two phonetic differences of relevance in the contrast between Catalan and Castilian:

- Catalan /l/ becomes velarized, especially after a back vowel.
- Catalan /s/ is apical, while Castilian is dorsal.

3. Orthograph

After a period of vacillation in XVIII and XIX centuries, Catalan orthograph was definitely fixed in 1913 by Pompeu Fabra. The orthographic conventions are based on contemporary dialects, classical usage and a etymological reasoning. Both positive and negative transfer of abilities and habits from one language to the other is a common phenomenon: thus, written Catalan is easily comprehensible to a native speaker who is literate exclusively in Castilian, as used to be the case during Francoist times, and learning of Catalan orthograph is a relatively simple issue for these speakers. Nevertheless, orthographic conventions are not always coincident, and negative transfers in the form of orthographic mistakes are frequent in both ways. For instance, the conjunction /i/, shared by both languages, is written i in Catalan and y in Castilian and the object of many mistakes at school.

On the other hand, although simplified and considerably more systematic than they used to be before the standardization, the Catalan orthographic conventions still include a number of points which are difficult for native speakers, principally due to etymological uses which no longer reflect phonemic distinctions (e.g. use of l/l·l, b/v, c/ç/s/ss, orthograph of final oclusives, etc.).

4. Morphology

Catalan and Castilian are inflectional languages. Two main inflectional systems can be distinguished: verbal and nominal inflectional morphology.

Catalan and Castilian being both pro-drop languages, Catalan and Castilian resort to both inflectional morphemes and analytical procedures to express conjugationm (three in each
language), number (singular and plural), person (1st, 2nd, 3rd), tense (present, past, future), mode (indicative, subjunctive, conditional, imperative), aspect (perfect and imperfect) and voice (active and passive). While Catalan and Castilian verbal paradigms roughly coincide, they are by no means identical. The most significant difference lies in the simple past, which in Catalan is formed by analytical means, adding some particular forms of anar 'to go' to the infinitive, while in Castilian it is a syntactic form.

(7) Catalan Castilian English
vas cantar cantaste 'you sang'
vas vas 'you go'

A structure similar to that used by Catalan to express simple past is used in Castilian for near future: to go + prep "a" + infinitive.

(8) Castilian English
vas vas a cantar 'you are going to sing'
vas 'you go'

Catalan and Castilian nominal morphology includes marks for number (singular and plural) and gender (masculine and feminine). A significant difference between both is that Catalan masculine morph is 0, while in Castilian it is [o] or [e].

(9) Catalan Castilian English
curs curso 'course, school grade'
amic amigo 'friend'
carnisser carnicero 'butcher'
parent pariente 'relative'

Determiners present considerable differences between both languages. Castilian has three articles (masc. el, fem. la, neuter lo). Standard Catalan only accepts one of them, although lo is widely used in spoken Catalan. Unlike Castilian, Catalan deletes the vowel of articles in front of words starting by vowel:

(10) Cast. Cat. French English
el hombre l'home l'homme 'the man'
el avar l'avar l'avare 'the mean one'
la isla l'illa l'île 'the island'
el hombre l'home l'homme 'the man'
el avar l'avar l'avare 'the mean one'
la isla l'illa l'île 'the island'

Possessives in Catalan are compound, including an article, and agree morphologically not with the owner but with the possessed entity. In Castilian there is no article and no agreement takes place:

(11) Cast. Cat. English
mi padre el meu pare 'my father'
mi madre la meva mare 'my mother'
Catalan pronominal system is closer to that of French in that it includes two adverbial pronouns, *en*, *hi* (cf. French *en*, *y*) of which Castilian is lacking. Standard Catalan has a fairly complicated pronominal system which in fact amounts to a compromise solution between classical Catalan and current dialectal forms, and which falls between them reflecting none. Teaching of this system occupies a fair amount of Catalan language arts classes, and can be said to be producing meager results, for in fact, this standard system is hardly ever used, and non-normative, much simpler forms take its place even in most of the formal interactions... including language teaching. While teaching of Catalan at school has by no means succeeded in imposing the standard form, it does seem to have introduced a certain degree of confusion which now reflects itself in more variability than used to be the case. This variability is further encouraged by the massive introduction of L2 speakers’ interlanguage forms. Thus, mixed and spurious forms are now recorded (pronouns are italicized):

(12)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken form</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Castilian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anem’s-en</td>
<td>anar-nos-en</td>
<td>amen-nos-vámonos</td>
<td>let us go</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>di’lzi</td>
<td>dir-los</td>
<td>dir-lis</td>
<td>decirles</td>
<td>to tell them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another area of disagreement between both languages is that of deictics. Place deictics only include two degrees of proximity in Catalan, while Castilian has three:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st. person</th>
<th>2nd person</th>
<th>3rd person</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalan:</td>
<td>aquí</td>
<td>allò, allì</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘here’ / ‘there’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian:</td>
<td>aquí</td>
<td>ahi</td>
<td>allò, allì</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan:</td>
<td>aquest</td>
<td></td>
<td>aquell</td>
<td>‘this’ / ‘that’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian:</td>
<td>este</td>
<td>ese</td>
<td>aquel</td>
<td>(demonstrative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan:</td>
<td>això</td>
<td>allò</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘this’ / ‘that’ (neutre pronouns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilian:</td>
<td>esto</td>
<td>eso</td>
<td>aquello</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Lexic

Catalan and Castilian lexic share a common origin, Latin, and, as a consequence, a good of their lexic units are cognates. Nevertheless, there exist significant lexical differences between both languages which often affect the basic vocabulary, frequently due to the fact that it was not the same Latin word which was at the origin of the current equivalences. In many of these cases, Catalan shows greater affinity with Occitan and French, while Castilian remains closer to Portuguese.
Table 2. Some basic lexical items of Latin origin in Castilian, Portuguese, Catalan and Occitan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Castilian</th>
<th>Portug.</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Catalan</th>
<th>Occitan</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>metus</td>
<td>miedo</td>
<td>medo</td>
<td>pavore</td>
<td>por</td>
<td>paur</td>
<td>‘fear’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fervere</td>
<td>hervir</td>
<td>ferver</td>
<td>bullire</td>
<td>bullir</td>
<td>bolir</td>
<td>‘to boil’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comedere</td>
<td>comer</td>
<td>comer</td>
<td>manducare</td>
<td>menjar</td>
<td>manjar</td>
<td>‘to eat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fabulare</td>
<td>hablar</td>
<td>falar</td>
<td>parabolare</td>
<td>parlar</td>
<td>parlar</td>
<td>‘to speak’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proximity between Catalan and Castilian favours the existence of thumb-rules to convert a Catalan word into a Castilian. Thus, a Catalan infinitive verb becomes a Castilian word the mere addition of a final -r:

(13)     Catalan | Castilian (in Catalonia) | English  
plegar    | plegar               | ‘to finish working’
engegar   | enchegar             | ‘to start up’

These norms are not dissimilar to the rules followed by Catalan second-language learners of French or English, and constitute easy conversion formulae already commented upon by Weinreich (1953). See how a song imitated French spoken by Catalans with tourists:

(14) Broken French: Vous tirez tout droit / i després trois quilomètres girez cap a la gauche.
Catalan: Vós tireu tot dret / i després de tres quilòmetres gireu cap a l’esquerra.
English: Go straight ahead / and after three kilometres turn left.

6. Syntax

Syntactically, both languages closely resemble each other, although a number of differences set them apart. Differences lay in a varied number of aspects, especially use of relatives and prepositions.

It is remarkable that spoken Catalan seems to have converged in a number of syntactic patterns towards Castilian. Thus, while normative Catalan requires deletion of prepositions a, amb, de, en, before conjunction que, and transformation of amb, en into de, a before infinitives, spoken Catalan often adopts non-deletion and non transformation as Castilian does (cf. table REF.).
Table 3. Syntactic convergence between spoken Catalan and Castilian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lang</th>
<th>SN</th>
<th>0’ (INF)</th>
<th>0’ (que)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Pensar</td>
<td>EN les vacances</td>
<td>A/DE fer vacances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Piensa</td>
<td>EN les vacances</td>
<td>EN fer vacances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Piensa</td>
<td>EN las vacaciones</td>
<td>En hacer vacaciones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>S/He thinks</td>
<td>in her/his holidays</td>
<td>in going on holidays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Compta</td>
<td>AMB els seus amics</td>
<td>A/D’anar-hi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Compta</td>
<td>AMB els seus amics</td>
<td>AMB anar-hi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Cuenta</td>
<td>CON sus amigos</td>
<td>CON ir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>S/he counts</td>
<td>upon his friends</td>
<td>S/he expects to go there</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C: Standard Catalan; SC: spoken Catalan; S: Castilian; E: English translation. (Table based on Cuenca, 1991: 40)

As a whole, these patterns are so well entrenched in Catalan that authorized grammarians have pledged in favour of reconsidering their proscription from normative usage (Solà, 1994). Other points of convergence of Catalan towards Castilian are adoption of preposition a to introduce DO and the usage of articles before relative pronouns.

