Sociolinguistic markets, norms and identity:
An interpretation of sociolinguistic
transitions in Catalunya[1]

Margaret Simmons*

A framework for understanding the situation of language contact in Barcelona and an overview of the situation has been presented (Simmons, 2000), and language shift on the part of individuals has been viewed as linguistic mobility (Simmons, 2002, Forthcoming). The present paper focuses on the mobility of languages and of speakers in the overall sociolinguistic market in Barcelona before and after the political changes of 1975 and, based on historical and sociolinguistic references, offers an interpretation of market conditions, the implied profile of legitimate speakers, sociolinguistic norms and linguistic mobility in Catalunya[2] in these times periods.

1.0　Concepts

1.1　Markets and Mobility of Languages

The concept of market implies a kind of economy where products can be exchanged according to shared beliefs concerning relative values of the available products. Language can be considered a kind of linguistic product and symbolic capitol (Bourdieu, 1991). In a geographical territory, there are often several linguistic varieties, which coexist with relative values to each other. Each variety and its speakers can be considered as a sub-market. Symbolic exchange takes place within subgroups where individuals choose various kinds of behaviors, including language, in exchange for group membership, solidarity, friendship, prestige, approval, cooperation, and other benefits such as education and employment opportunities. Symbolic exchange also takes place between members of different subgroups.

The value of each sub-market, and its associated language, relative to the others, depends on numerous factors such as the language's legal status and integration in governmental functions, the number of speakers, the characteristics of the native and also non-native speakers, how the particular group values itself and the value assigned to that group by members of other groups.

The vitality of the language and its market depends on its value and its possibilities for attracting new speakers, i.e., acquisition of the language by younger generations in the group and also acquisition by individuals from other groups. Languages with fairly high value in the overall market logically attract new speakers; whereas languages with little value may lose speakers and may disappear. Subgroups with a relatively small number of members may become either negatively marginalized, especially if the value of the group and their linguistic products is low, or positively marginalized, i.e., elite, if the group is valued highly compared to other groups in the market.

*産業社会学部助教授

Gaining a viable position in the market occurs through competitiveness, by offering incentives and benefits of relatively more value than other groups. Reasons for viability or relative dominance in a market maybe due to the economic activity of that group, political and legal advantages, official status, and the sociolinguistic mobility of individuals in the group.

A market, a space where exchange takes place, may be considered legitimate or not according to various criteria. Blau (1964) does not consider exchanges made due to physical coercion as true exchanges, and we can apply this to the linguistic markets in 20th century Spain where regional languages were officially prohibited under a military government. Prohibition of a language or other product can sometimes create black markets and covert prestige for oppressed or outlawed people or products. Where black markets do exist, they are often used by elites who have access to them. Bourdieu's concept of arbitrary value being misrecognized as natural (1991, p. 23) is also important, and in relationship to the political changes in Spain during recent centuries, political imposition of languages rather than "natural" value is evident.

1.2 Sociolinguistic Market Conditions

The conditions of the overall market, where all of the subgroups interact, are also important, and the degree of mobility of subgroups as well as of individuals is affected by the degree of stability of the value hierarchy of the coexisting groups and their respective languages. The degree of unification of the market revolves around the agreement on the value given to the varieties and the degree of acceptance (or *misrecognition*) of the hierarchy as naturally legitimate rather than arbitrary. Economic interaction between subgroups and political and legal structures that affect groups are also important, as well as criteria for the social identity of groups along with the degree of recognition of such groups by outsiders, and the importance of language in determining group identity. Additionally, changes in population through immigration, emigration and mobility of individuals influence the overall conditions of the sociolinguistic market.

1.3 Sociolinguistic Mobility of Individuals

An individual's own identity, values and desire for social mobility are often considered motivations for choosing a particular language in a particular situation. Identity often determines one's potential activities, and the development of one's identity is a process of acquiring identity components (Baumeister, 1986, pp. 17, 21), one of which can be language. So if a person wishes to change their social potential, it may be necessary to change their identity through acquiring different identity components, one of which might be language. Then while identity determines one's potential, making choices actualizes one of existing possibilities. For example, choosing and using a new language probably reinforces it as an identity component, especially as the individual becomes a more frequent and also more fluent user of the language.