Castilian in Catalonia, on the other side, seems to frequently adopt some syntactic structures which are clearly of Catalan origin, such an interrogative structure started by the Catalan interrogative particle que (e.g. ¿que vendrás, mañana? cf. Standard Cast. ¿vendrás, mañana? and Catalan que vendràs, demà?).

7. Discourse and pragmatics

If Catalan and Castilian discourse and pragmatic studies are just starting as a discipline (cf. Boix and Payrató, 1994), they constitute a practically virgin field in what language contact concerns. Some aspects may be pointed at, more out of anecdotal references than systematic research.

Use of T/V (tu/vostè) address pronouns in Catalan remains strongly entrenched in everyday use, especially when interlocutors of different ages are involved, and sometimes includes a third member (vós) to express extreme respect. On the contrary, the distinction may have weakened considerably disappeared in interactions between interlocutors of the same age under 40, irrespective of their degree of familiarity. Castilian seems to have moved much beyond Catalan in the suppression of T/V distinction even between interlocutors of the same age. This is an issue which should be studied in a broader ideological perspective: as a result of ideological trends, the address pronouns system seems to have experienced a deep restructuration in some Western European language and a not so deep one in other languages (for a similar case regarding Danish and German, Byram, 1986).

A so far unknown number of politeness strategies differ between both languages. At least in some cases, Catalan seems to make wider use of indirectionality. For instance, the Catalan equivalent for 'how much is it?' is 'que em pot/vol cobrar, sisplau?', literally 'Can you please
charge it upon me?' or 'Do you want to charge it upon me, please?', or even 'que em vol fer el favor de cobrar, sisplau', lit. 'do you want to do me the favour of charging it, please?' while Castilian seems to make use of more direct strategies such as '¿cuánto es?', i.e. 'how much is it?' or 'cóbrame / cóbrame', 'charge it upon me'.

Other discourse structures which show differences between both languages are good-bye adjacency pairs. In Catalan, these are expressed with: a: adéu / b: adéu, 'bye', while in Castilian they are a: hasta luego / b: hasta luego, i.e., 'till soon'. In the past, Catalan had borrowed adiós (Cast. equivalent for adéu) as a farewell formula, but this now seems to have lost much ground. Conversely, adéu is often used in otherwise Castilian interactions. Finally, the - probably Southern American- Castilian form nos vemos, lit. 'we see each other', seems to be gaining some currency among young Catalan speakers as ens veiem.

An example of discourse borrowing is furnished by the importation of Castilian way to say the time into Catalan: traditionally, the Catalan time system is based on the hour which is to be completed; therefore, halves and quarters are referred to the following hour: e.g. 1h 15' is un quart de dues, literally 'a quarter of two'; 5h 30' is dos quarts de sis, literally 'two quarters of six'\textsuperscript{101}. Castilian, on the other hand, bases its time table on the hour already completed and says 1h 15' una y cuarto lit. 'one and a quarter', and 5h 30' cinco y media, lit. 'five and a half'. Catalan has borrowed this structure and often builds the time on the Castilian pattern: 1h 15h una i quart, 5h 30' cinc i mitja.

\textsuperscript{101} This system seems to have its origins in the time as marked by clock bells.
3.2. Research on language contact and code-switching in the Catalan area

Major conclusions regarding language choice and code switching in the Catalan Countries of some significant macroscopic studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR OF FIELD-WORK</th>
<th>BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCE</th>
<th>MAJOR FINDINGS / CLAIMS REGARDING LANGUAGE CHOICE AND CODE-SWITCHING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986-90</td>
<td>Subirats (dir.) 1990, 1992</td>
<td>Increase in the number of bilinguals Bilinguals make more use of Catalan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Rambla (1993)</td>
<td>Geographical distribution of linguistic groups; Bilinguals, more code-switching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 90's</td>
<td>Universities: Servei (1991); Gabinet (1993); Universitat (1994)</td>
<td>Catalan and Catalan-speakers, dominant in the autonomous administration and at the universities. Castilian remains in use. Catalan and Castilian divergers vs. Catalan and Castilian accommodators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tudela (1994)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas (1994)</td>
<td>Catalan progresses in Catalonia (not in Valencia and Balearic Islands) Predominant monolingual use by domain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Microscopic studies on language choice and code switching in the Catalan Countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD-WORK</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>MAJOR FINDINGS / CLAIMS REGARDING LANGUAGE CHOICE AND CODE-SWITCHING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Woolard (1992)</td>
<td>Accommodation eroding; more code-switching; New bilingual identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Nussbaum (1990)</td>
<td>Situational determinants for code-switching; Catalan, public language in education but accommodation persists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Pujolar (1991a)</td>
<td>Conflicting norms on TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early 90's</td>
<td>Pujadas and Turell (1993)</td>
<td>Prevalence of bilingual conversation Abundant transcodic markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>Doyle (1993)</td>
<td>Increase in the use of Catalan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-931992-93</td>
<td>Pujolar (1995)</td>
<td>Minimal use of Catalan among young Castilian-speaking, working-class people in Barcelona unless politicised; Catalan-speaking and Bilingual working class youngsters in the same group in Barcelona adopting Castilian as main group language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4. Methodology and results

4.1. Family language use questionnaire

Nom:

0. Pensa qui són les persones que viuen amb tu a casa teva -des de fa com a mínim un any- i escriu-les.
Ex.: mare, tieta, avi, germà gran, germana petita

1. Mare:
   1.1. En quina llengua et parla la teva mare?
   1.2. En quina llengua li parles a la teva mare?

2. Pare
   2.1. En quina llengua et parla?
   2.1. En quina llengua li parles?

3. Germà / -ana (tots i cadascun per separat)
   3.1. En quina llengua et parla?
   3.1. En quina llengua li parles?

4. Avi patern / àvia paterna / avi matern / àvia materna / tiet -a/ etc.
(English translation)

Name:

0. Think who are the people who live with you at your home -at least from one year ago- and write their them.
Example:
    mother, auntie, grand-father, older brother, younger sister

1. Mother
   1.1. In what language does your mother speak to you?
   1.2. In what language do you speak to your mother?

2. Father
   2.1. In what language does your father speak to you?
   2.2. In what language do you speak to your father?

3. Brother / sister (each one separately)
   3.1. In what language does he/she speak to you?
   3.2. In what language do you speak to him/her?

4. Paternal grandfather / grandmother / Maternal grandfather / grandmother/ Uncle / Auntie/ etc..
4.2. The *social usage of catalan* and self-rating competence questionnaire

NOM: [Redacted]  ESCOLA: Rosselló-Pòrcel  
CURS: [Redacted]  DATA: [Redacted]  

1. Escriu el nom de vint persones amb qui et relacionis cada dia a la columna de l'esquerra.  
2. Digues què és respecte de tu o com consideres tu cadascuna d'aquestes persones omplint amb una creu cadascuna de les columnes del centre.  
3. Digues en quina llengua (C = català; E = espanyol) parles tu a aquesta persona i enquina llengua et parla ell / ella a tu a les dues caselles de la dreta.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nom</th>
<th>Conegut</th>
<th>Familiar</th>
<th>Millor amic</th>
<th>Relació</th>
<th>Llengua</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tu</td>
<td>Ell(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Com creus que saps parlar català, tu? bé; regular; malament  
b. Com creus que saps parlar castellà, tu? bé; regular; malament  
c. Et va més bé parlar amb amics i amigues de la teva edat en alguna llengua? En quina?.  
   En les dues; català; castellà
(English translation)

NAME: 
SCHOOL: Rosselló-Pòrcel
COURSE
DATE

1. Write the name of 20 people with whom you relate every day on the left column.
2. Indicate what each person is for you, or what you consider him/her with regards to yourself by crossing in the central columns.
3. Indicate the language you speak with each person and what language he/she speaks to you in the column on the right

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Acquaintance</th>
<th>Relative</th>
<th>Best friend</th>
<th>Relations hip</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How well do you think you can speak Catalan? well; middling; bad.
How well do you think you can speak Castilian? well; middling; bad.
Is it better for you to speak to your friends of your age in any language? in which one?
Both; Catalan; Castilian
7.7 Table used to record the table tennis interactions

The following table includes the English version of the control sheet used to note the language (L.) addressed by each speaker (Sp.) to each addressee (Ad.). Hearers (Hear.), overhearer (Ov.), and even potential eavesdroppers (Eav.) were also taken into account. The final column was reserved for notes.
PARTICIPANTS:  (name, family name, FLG, course)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date:
School:
Setting:
Subject
Appendix 5. Statistical aspects

5.1. Tests applied in this study

It is a fact that, when measured on any capacity, individuals rarely obtain exactly the same scores, i.e., there exists a degree of variability in any human group for any variable. How then do we manage to establish different groups, if variability is always there? Groups are formed on the basis of one or more variables that are regarded as relevant for classification. Each individual is ascribed to one group or another because he/she is 'less different' from the rest of individuals in that group than from the members of the other group, or, to put it differently, individuals assigned to the same group are considerably more alike with one another than they are in comparison with individuals assigned to the other groups. That is, the degree of internal difference within each group is significantly smaller than difference between groups. Of course, variability between individuals within one or more groups may preclude the possibility of establishing such groups. In other words, it may happen that what we had previously thought of as a single group actually encompasses so much variation that many of its members are closer to other groups than to their peers. In that case, we are forced to admit that our original conception of the group has to be re-elaborated.

The statistical methods used in the present study are basically addressed at establishing whether significant differences exist between groups of subjects (or items) measured on different capacities. In most cases, we are trying to elucidate whether members of two or more groups (e.g. Catalan, Castilian and bilingual speakers) behave differently enough in a given capacity (e.g. use of Catalan with teachers) so that we can claim that their behaviour is indeed different as groups. Only the most essential aspects are commented here. Those interested may find it convenient to consult specialised handbooks such as Hatch and Farhady (1982) and Hand and Taylor (1987), among many others.

1 Analysis of variance

The analysis of variance or ANOVA enables us to compare the means of more than two groups on one variable. By using this statistic test, we can examine the differences between the means and decide whether those differences respond to the actual existence of different groups, or happen by chance, and thus refute the existence of different groups.

The analysis of variance presupposes the existence of a single dependent variable. When more than one factors are thought to interact with each other, it is necessary to adopt a multivariate analysis such as the multivariate analysis of variance or MANOVA, which investigates not only the difference between means but the significance of each factor and factor combination in the production of the final results. The adequacy of MANOVA to the present research is clearly expressed by Hand and Taylor (1987) when saying:
"(...) manova should be used when interest lies in exploring between-groups patterns of differences on a set of variables in toto. The individual variables are of no intrinsic interest, it is their union which matters. (...) It can happen that no one of a set of variables shows any distinction between groups, whereas a suitable combination of variables distinguishes well. Identifying that suitable combination is a multivariate task."

(ibid.: 4)

The analysis of language choice and code-switching is such a case: at least in Catalonia, language choice depends on a precise combination of factors that can to be established quantitatively if the adequate methods are used.

II Chi square test

The chi square method is specially convenient when dealing with nominal variables. When we measure nominal variables, we are concerned not with how much but rather with how often or how many, i.e., frequencies rather than scores. The Chi square test evaluates to what extent the results obtained by different groups on two or more variables can be attributed to chance, i.e., they do not support the hypothesis that the groups behave differently, or rather should be thought as behaving in significantly different terms from each other. The groups are found to be significantly different when the level of level of significance of their Chi-square turns out to be below 0.05; besides that, the higher the Chi-square, the higher their significance. Thus, in the following example, the level of significance (p ≤ 0.0001) and the high Chi square (1171) obtained implies that the difference between Catalan and Castilian is not random and, in fact, quite remarkable.

Table 6.13. Quantitative importance of lexical transcoding markers in Catalan and Castilian. Tokens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Min E.F.</th>
<th>Cells with E.F. ≤ 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1171.19173</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>810.055</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1172.8216</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Before Yates Correction)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Missing Observations = 0

III Cluster analysis

The clusters analysis differs from the previous tests in that it is not designed to evaluate to what extent the members of a given group differ from each other. Rather, this test groups the subjects on the basis of two or more variables in the number of clusters decided by the analyst. It shows (a) what subjects form part of each cluster, (b) what is the mean for each cluster, (c) the distance between each subject and the mean. It is the researcher who has to decide whether the number and characteristics of the clusters obtained is satisfactory, or rather more/fewer clusters have to be obtained.
5.2. Multivariate analysis of variance of language choice: results

5.2.1. Presentation

Chapter 5.1 presented a synthetic view of the most relevant results obtained with the multivariate analysis of variance as applied to the language choice. Here follow the statistics obtained during that analysis at length, so that the interpretations can be conveniently verified by those willing to do so. The results produced by the SPSS programme have been included practically in their totality, and only a few irrelevant aspects have been suppressed and/or completed to render the tables easier to understand. I have also added a few comments to increase comprehensibility.

Table 5.5, including the different factors taken into account in the analysis and their respective categories, has been repeated here.

Table 5.5. Factors included in the repeated measures analysis and their categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers’ Family Language Group (FLG)</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Castilian-speaker</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>Catalan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bilingual speaker</td>
<td>Untutored</td>
<td>Catalan-speaking</td>
<td>Castilian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Catalan-speaker</td>
<td>Pupil*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Castilian-speaking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor / Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Pupil is intended to include all class-mates whose voices could not be clearly identified.

The most significant aspects to interpret these results can be synthesised in a few number of points. The results which are of maximal relevance to the interpretation of this model are provided once cells means and standard deviations are analysed, and once it has been concluded that the model obtained here includes a variable. Several sorts of calculations are displayed:

1. **Univariate and multivariate tests** assess whether a given factor is found significant in predicting the results. When the factor significance turns out to be higher than 0.05 (our level of significance), it has to be concluded that the factor analysed has no significant effect on the results. On the contrary, when the level of significance of a given factor (or factor combination) turns out to be smaller than 0.05, the factor is found significant. Thus, in the following example, both the ‘domain’ factor and the ‘FLG by domain’ factor interaction are found to be not significant in predicting the percentage of utterances produced (sig. > 0.05).
UNIVARIATE TEST FOR 'DOMAIN' EFFECT
Tests involving 'Domain' Within-Subject Effect.
Tests of Significance for T2 using UNIQUE sums of squares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN CELLS</td>
<td>39997.32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>869.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMAIN</td>
<td>1133.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1133.36</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG BY DOMAIN</td>
<td>2365.57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1182.79</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Symmetry condition tests**: when the symmetry hypothesis is accepted (significance over 0.05), both univariate and multivariate tests are available for the research; when it is refuted (significance below 0.05), only multivariate tests produce reliable results.

3. **Estimates of factor and factor combination effects**: Once a given factor has been found significant, it still remains to be seen whether (a) all its categories are significant on their own, and (b) to what extent. Also, when a given factor interaction is found significant, it still remains to be seen which category combinations are significant and to what extent. This is what effect estimates offer.

Effect estimates consist of two sorts of tables. In the first one, the significance of a given category (here called *parameters*) or category combination is evaluated. When the confidence interval (the interval included between the scores obtained for Lower 95% CL and Upper) includes 0, the parameter -i.e., the particular category or category combination- is found not significant. When the interval does not include 0, it is found significant, and we can move to analyse its estimated effect.

In the next example, the first factor interaction (11), which stands for the interaction between Castilian-speakers and Catalan / Castilian language (see table 5.5 above), is found to be significant, for its interval (-85.74005 and -25.50722) does not include 0; whereas the second interaction (21), which stands for the interaction between bilingual speakers and Catalan / Castilian language, is null, for its interval encompasses 0.

```
FLG BY LANG
Parameter  Coeff.  Std. Err  t-Value  Sig. t  Lower -95% CL  Upper
{11}  2  -55.623635  14.96174  -3.71773  .001  -85.74005  -25.50722
{21}  3  -2.7447810  17.96142  -0.15282  .879  -38.89924  33.40968
```

Now we can move to analyse the estimated effect of each parameter on the results. It turns out that there exists a significant relationship between Castilian speakers and the Castilian language, and between Catalan speakers and the Catalan language; on the other hand, no interaction can be posited for bilingual speakers and Castilian, for it was found not significant.

Interaction between Castilian-speakers and Catalan language:  -55.62363
Interaction between Castilian-speakers and Castilian language: +55.62363

Interaction between Bilinguals and Catalan language: -2.74478 (null)
Interaction between Bilinguals and Castilian language: +2.74478 (null)

Interaction between Catalan-speakers and Catalan language: +58.36841
Interaction between Catalan-speakers and Castilian language: -58.36841

Armed with these interpretive tools, we can now move to review the results.
5.2.2. Multivariate analysis of variance: results

COMMANDS USED IN SPSS

MANOVA Y1 TO Y20 BY FLG(1,3)
/WSFACTOR= DOMAIN(2) ADDR(5) LANG(2)
/WSDESIGN= DOMAIN, ADDR, LANG, DOMAIN BY ADDR, DOMAIN BY LANG, ADDR BY LANG, DOMAIN BY ADDR BY LANG
/PRINT CELLINFO(MEAN) PARAMETER(ESTIM)
/DESIGN.

49 cases accepted.
0 cases rejected because of out-of-range factor values.
0 cases rejected because of missing data.
3 non-empty cells.
1 design will be processed.