Choosing a new language is often connected to social mobility, and also with entering into and establishing new social networks, which can reinforce the acquisition of the new language. However, sometimes, access to the desired social networks is not easy and may need to be facilitated by some introduction as well as by the individual's ability and willingness to acquire the necessary language and perhaps other characteristics, whether moving up or down in socioeconomic status. Individuals often participate in multiple networks and use a variety of linguistic codes as needed. The more integrated a person becomes in a particular network, the more she/he uses that language (Gal, 1979, Milroy 1980). Use of a new language, even if only temporarily, is linguistic mobility and constitutes some degree of shift of the individual's first language (Simmons,

Forthcoming).

If we consider three types of socioeconomic groups and the status of their respective languages: marginalized, mainstream, elite; and three directions of movement: up, lateral, down; it is possible to create Figure 1.

Direction of movement	Marginalized	Mainstream	Elite
Down	X	(↓)	(↓)
Lateral	Minimal sociolinguistic space	← → Wide sociolinguistic space	Minimal sociolinguistic space
Up	↑	↑	X

Figure 1

Logically members of marginalized groups at the bottom of the socioeconomic scale cannot go further down but may move upward to interact with members of higher status groups, perhaps for socioeconomic opportunities, whether temporarily or permanently. Members of a viable mainstream group may seek a higher social status and or seek movement into other groups of similar status. Members of an elite group, logically, cannot go up, and probably do not wish to go down in socioeconomic status, but may wish to interact with lower status groups, for commerce, customer relations, employee relations or personal reasons.

There are more profitable possibilities for monolinguals in the mainstream group, and monolingualism in the mainstream also contributes to dominance of the mainstream language by requiring individuals from outside groups to conform to the mainstream language. And more bilingualism is expected in socially mobile members of groups at the far ends of the continuum: upward movement for negatively marginalized individuals, and also possible use of the language of socioeconomically lower groups by members of elite groups.

1.4 Legitimate Language Use

Sociolinguistic market conditions may sometimes be in conflict with an individual person's motivations and can impose restrictions on choices and also on the extent to which the person can implement a choice. Such restriction may occur in relationship to the perceived legitimacy of the speaker's use of the chosen language. The use of a language, especially of a non-native language, may be considered as a claim to the identity associated with that language (Woolard and Gahng, 1990, p. 327) or as a kind of speech act asserting that identity, and in order for a speech act to be successful, certain conditions must be met, including qualifications of the speaker (see Austin, 1962). Language skill may be one requirement, but there are also likely to be others. In response to one speaker's language choice, the other interlocutor assesses the value of the first speaker and the degree to which that speaker is legitimately associated with the language she/he has chosen in that situation.

How does one know if one is recognized as a legitimate speaker when using another group's language? If the interlocutor answers and converses in the language the first speaker has chosen, it seems the interlocutor recognizes and allows the speaker to actualize the use of that language. If the interlocutor switches to another language, it seems the first speaker has not been recognized as a legitimate user of the language chosen. The implementation of desired language choice into actual language use depends on cooperation from the interlocutor.

Of course, in language contact areas, there may be varying degrees of bilingualism among speakers. Where language A and language B coexist, in each group, speakers' abilities may range from monolinguals to very fluent bilinguals. In conversations between speakers of the same first language, that language would be expected. In conversations between speakers of different first languages, a variety of options present themselves, depending on the bilingual abilities of the two individuals and their attitudes regarding language values and norms. The overt reasons for adapting to the first language of another interlocutor may be to show a positive attitude toward that person and his culture (see work by Giles, Giles et al., Bourhis and Giles), courtesy or a wish to facilitate communication for a less skilled speaker. However, the result of restricting the first speaker's language choice remains whether it is intended or not. Not adapting to another person's language may indicate an assertion of one's own identity (see Giles, Giles et al., Bourhis and Giles), or an insistence that the other interlocutor adapt, which may be difficult in some cases depending on the other individual's linguistic repertoire. However, insisting on one's own language in a conversation does give the other interlocutor access to that language and an opportunity to use it.

Figure 2, attempts to diagram some of the dynamics of language choice and recognition by others.