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

Variable .. Y1 (Domain Class-Addr.BILINGUAL-Lang. Catalan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.339</td>
<td>40.728</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23.106</td>
<td>40.284</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>74.286</td>
<td>43.331</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.832</td>
<td>42.784</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable .. Y2 (Domain Class-Addr.BILINGUAL-Lang. Castilian)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.905</td>
<td>48.242</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37.500</td>
<td>49.687</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.714</td>
<td>43.331</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.325</td>
<td>47.936</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable .. Y3 (Domain Class-Addr.Catalan-speaker-Lang.Catalan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>2.899</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.273</td>
<td>46.710</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>68.824</td>
<td>43.803</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.643</td>
<td>33.080</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable .. Y4 (Domain Class-Addr.Catalan-speaker-Lang.Castilian)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.119</td>
<td>48.239</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32.857</td>
<td>46.181</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td>22.361</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.415</td>
<td>46.058</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable .. Y5 (Domain Class-Addr.Pupil-Lang.Catalan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CODE</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.162</td>
<td>26.884</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23.333</td>
<td>35.434</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.667</td>
<td>25.965</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.599</td>
<td>29.003</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable .. Y6 (Domain Class-Addr.Pupil.Lang.Castilian)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53.474</td>
<td>47.723</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49.394</td>
<td>45.137</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52.333</td>
<td>41.660</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.442</td>
<td>45.720</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable .. Y7 (Domain Class-Addr.Castilian-speakerS.Lang.Catalan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.379</td>
<td>32.790</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.160</td>
<td>36.470</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38.166</td>
<td>40.906</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.389</td>
<td>34.088</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable .. Y8 (Domain Class-Addr.Castilian-speakerS.Lang.Castilian)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.677</td>
<td>37.736</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62.252</td>
<td>47.079</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61.487</td>
<td>40.551</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.154</td>
<td>39.409</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable .. Y9 (Domain Class-Addr.Monitor_TeacherS.Lang.Catalan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75.007</td>
<td>23.161</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>83.980</td>
<td>19.836</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>88.612</td>
<td>4.747</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>78.409</td>
<td>21.619</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable .. Y10 (Domain Class-Addr.Monitor_TeacherS.Lang.Castilian)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.253</td>
<td>15.154</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.911</td>
<td>9.952</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.323</td>
<td>5.241</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.428</td>
<td>13.544</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable .. Y11 (Domain Untutored-Addr.BilingualS.Lang.Catalan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.202</td>
<td>19.531</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.631</td>
<td>34.969</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70.098</td>
<td>40.295</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.206</td>
<td>31.672</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable .. Y12 (Domain Untutored-Addr.BilingualS.Lang.Castilian)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73.653</td>
<td>37.359</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56.420</td>
<td>43.214</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29.093</td>
<td>40.778</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.238</td>
<td>40.751</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.318</td>
<td>28.375</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55.208</td>
<td>43.790</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38.049</td>
<td>52.148</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.266</td>
<td>37.899</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58.412</td>
<td>42.231</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.474</td>
<td>35.770</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>1.789</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.914</td>
<td>43.353</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.634</td>
<td>7.752</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.225</td>
<td>12.676</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.369</td>
<td>29.746</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.495</td>
<td>13.110</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable .. Y16 (Domain Untutored-Addr.Pupil-Lang.Castilian)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89.850</td>
<td>24.713</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62.028</td>
<td>42.918</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>77.799</td>
<td>30.331</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.374</td>
<td>31.671</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable .. Y17 (Domain Untutored-Addr.Castilian-speakerS-Lang.Catalan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.723</td>
<td>3.532</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.290</td>
<td>7.106</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.142</td>
<td>38.117</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.812</td>
<td>13.618</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96.815</td>
<td>5.059</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82.545</td>
<td>29.303</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73.775</td>
<td>39.210</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>91.261</td>
<td>19.863</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
For entire sample                         72.465     32.455         49


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLG 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.686</td>
<td>21.469</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.946</td>
<td>21.982</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.395</td>
<td>10.167</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For entire sample                         12.878     20.589         49

UNIVARIATE TEST FOR 'FLG' EFFECT

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects.

Tests of Significance for T1 using UNIQUE sums of squares
Source of Variation          SS      DF        MS         F  Sig of F
WITHIN CELLS           63791.31      46   1386.77
CONSTANT                 923543.56     1     923543.56    665.97      .000
FLG                     2505.06       2   1252.53       .90      .412

The significance of the model's constant is accepted. The present linear model will include a constant. Regarding F.L.G. factor, it has to be accepted that its effect is zero, for the p-value is higher than 0.05.

ESTIMATE OF THE MODEL'S CONSTANT

Estimates for T1
CONSTANT
Parameter     Coeff.  Std. Err.    t-Value    Sig. t  Lower -95% CL-  Upper
  1     181.552987    7.03520   25.80637       .000  167.39186  195.71411

ESTIMATE OF 'FLG' EFFECT

FLG EFFECT
Parameter     Coeff.  Std. Err.    t-Value    Sig. t  Lower -95% CL-  Upper
  2     -4.3967448    7.96880   -.55174       .584  -20.43711   11.64362
  3     -11.228435    9.56647  -1.17373       .247  -30.48474    8.02787

The FLG factor turns out to be not significant.

UNIVARIATE TEST FOR 'DOMAIN' EFFECT
Tests involving 'Domain' Within-Subject Effect.

Tests of Significance for T2 using UNIQUE sums of squares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN CELLS</td>
<td>39997.32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>869.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMAIN</td>
<td>1133.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1133.36</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG BY DOMAIN</td>
<td>2365.57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1182.79</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to their sig. of F, neither 'domain' nor 'FLG by domain' turn out to be significant.

ESTIMATES OF 'DOMAIN' AND 'FLG BY DOMAIN'

Estimates for T2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMAIN</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower -95% CL</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-6.3600244</td>
<td>5.57072</td>
<td>-1.14169</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>-17.57330</td>
<td>4.85325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This factor is not significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLG BY DOMAIN</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower -95% CL</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-10.222940</td>
<td>6.30998</td>
<td>-1.62012</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>-22.92426</td>
<td>2.47838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-1.2834954</td>
<td>7.57506</td>
<td>-.16944</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>-16.53131</td>
<td>13.96432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'FLG by domain' turns out to be not significant

SYMMETRY TEST FOR THE 'ADDR' FACTOR

Tests involving 'Addr' Within-Subject Effect.

Mauchly sphericity test, W = .77351
Chi-square approx. = 11.40721 with 9 D. F.
Significance = .249

Greenhouse-Geisser Epsilon = .89512
Huynh-Feldt Epsilon = 1.00000
Lower-bound Epsilon = .25000

AVERAGED Tests of Significance that follow multivariate tests are equivalent to univariate or split-plot or mixed-model approach to repeated measures. Epsilons may be used to adjust d.f. for the AVERAGED results.

The symmetry hypothesis is accepted (sign > 0.05). Therefore, univariate and multivariate contrasts will be equivalent and will thus enjoy the same validity.

MULTIVARIATE TEST FOR 'FLG BY ADDR' EFFECT
EFFECT .. FLG BY Addr
Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 2, M = 1/2, N = 20 1/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. F</th>
<th>Hypoth. DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillais</td>
<td>.15051</td>
<td>.89519</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotellings</td>
<td>.16836</td>
<td>.88387</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td>.85294</td>
<td>.88987</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roys</td>
<td>.12223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MULTIVARIATE TEST FOR 'ADDR' EFFECT

EFFECT .. Addr
Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 1, N = 20 1/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. F</th>
<th>Hypoth. DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillais</td>
<td>.41626</td>
<td>7.66565</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotellings</td>
<td>.71308</td>
<td>7.66565</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td>.58374</td>
<td>7.66565</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roys</td>
<td>.41626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNIVARIATE TEST FOR 'ADDR' AND 'FLG BY ADDR' EFFECT

Tests involving 'Addr' Within-Subject Effect.

AVERAGED Tests of Significance for Y using UNIQUE sums of squares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN CELLS</td>
<td>97019.13</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>527.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addr</td>
<td>15900.19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3975.05</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG BY Addr</td>
<td>4121.77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>515.22</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The addressee effect is significant (significance < 0.05), while 'addr by flg' is clearly not significant (sig > 0.05).

ESTIMATE FOR 'ADDR' AND 'FLG BY ADDR' EFFECT

Estimates for T3
Addr (nivel 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower -95% CL</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-4.3775361</td>
<td>4.21283</td>
<td>-1.03910</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>-12.85752</td>
<td>4.10245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FLG BY ADDR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower -95% CL</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{11} 2</td>
<td>-.84359486</td>
<td>4.77189</td>
<td>-.17678</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>-10.44891</td>
<td>8.76172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{21} 3</td>
<td>-5.2964118</td>
<td>5.72861</td>
<td>-.92455</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>-16.82750</td>
<td>6.23468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimates for T4
Addr (nivell 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower -95% CL</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FLG BY ADDR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower -95% CL</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-71.263153</td>
<td>5.59394</td>
<td>-12.739</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>-119.7265</td>
<td>10.54739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.3180366</td>
<td>6.71547</td>
<td>1.98319</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-1.9950</td>
<td>26.83558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimates for T5
Addr (level 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower -95% CL</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.41871545</td>
<td>4.71542</td>
<td>0.8868</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td>-9.07347</td>
<td>9.90982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FLG BY ADDR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower -95% CL</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.72968960</td>
<td>5.34117</td>
<td>0.51107</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>-8.02154</td>
<td>13.48092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-3.5285116</td>
<td>6.41203</td>
<td>-0.55030</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>-16.43525</td>
<td>9.37823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimates for T6
Addr (level 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower -95% CL</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.7181687</td>
<td>3.30183</td>
<td>3.85185</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>6.07193</td>
<td>19.36441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FLG BY ADDR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower -95% CL</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.69004846</td>
<td>3.74000</td>
<td>1.25402</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>-2.83818</td>
<td>12.21827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-3.8278915</td>
<td>4.48983</td>
<td>-0.85257</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>-12.86545</td>
<td>5.20967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Addr level 1 (Bilingual addressees) effect: -4.37753
Addr level 2 (Catalan-speaking addressees) effect: -19.65686
Addr level 3 (Pupil addressees) effect: 0.41817
Addr level 4 (Castilian-speaking addressees) effect: 12.71816
Addr level 5 (Monitor_Teacher addressees) effect: -10.89806

UNIVARIATE TEST FOR 'LANG' AND 'FLG BY LANG' EFFECTS

Tests involving 'Lang' Within-Subject Effect.

Tests of Significance for T7 using UNIQUE sums of squares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN CELLS</td>
<td>224874.09</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4888.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANG</td>
<td>7396.98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7396.98</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG BY LANG</td>
<td>68662.59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34331.30</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 'language' factor is not significant (Sig. > 0.05), whereas the 'FLG by language' interaction is
significant (sig. < 0.05).

ESTIMATES FOR 'LANG' AND 'FLG BY LANG' EFFECT

Estimates for T7 Lang (nivell 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower -95% CL</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-16.248079</td>
<td>13.20887</td>
<td>-1.23009</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>-42.83615</td>
<td>10.33999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor lang level 1(catalan)effect: -16.24807
Factor lang level 2(castilian)effect: +16.24807

FLG BY LANG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower -95% CL</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{11} 2</td>
<td>-55.623635</td>
<td>14.96174</td>
<td>-3.71773</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-85.74005</td>
<td>-25.50722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{21} 3</td>
<td>-2.7447810</td>
<td>17.96142</td>
<td>-.15282</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>-38.89924</td>
<td>33.40968</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second interaction [21], which stands for the interaction between Bilingual speakers and Catalan / Castilian language, is null, for its interval encompasses 0.

Interaction between Castilian-speakers and Catalan language: -55.62363
Interaction between Castilian-speakers and Castilian language: +55.62363

Interaction between Bilinguals and Catalan language: -2.74478 (null)
Interaction between Bilinguals and Castilian language: +2.74478 (null)

Interaction between Catalan-speakers and Catalan language: +58.36841
Interaction between Catalan-speakers and Castilian language: -58.36841

SIMMETRY CONDITION TEST FOR 'DOMAIN BY ADDR'

Tests involving 'Domain by Addr' Within-Subject Effect.

Mauchly sphericity test, W = .55318
Chi-square approx. = 26.29822 with 9 D. F.
Significance = .002

Greenhouse-Geisser Epsilon = .78993
Huynh-Feldt Epsilon = .89184
Lower-bound Epsilon = .25000

AVERAGED Tests of Significance that follow multivariate tests are equivalent to univariate or split-plot or mixed-model approach to repeated measures. Epsilons may be used to adjust d.f. for the AVERAGED results.

The symmetry hypothesis is not accepted; therefore, only multivariate tests will be reliable.

MULTIVARIATE TEST FOR 'DOMAIN BY ADDR' AND 'FLG BY DOMAIN BY ADDR' EFFECTS
EFFECT .. FLG BY Domain BY Addr
Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 2, M = 1/2, N = 20 1/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. F</th>
<th>Hypoth. DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillais</td>
<td>.24376</td>
<td>1.52674</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotellings</td>
<td>.27886</td>
<td>1.46401</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td>.77067</td>
<td>1.49545</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roys</td>
<td>.14262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 'FLG by domain by addr' interaction is not significant (Sig. > 0.05).

EFFECT .. Domain BY Addr
Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 1 , N = 20 1/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. F</th>
<th>Hypoth. DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillais</td>
<td>.09228</td>
<td>1.09282</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotellings</td>
<td>.10166</td>
<td>1.09282</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td>.90772</td>
<td>1.09282</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roys</td>
<td>.09228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 'Domain by Addr' interaction is not significant (sig. > 0.05).

UNIVARIATE TEST FOR 'DOMAIN BY ADDR' AND 'FLG BY DOMAIN BY ADDR' EFFECTS

Tests involving 'Domain BY Addr' Within-Subject Effect.

AVERAGED Tests of Significance for Y using UNIQUE sums of squares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN CELLS</td>
<td>80776.76</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain BY Addr</td>
<td>1366.20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>341.55</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG BY Domain BY Addr</td>
<td>6482.38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>810.30</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ESTIMATES OF 'DOMAIN BY ADDR' AND 'FLG BY DOMAIN BY ADDR' EFFECTS

### Estimates for T8

**Domain BY Addr**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower 95% CL</th>
<th>Upper 95% CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{11} 1</td>
<td>-.3988606</td>
<td>3.69264</td>
<td>-1.19125</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>-11.83176</td>
<td>3.03404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FLG BY DOMAIN BY ADDR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower 95% CL</th>
<th>Upper 95% CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{111} 2</td>
<td>1.3079264</td>
<td>4.18267</td>
<td>.43771</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>-6.58848</td>
<td>10.25007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{211} 3</td>
<td>-6.6346053</td>
<td>5.02125</td>
<td>-1.32131</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>-16.74186</td>
<td>3.47265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Estimates for T9

**Domain BY Addr**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower 95% CL</th>
<th>Upper 95% CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{12} 1</td>
<td>-.93419551</td>
<td>4.55206</td>
<td>-.20522</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>-10.09702</td>
<td>8.22863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FLG BY DOMAIN BY ADDR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower 95% CL</th>
<th>Upper 95% CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* {112} 2</td>
<td>-12.086088</td>
<td>5.15614</td>
<td>-2.34402</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-22.46485</td>
<td>-1.70732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{212} 3</td>
<td>-5.0712190</td>
<td>6.18989</td>
<td>-.81927</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>-17.53083</td>
<td>7.38839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*interaction between castilian-speakers, class domain and Catalan addr: -12.086*

### Estimates for T10

**Domain BY Addr**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower 95% CL</th>
<th>Upper 95% CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{13} 1</td>
<td>-.52924765</td>
<td>4.24515</td>
<td>-1.24671</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>-13.83751</td>
<td>3.25256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FLG BY DOMAIN BY ADDR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower 95% CL</th>
<th>Upper 95% CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{113} 2</td>
<td>-1.7386495</td>
<td>4.80850</td>
<td>-36158</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>-11.41765</td>
<td>7.94035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{213} 3</td>
<td>10.5837884</td>
<td>5.77255</td>
<td>1.83347</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-1.03575</td>
<td>22.20333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Estimates for T11

**DOMAIN BY ADDR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower 95% CL</th>
<th>Upper 95% CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{14} 1</td>
<td>.725942123</td>
<td>3.20851</td>
<td>.22626</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>-5.73246</td>
<td>7.18434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FLG BY DOMAIN BY ADDR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower 95% CL</th>
<th>Upper 95% CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{114} 2</td>
<td>3.38212332</td>
<td>3.63429</td>
<td>.93061</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>-3.93333</td>
<td>10.69758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{214} 3</td>
<td>-1.0535216</td>
<td>4.36239</td>
<td>-.24147</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td>-9.85655</td>
<td>7.72861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNIVARIATE TEST FOR 'DOMAIN BY LANG' AND 'FLG BY DOMAIN BY LANG' EFFECTS

Tests involving 'Domain BY Lang' Within-Subject Effect.

Tests of Significance for T12 using UNIQUE sums of squares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN CELLS</td>
<td>111339.93</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2420.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain BY Lang</td>
<td>13241.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13241.00</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG BY Domain BY LANG</td>
<td>3331.49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1665.75</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interaction of Domain by lang is accepted. The interaction FLG by Domain by Lang is rejected.

ESTIMATES FOR 'DOMAIN BY LANG' AND FLG BY DOMAIN BY LANG' EFFECTS

Estimates for T12

Domain BY Lang

Parameter: Coeff. Std. Err. t-Value Sig. t Lower -95% CL- Upper

{11} 1  21.7387744  9.29440  2.33891 .024  3.03012  40.44743
Interaction between Class Domain and Catalan language: +21.73877
Interaction between Class Domain and Castilian language: -21.73877
Interaction between Untutored Domain and LangUA Catalan: -21.73877
Interaction between Untutored Domain and LangUA Castilian: +21.73877

FLG BY DOMAIN BY LANG

Parameter: Coeff. Std. Err. t-Value Sig. t Lower -95% CL- Upper

{11} 2  10.8668973  10.52780  1.03221 .307 -10.32447  32.05827
{21} 3 -8.1402662  12.63852 -.64408 .523 -33.58030  17.29976

SYMMETRY CONDITION TEST FOR 'ADDR BY ADDR'

Tests involving 'Addr BY Lang' Within-Subject Effect.