Overall Sociolinguistic Market		
	VALUE of B > A	
Language A market	overt and covert sociolinguistic norms	Language B market
Member of group A	Desires to go to group B	
Individual A's SELF-EVALUATION of his/her identity components and qualifications for entering Group B (temporarily or permanently)		The Bs' criteria for EVALUATING outsiders and possible new members
1. A's ability in Language B 2. A's Non-linguistic characteristics.		
Choice of Behavior to use Language B		B's evaluation of 1. A's language ability in B's Lang 2. A's Non-linguistic characteristics
	influence of overt and covert sociolinguistic norms	RESPONSE from the Bs ＋ RECOGNITION or － RECOGNITION
＋ IMPLEMENTATION or － IMPLEMENTATION of choice and chosen identity		

Figure 2

1.5 Sociolinguistic Norms

In particular situations some language choices may be more acceptable than others. The expected socially acceptable choices are sociolinguistic norms. Norms come into being based on numerous factors including political language policies and laws, languages used in education, socioeconomic

and sociolinguistic dynamics of groups, collective effects of individuals, the function of language as a group identity marker and the importance of language in achieving successful social mobility. Sociolinguistic norms indicate which language to use with whom in what situations. Overt norms maybe in line with official policies, and covert norms maybe in opposition to official policies, continuations of older norms or efforts to change the norms. For individuals there may be options for sociolinguistic mobility within and/or in violation of existing norms.

2.0   Language Contact in Catalunya

In the history of the multicultural geographic area of present day Spain, there have been many political conflicts, and with the unification of Spain under more central governments, notably in the twentieth century, there have been several policy changes concerning regional languages, including in Catalunya (Balcells, 1996; Benet, 1995). Language has been a symbol of nationalism as well as of regional autonomy and ethnic identity, and has been manipulated politically (Benet, 1995; Inglehart and Woodward, 1967; Shabad and Gunther, 1982). From some perspectives, Catalunya has undergone particularly harsh treatment from central governments (Benet, 1995; Jones, 1976).

Internal migrations have also influenced the history of Spain and in particular Catalunya. In many ways, immigration has contributed to the Catalan economy and immigrants have been able to be assimilated into Catalan society. However, Catalan and non-Catalan Spanish ethnic groups have also remained separate geographically, socioeconomically and sociolinguistically to some extent (Shafir, 1995).

Some immigrants did learn the Catalan language in all of the eras, and continue to do so (Baez de Aguilar González, 1997; Reixach et al., 1997; Shabad and Gunther, 1982; Shafir, 1995; Simmons 1998, 2001, Forthcoming); however, depending on language policies, opportunities for doing so have varied.

Self-reported national identity and political viewpoints on the part of immigrants and natives, seems to be more associated with place of birth, rather than with language (Shabad and Gunther, 1982). And to some extent, socioeconomic advantages also seem to be associated with place of birth as well (Sáez, 1980 and Pinilla de las Heras, 1979: both cited in Shafir, 1995[3]). Of course, place of birth itself is often associated with language.

2.1   Catalunya 1936~1975

2.1.1   Sociolinguistic Market Conditions

For some centuries prior to the Civil War, the sociolinguistic market for the Catalan language was viable and legitimate because of its economic competitiveness in its regional area of use. During the Franco era Catalan was made illegal in official and public spheres, and its value was deflated by being redefined as a dialect (Woolard, 1989b; p. 357) as well as prohibited through force (Benet, 1995; Jones, 1976) in the official linguistic market, but remained viable and valuable as a kind of 'black market' where it gained value as a symbol of solidarity. In spite of being prohibited during the Franco period, it maintained its association with the middle class and concurrently became reinforced by solidarity, perhaps in response to political marginalization (see Milroy, 1980).

The non-Catalan speaking immigrant population in Catalunya increased over the years, and this reinforced the Castilian linguistic market. Castilian Spanish is also a prestige language, as the national language of Spain, of the Spanish Empire and as a language with a strong literary tradition. However, the market for the Castilian language in Catalunya was questionably legitimate

due to imposition of Castilian. The value of Castilian could hardly be *misrecognized* as natural in the context of post war political and military decisions. There were no officially acceptable alternatives to the Castilian language in the public sphere, so there was no overt competition of linguistic products and no real linguistic market in the economic sense.

Catalans who were not already bilingual became Castilian speakers, so that there was widespread bilingualism, and clear linguistic mobility for this group. Castilian speakers, on the other hand, had little access to "black market" languages, so they remained monolingual without linguistic mobility. Although Castilian had overt prestige, it was still clearly imposed and drafting new speakers rather than attracting them, as well as restricting the linguistic mobility of its native speakers.