Mauchly sphericity test, W = .81586
Chi-square approx. = 9.03941 with 9 D. F.
Significance = .434

Greenhouse-Geisser Epsilon = .90987
Huynh-Feldt Epsilon = 1.00000
Lower-bound Epsilon = .25000

AVERAGED Tests of Significance that follow multivariate tests are equivalent to univariate or split-plot or mixed-model approach to repeated measures. Epsilons may be used to adjust d.f. for the AVERAGED results.

The symmetry hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, the information obtained from multivariate and univariate tests will be reliable.
MULTIVARIATE TEST FOR 'ADDR BY LANG' AND 'FLG BY ADDR BY LANG' EFFECTS

EFFECT .. FLG BY Addr BY Lang
Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 2, M = 1/2, N = 20 1/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. F</th>
<th>Hypoth. DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillais</td>
<td>.48517</td>
<td>3.52307</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotellings</td>
<td>.75394</td>
<td>3.95821</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td>.55006</td>
<td>3.74452</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roys</td>
<td>.39627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The significance of FLG BY Addr BY Lang is accepted.

EFFECT .. Addr BY Lang
Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 1 , N = 20 1/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. F</th>
<th>Hypoth. DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillais</td>
<td>.87338</td>
<td>74.15297</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotellings</td>
<td>6.89795</td>
<td>74.15297</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td>.12662</td>
<td>74.15297</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roys</td>
<td>.87338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The significance of Addr BY Lang effect is accepted.

UNIVARIATE TEST FOR 'ADDR BY LANG' AND 'FLG BY ADDR BY LANG' EFFECTS
Tests involving 'Addr BY Lang' Within-Subject Effect.

AVERAGED Tests of Significance for Y using UNIQUE sums of squares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN CELLS</td>
<td>185727.69</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1009.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addr BY Lang</td>
<td>286786.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71696.50</td>
<td>71.03</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLG BY Addr BY Lang</td>
<td>30093.84</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3761.73</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both univariate and multivariate tests reach the same conclusion: all effects are significant.

ESTIMATE FOR 'ADDR BY LANG' AND 'FLG BY ADDR BY LANG' EFFECTS

Estimates for T13
ADDR BY LANG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t Lower -95% CL- Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{11} 1</td>
<td>-54.999593</td>
<td>6.57643</td>
<td>-8.36314</td>
<td>.000 -68.23725 -41.76193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FLG BY ADDR BY LANG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t Lower -95% CL- Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{111} 2</td>
<td>-19.248702</td>
<td>7.44915</td>
<td>-2.58401</td>
<td>.013 -34.24306 -4.25435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{211} 3</td>
<td>-9.8733984</td>
<td>8.94263</td>
<td>-1.10408</td>
<td>.275 -27.87397 8.12717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Estimates for T14
ADDR BY LANG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower 95% CL</th>
<th>Upper 95% CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-19.86426</td>
<td>6.69318</td>
<td>-2.96783</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-33.33694</td>
<td>-6.39158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FLG BY ADDR BY LANG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower 95% CL</th>
<th>Upper 95% CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>-19.10681</td>
<td>7.58140</td>
<td>-2.52022</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-34.36738</td>
<td>-3.84625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>11.53102</td>
<td>9.10139</td>
<td>1.26695</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>-6.78913</td>
<td>29.85118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimates for T15
ADDR BY LANG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower 95% CL</th>
<th>Upper 95% CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>-62.72197</td>
<td>5.63117</td>
<td>-11.13834</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-74.05693</td>
<td>-51.38700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FLG BY ADDR BY LANG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower 95% CL</th>
<th>Upper 95% CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>11.35765</td>
<td>7.65727</td>
<td>1.48325</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>-4.05564</td>
<td>26.77094</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimates for T16
ADDR BY LANG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower 95% CL</th>
<th>Upper 95% CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>-53.68306</td>
<td>4.93388</td>
<td>-10.88049</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-63.61445</td>
<td>-43.75167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FLG BY ADDR BY LANG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower 95% CL</th>
<th>Upper 95% CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>12.81548</td>
<td>5.58863</td>
<td>2.29314</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>1.56616</td>
<td>24.06481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>-4.65570</td>
<td>6.70909</td>
<td>-.69394</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>-18.16040</td>
<td>8.84900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interaction between Bilingual addressees and Catalan language: -54.59959
Interaction between Catalan-speaking addressees and Catalan language: -19.86426
Interaction between Pupil addressees and Catalan language: -62.72196
Interaction between Castilian-speaking addressees and Catalan language: -53.68305
Interaction between Monitor_Teacher addressees and Catalan language: +190.86886

INTERACTIONS BETWEEN FLG, ADDRESSEES AND LANGUAGE:

111: -19.24870  112: +19.24870
211: -9.87339   212: +9.87339
311: +29.12209  312: -29.12209
121: -19.10681  122: +19.10681
221: +11.53102  222: -11.53102
321: +7.57579   322: -7.57579
It should be borne in mind that results for bilinguals are not significant, for they are included in the confidence interval.

**SYMmetry CONDITION TEST FOR 'DOMAIN BY ADDR BY ADDR'

Tests involving 'Domain BY Addr BY Lang' Within-Subject Effect.

Mauchly sphericity test, $W = .63243$
Chi-square approx. = 20.35131 with 9 D. F.
Significance = .016

Greenhouse-Geisser Epsilon = .83527
Huynh-Feldt Epsilon = .94770
Lower-bound Epsilon = .25000

AVERAGED Tests of Significance that follow multivariate tests are equivalent to univariate or split-plot or mixed-model approach to repeated measures. Epsilons may be used to adjust d.f. for the AVERAGED results.

The symmetry hypothesis is refused; therefore, only the multivariate test will be acceptable.

**MULTIVARIATE TEST FOR 'DOMAIN BY ADDR BY LANG' AND 'FLG BY DOMAIN BY ADDR BY LANG' EFFECTS

**EFFECT . . FLG BY Domain BY Addr BY Lang**
Multivariate Tests of Significance ($S = 2, M = 1/2, N = 20 1/2$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. F</th>
<th>Hypoth. DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillais</td>
<td>.16407</td>
<td>.98300</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotellings</td>
<td>.18886</td>
<td>.99150</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td>.83876</td>
<td>.98785</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roys</td>
<td>.14448</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EFFECT . . Domain BY Addr BY Lang**
Multivariate Tests of Significance ($S = 1, M = 1, N = 20 1/2$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. F</th>
<th>Hypoth. DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillais</td>
<td>.14980</td>
<td>1.89408</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotellings</td>
<td>.17619</td>
<td>1.89408</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td>.85020</td>
<td>1.89408</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roys</td>
<td>.14980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neither effect turns out to be significant.

**UNIVARIATE TEST FOR DOMAIN BY ADDR BY LANG I FLG BY DOMAIN BY ADDR BY LANG EFFECTS**
Tests involving 'Domain BY Addr BY Lang' Within-Subject Effect.

AVERAGED Tests of Significance for Y using UNIQUE sums of squares
Source of Variation SS  DF   MS   F  Sig of F

WITHIN CELLS 170880.56 184 928.70
Domain BY Addr BY LLE 8694.93 4 2173.73 2.34 .057
NG FLG BY Domain BY Addr 4971.56 8 621.45 .67 .718
BY Lang

Even if it is not acceptable here, results from the univariate test confirm the previous results.

ESTIMATES FOR 'DOMAIN BY ADDR BY LANG' AND 'FLG BY DOMAIN BY ADDR BY LANG' EFFECTS

Estimates for T17  
Domain BY Addr BY Lang

Parameter Coeff. Std. Err. t-Value Sig. t Lower -95% CL Upper
{111} 1 4.91293353 6.18611 .79419 .431 -7.53906 17.36493

FLG BY DOMAIN BY ADDR BY LANG

Parameter Coeff. Std. Err. t-Value Sig. t Lower -95% CL Upper
{1111} 2 6.88377448 7.00703 .98241 .331 -7.22065 20.98820
{2111} 3 -5.4209869 8.41188 -.64444 .522 -22.35321 11.51124

Estimates for T18  
DOMAIN BY ADDR BY LANG

Parameter Coeff. Std. Err. t-Value Sig. t Lower -95% CL Upper
{121} 1 -7.6250279 5.83319 -1.30718 .198 -19.36663 4.11657

FLG BY DOMAIN BY ADDR BY LANG

Parameter Coeff. Std. Err. t-Value Sig. t Lower -95% CL Upper
{1121} 2 -.73931438 6.60728 -.11189 .911 -14.03908 12.56045
{2121} 3 -14.596556 7.93197 -1.84022 .072 -30.56279 1.36968

Estimates for T19  
DOMAIN BY ADDR BY LANG

Parameter Coeff. Std. Err. t-Value Sig. t Lower -95% CL Upper
{131} 1 11.2704438 5.49658 2.05045 .046 .20641 22.33448

FLG BY DOMAIN BY ADDR BY LANG

Parameter Coeff. Std. Err. t-Value Sig. t Lower -95% CL Upper
{1131} 2 .650618527 6.22500 .10450 .917 -11.88166 13.18290
{2131} 3 .755449604 7.47425 .10107 .920 -14.28943 15.80033
Estimates for T20
DOMAIN BY ADDR BY LANG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower 95% CL</th>
<th>Upper 95% CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.051</td>
<td>5.484</td>
<td>1.833</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.987</td>
<td>21.089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FLG BY DOMAIN BY ADDR BY LANG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. t</th>
<th>Lower 95% CL</th>
<th>Upper 95% CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.159</td>
<td>6.212</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>-9.345</td>
<td>15.663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.3. Cluster analysis

*quick clu a b c*

*crl clu(6)*

*print id(d) clu dis.*

QUICK CLUSTER requires 664 BYTES of workspace for execution.

**Classification Cluster Centers.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5875</td>
<td>.6957</td>
<td>.9679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4788</td>
<td>.0271</td>
<td>.0699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.9807</td>
<td>.1516</td>
<td>.8242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.5000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.5298</td>
<td>.3772</td>
<td>.4807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Case listing of Cluster membership.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESG</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XPR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Cluster Centers.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5833</td>
<td>.6500</td>
<td>.9333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4433</td>
<td>.0284</td>
<td>.2033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.9575</td>
<td>.2169</td>
<td>.7800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.5000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.5000</td>
<td>.3926</td>
<td>.5200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Distances between Final Cluster centers.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5482</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.9690</td>
<td>1.3743</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distances between Final Cluster centers. (CONT.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.5925</td>
<td>.8145</td>
<td>.7953</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0003</td>
<td>1.1180</td>
<td>.9943</td>
<td>1.1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.4940</td>
<td>.9216</td>
<td>.4859</td>
<td>.5548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cluster 5 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.7996</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Cases in each Cluster.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>unweighted cases</th>
<th>weighted cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing 34
Total 15.0 15.0
## Appendix 6

### 6.1. One-word lexical transcodic markers inserted in Castilian utterances

Markers are classified in alphabetic order. In the list, lexemes were preferred unless the actual form produced was necessary to understand its particularities.

SC: syntactic category (see chapter 6);
DL: donor language (C: Catalan; E: English; J: Japanese);
PI: (predominant degree of) phonic integration (see chapter 6);
MI: (predominant degree of) morphologic integration.
TK: tokens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of item</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>DL</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>CL</th>
<th>TK</th>
<th>Standard Castilian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>standard Castilian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>translation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a más</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>CAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>además</td>
<td>more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a más a más</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>CAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>además</td>
<td>moreover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a sota</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>debajo</td>
<td>below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aboñar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>abollar</td>
<td>to dent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acojonir</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>acojonar</td>
<td>to intimidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agradar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>CAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>gustar</td>
<td>like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amors</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>amores</td>
<td>loves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>análisi</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>análisis</td>
<td>analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aqui</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>CAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ahí</td>
<td>here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banda</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>CAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>lado</td>
<td>side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barrecha</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>mezcla</td>
<td>mix-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>batut</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>batido</td>
<td>milk shake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black and decker</td>
<td>NN</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>black a.</td>
<td>black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and decker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bombolla</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>burbuja</td>
<td>bubble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bonus</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>bono</td>
<td>bonus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bufar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>soplar</td>
<td>to blow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>básquet</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>baloncesto</td>
<td>basketball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadira</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>silla</td>
<td>chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cargol</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>caracol</td>
<td>snail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carquiholi</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>sort of biscuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chopped</td>
<td>NN</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>chopped ham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ciao</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>hasta luego</td>
<td>bye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colla</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>panda</td>
<td>gang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>com</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>como</td>
<td>like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>com que</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>CAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>como</td>
<td>since</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consecutiu</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>consecutivo</td>
<td>consecutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crioll</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>criollo</td>
<td>creole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cuerno [ˈkwénu]</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>cuerno [ˈkweɾno]</td>
<td>horn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cusin</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>primo</td>
<td>cousin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de acuerdo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>CAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>vale</td>
<td>all right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de estranquis</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ilegalmente</td>
<td>illegally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decirle a uno</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>CAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>llamarse</td>
<td>to be called</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decir de</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>CAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>proponer</td>
<td>to suggest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deu</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>diez</td>
<td>ten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disk-joquey</td>
<td>NN</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>disk-jockey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distància</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>distancia</td>
<td>distance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
divuit

doncs

efectivi-wonder

¿éh?

empreñar

encheagar

enganchar

enquaderación

Espanyol NM

espanyols

esta

este

efectivamente

¿no?

¿éh?

empreñar

engachar

enquaderación

Espanyol NM

espanyols

esta

este

efectivamente

indeed

so

to stick

book binding

this (masculine)

this (feminine)

this

this (neuter)

to do

how fantastic

leaf fantastic

mean

gear

gear

music

older

limp

to be

(pro-verb)

taxes

never

Japanese

plumber

Dios mío my God

metal

metal

to try to

mountain bike

peach

boy

bricklayer

fool

stall

to work

to assume,

to burst

to die laughing

pin

though

president

pressure
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Part of Speech</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>punky</td>
<td>NN</td>
<td>estar seguro</td>
<td>to be sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>querer decir</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>botón de grabar</td>
<td>recorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recorder</td>
<td>NN</td>
<td>renta</td>
<td>income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>renda</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>morado</td>
<td>bruise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sacar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>oír</td>
<td>to hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sangtraít</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>morado</td>
<td>bruise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentir</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>oír</td>
<td>to hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ser</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>estar</td>
<td>to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seté</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>séptimo</td>
<td>seventh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>firmar</td>
<td>to sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skate-park</td>
<td>NN</td>
<td>parque para patinar</td>
<td>skate-park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>español</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taca</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>mancha</td>
<td>spot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talladors</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>cortadores</td>
<td>cutters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>també</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>también</td>
<td>also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taula</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>mesa</td>
<td>table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tirar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>echar</td>
<td>to throw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>titella</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>marioneta</td>
<td>marionette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tornar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>volver</td>
<td>to come back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tornavís</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>destornillador</td>
<td>screwdriver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vendre</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>vez</td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vendre</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>vender</td>
<td>to sell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veterinari</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>veterinario</td>
<td>vet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veure</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>ver</td>
<td>to see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vidrio</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>cristal</td>
<td>glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocabulari</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>vocabulario</td>
<td>vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vuit</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>ocho</td>
<td>eight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2. Lexical transcodic markers inserted in Catalan utterances

SC: syntactic category (see chapter 6);
DL: donor language (C: Catalan; E: English; J: Japanese);
PI: (predominant degree of) phonetic integration (see chapter 6); 
MI: (predominant degree of) morphologic integration.
TK: tokens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of item</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>DL</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>CL</th>
<th>TK</th>
<th>Standard Catalan</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a l'estona</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>CAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>un estona</td>
<td>a while later</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a tope</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>al màxim</td>
<td>to the limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>acceptar</td>
<td>to accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acera</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>vorera</td>
<td>sidewalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adelantar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>avançar</td>
<td>to overtake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ademés</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>CAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>a més a més</td>
<td>moreover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adivinar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>endevinar</td>
<td>to guess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afrodissiaca</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>afrodísica</td>
<td>aphrodisiac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agafar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>CAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>coger</td>
<td>to take</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ahir nit</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>CAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ahi a la nit</td>
<td>yesterday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>algo</td>
<td>PN</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>alguna cosa</td>
<td>something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>almenos</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>alçar/la nit</td>
<td>at least</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anda!</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>alçar</td>
<td>go on!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andalucía</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Andalusia</td>
<td>Andalusia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>andaluza</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>andalusia</td>
<td>Andalusian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aparato</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>aparell</td>
<td>device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apellit</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>cognom</td>
<td>name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apretar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>pitjar</td>
<td>to push</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aquel</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>aquell</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>árbitro</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>àbitre</td>
<td>referee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arrasar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>arrasar</td>
<td>to devastate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asquerosa</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>fastigosa</td>
<td>disgusting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asentar-se</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>CAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>seure</td>
<td>to sit down</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assustar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>espantar</td>
<td>to scare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>así</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>així</td>
<td>like this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asín</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>així</td>
<td>like this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aunque</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>encara que</td>
<td>even though</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avion</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>avió</td>
<td>plane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bajar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>baixar</td>
<td>to get down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>balommano</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>hàndbol</td>
<td>handball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bien</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ben</td>
<td>well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bitxo (afectiu)</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>cuca</td>
<td>little child (vocative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bobadillo NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>entrepà</td>
<td>sandwich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bocata</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>entrepà</td>
<td>sandwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bombilla</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>bombeta</td>
<td>light bulb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>borde</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>bord</td>
<td>bastard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>borrar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>esborrar</td>
<td>to erase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>Ê</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bueno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>well, all right,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cabrear-se</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>cabrejar-se</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cabrón</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>cabró</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cadete</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>cadet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>càgare</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>caga’t-hí</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calbo</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>calb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calle veinticinc</td>
<td>(joc)</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>carrer vint-i-cinc(?) street 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(game)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>canguro</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>cangur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capullo</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>torracollons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capítol</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>capitol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carajillo</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>cigaló</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carcu (quelcom + algo) PN</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>alguna cosa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carrera</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>correguda, cursa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>catxondejar-se</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>fotre’s de to make fun of sthg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>catxondo</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>divertit fun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>celo</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>cel-lo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cerdo</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>porc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cerebro</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>cervell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chair</td>
<td>NN</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>cadira</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ciudadà</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ciutadà</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clar está que</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>é claro que</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>claro</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(és) clar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indeed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of course,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cllave</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>clau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cobijo</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>aixopluc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colegio</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>col·legi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>con que</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>així que</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cono</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>con</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cónsola</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>consola</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contrabando</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>contraband</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corn</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>banya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coño</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>cony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cuartelillo</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>caserna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quarter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guarda Civil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cuerno</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>banya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cura</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>mossèn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>currar-se</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>pegar-se</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curso</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>curs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dale</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>fot-li, da-li</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dalt</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>amunt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>donar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de-parte</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>de-part (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deber</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>deure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deixar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>deixar estar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delante</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>davant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demés</td>
<td>PN</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>altres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deret</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>dret</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descuido</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>descuit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mistake</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>despés</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>després</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>darrere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detrás</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>despés</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

530
<p>| dioptria | NF | S | I | C | LW | 1 | diòptria | dioptrre |
| donar    | V  | S |   |   | CAL| 27| fer      | pro-verb |
| donar igual | ID | S |   |   | CAL| 6 | tant se val | never mind |
| donar lo mateix | ID | S |   |   | CAL| 1 | tant se val | never mind |
| donar-se compte | ID | S |   |   | CAL| 4 | adonar-seto realise | |
| donar-se-les de llest | ID | S |   |   | CAL| 1 | fer veure que s’hi entén | |
| sthgs    |   |   |   |   |   |   | to pretend to know about | |
| drogata   | NM | S | D | A | LW | 2 | drogoaddicte | junkie |
| dulces    | NM | S | D | C | CS | 1 | dolços | sweets |
| efe-pe    | NF | S | D | A | LW | 15 | efa-pe | |
| vocational training |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | |
| él        | PM | S | C | A | CS | 1 | ell | he |
| empuixar  | V  | S | R | R | LW | 1 | empènyer, empentar to push | |
| emputzar  | V  | S | R | R | LW | 3 | empènyer, empentar to push | |
| en plan   | R  | S | R | A | LW | 3 | en acitud de | in a given way |
| en sèrio  | DV | S | R | D | LW | 3 | seriament | seriously |
| en ves de | R  | S | R | A | LW | 3 | en comptes de | instead of |
| encandre  | V  | S |   |   | CAL| 1 | engegar | to start an |
| encreuar  | V  | S |   |   | CAL| 1 | creuar | to cross |
| engatxurar | V | S | R | C | LW | 1 | ensarronar | to coax |
| ens veiem | ID | S |   |   | CAL| 2 | a reveure, adéu | see you later |
| enterar-se | V | S | R | R | LW | 6 | assabentar-se | to come to |
| know      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| entrar en raó | ID | S |   |   | CAL| 1 | venir a la raó | to make sb. see |
| sense     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| enxufar   | V  | S | R | R | LW | 1 | endollar | to plug in/ to recommend |
| escoltar  | V  | S | R | C | LW | 1 | evitar | to avoid |
| escrivir  | V  | S | R | D | CS | 1 | escriure | to write |
| eso       | PN | S | D | D | CS | 1 | això | this (neuter) |
| esta      | DF | S | C | C | CS | 2 | aquesta | this (feminine) |
| estar     | V  | S |   |   | CAL| 1 | ser | to be |
| este      | DM | S | A | D | CS | 1 | aquest | this |
| (masculine) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| etxar     | V  | S | R | R | CS | 2 | llançar | to throw |
| fet pols  | ID | S |   |   | CAL| 1 | baldat, rebentat | worn out |
| flaco     | AM | S | D | D | CS | 1 | prim | slim |
| flipar (slang) | V | E | R | C | LW | 1 | gaudir, al-lucinar | to flip over |
| sthgs     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| follta    | NF | S | C | C | CS | 1 | full | leaf, sheet |
| forofo    | NM | S | D | D | LW | 1 | fan, seguidor | supporter |
| fulla     | NF | S |   |   | CAL| 4 | full | leaf, sheet |
| fundamental | AI | S | R | A | LW | 1 | fonamental | fundamental |
| (bomba) fètida (bomb) | AF | S | D | C | CS | 1 | (bomba) fètida | stinking |
| fútbol    | NM | S | D | A | LW | 13 | futbol | football |
| gases     | NM | S | D | D | CS | 1 | gasos | gases |
| gilipollada | NF | S | D | C | LW | 1 | idiotada | foolishness |
| gimnàssia training | NF | S | R | C | LW | 1 | gimnàstica | physical |
| gordito   | AM | S | D | D | CS | 1 | grassonet fatty | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>terme</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>number</th>
<th>origin</th>
<th>translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gorda</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gordo</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gorro</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gran</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guai</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guaro</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gustar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>habér</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hala!</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hale!</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hasta</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hambre</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hortero</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>igual</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incómodo</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inglés</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inglés</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jabali</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jefe</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joder!</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jolin</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kame-ame</td>
<td>NN</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>larguero</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>libre</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>licra</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lio</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>llegar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>llinterna</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo</td>
<td>DN</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lobo</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lolailo</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loro</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>los</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mandar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mando</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manguera</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mantequilla</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maquineta</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>massa</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matxaca</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mechero</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mellorar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>melocotón</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>menos</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentira</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentres</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mensys mal</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mister</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moco</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>molar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>molt</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mono</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LW 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>montar</td>
<td>V S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>LW 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moscatel</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A CS 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mulucuó</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A CS 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>más</td>
<td>Q S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>CS 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>navaixa</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C LW 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negro [mex]</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D CS 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ningun</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A LW 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ninguna</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C LW 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no sé quantos</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D LW 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(que) no vegis</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nòvia</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C LW 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nòvio</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D LW 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o sea</td>
<td>M S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>CS 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ojalà</td>
<td>M S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>LW 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>par</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>para</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paraigües</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A CS 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parxe</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A CAL 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passada</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A LW 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passar (de)</td>
<td>V S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pasteler</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R LW 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pasteleria</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C LW 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patada</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C LW 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pavo</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D LW 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pelma</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A LW 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peluca</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C LW 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pelo</td>
<td>C S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>LW 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pera</td>
<td>C S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>LW 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pereria</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C CS 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peste</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A LW 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pico</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D LW 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pilla-pilla</td>
<td>S C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>CS 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pillar</td>
<td>V S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>LW 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>posar (cara de)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>posar colzes</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAL 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poste</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A LW 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prima</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C CS 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primero</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D CS 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pringar</td>
<td>V S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>LW 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provar</td>
<td>V S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psicólogue</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>M CS 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pueblo</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D CS 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Catalan</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tonta</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>LW 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tonteria</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>LW 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tonto</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>LW 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>top</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>LW 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tope</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LW 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>super</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tratar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>LW 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>treure</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>CAL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trueno</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>txaco</td>
<td>NN</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>txatxi</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>txorrada</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LW 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un montón</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vago</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>LW 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaia</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>LW 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>val</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>CAL</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vale</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LW 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>venga</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>CS 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>venir (&quot;viene&quot;)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vip</td>
<td>NN</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xilena</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>CAL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xivatar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>LW 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xorixo</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>LW 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xulo</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>LW 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xupar</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>LW 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xupat</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>LW 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xàndal</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zombi ‘θombi’</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table entries include part of speech (P.O.S.) and word forms. The entries for 'xàndal' and 'zombi ‘θombi’' are particularly interesting.
6.3. Personal weak pronouns ('pronoms clitics')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Catalan</th>
<th>Bilingual</th>
<th>Castilian</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>els x en</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en F</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en S</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en x el</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l’hi x els en</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hi F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hi S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hi x li</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l’hi x els hi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>li x hi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el x ho</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el x la</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el x li</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>els F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>es F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>es x ens</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ho F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ho x el</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ho x els</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ho x la</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>les x els</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>li CD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>li DAT PL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo x ho</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me se</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s’ho x li ho</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se + V</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se ho x li ho</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se’l x l’hi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se’l x se les</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se’ls x se les</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se la x els hi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t’ho x li ho</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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