2.1.2 Legitimate Speakers

As for speaker qualifications during the Franco period, there were no qualifications needed to become recognized as a legitimate speaker of Castilian other than basic linguistic ability as Castilian was the only acceptable language and no other legal choices existed. Since Catalan was illegal, no one could be a legitimate speaker of Catalan in public spheres, not even ethnic Catalan native speakers. The value of Castilian in Catalunya had been inflated and the value of Catalan deflated through political change.

However, unofficially, in private homes and among ethnic group friends, and in private schools (Shabad and Gunther, 1982, p. 469) Catalan functioned as valued linguistic capitol which was exchangeable for solidarity and maintenance of pre–Civil War historical, territorial ideals (see Fishman, 1977), and was associated with middle class status. As Catalan was outlawed and acquisition not possible, it symbolized a closed group of speakers who in addition to sharing the same first language also shared many additional characteristics such as being of the same ethnic background, birthplace, social class and political marginalization.[4]

2.1.3 Sociolinguistic Norms

During the imposition of Castilian and, perhaps more importantly, the outlawing of Catalan, sociolinguistic norms developed. If Catalan was spoken, it would likely be with other ethnic Catalan native speakers in private settings. People probably learned to be careful about when and where and with whom to use Catalan, whereas Castilian was 'safe' to use in almost all situations.

Due to the prohibition of Catalan, L1 Castilian speakers were primarily monolinguals (or possibly bilingual in another regional language of Spain) and had limited options within their linguistic repertoires to choose Catalan. Concurrently, nearly everyone who knew Catalan as a native language was under pressure to become bilingual in Castilian. Subsequently, in mixed ethnic group interactions, Castilian was the only choice.

There was diglossia dividing official domains from private domains for Catalan speakers. Even though L1 Catalan speakers were required to use the language of the Castilian group, a kind of social and linguistic division, rather than assimilation of either into the other, was reinforced between the two ethnic groups by these language policies and related norms.

2.2 After 1975, Transition and Towards the Present

2.2.1 Sociolinguistic Market Conditions

After Franco, under the new Constitution, the regional languages were given official status (Shabad and Gunther, 1982, p. 160), and what had been the marginalized black market for Catalan became a market which was co-official with Castilian in Catalunya, and the Catalan language legally regained its natural regional territory. The speakers of Catalan as the newly official language

were mainly L1 speakers and few non-native or non-ethnic speakers, at least during the early phases. These speakers, largely of middle class background, added social status to Catalan's official status and reinstated territorial status. Catalan had also been further endowed with solidarity during the prohibition period. Catalan gained linguistic territory through its official status and gained economic power not only through its continued association with the middle class but also because it became required for jobs in the public sector.

When Catalan became an official option, Castilian lost its monopoly. However a functional market remained for its speakers. The market for written Castilian remained important for both ethnic Castilians and ethnic Catalans due to the prohibition of education in Catalan in the post Civil War era. Castilian was also maintained by L1 Catalan speakers who continued to follow the sociolinguistic norm of adapting to Castilian in mixed L1 conversations.

The political changes after Franco's death resulted in a rapid redistribution of values associated with languages[5] through sociopolitical and socioeconomic incentives rather than through the use of military force. As symbolic capitol, Catalan was revalued at its old price plus the added solidarity value and new economic value, and its previous *marginalization was converted to eliteness*; Catalan thereby became a kind of elite minority language with official status. Castilian, on the other hand, was devalued by a decrease in political, linguistic and economic territory and remained a common language. Castilian also became associated with an unjust historical experience (Woolard, 1993) which remained in the minds of some people. From some perspectives, Castilian could be considered a marginalized majority language.

There have been concerns that the imposition of Catalan might discriminate against the immigrant population as Catalan language skill and literacy became important for gaining employment (Shabad and Gunther, 1982, pp. 468-469). Because of lack of bilingualism in the L1 Castilian group, these people could not have immediate linguistic mobility in the new market conditions, but rather had the double disadvantage of not having fluency in Catalan, not to mention literacy, and also of having to learn or struggle with Catalan as non-native speakers. The formerly imposed dominance of Castilian, resulted in loss of linguistic mobility, and perhaps delayed social mobility, for some of its monolingual native speakers.

2.2.2 Legitimate Speakers

As Castilian remained a public language which everyone knew, it remained available to native and non-native speakers alike and could not impose any special requirements on speakers regarding their legitimacy other than basic linguistic ability. As for Catalan, in the early transition period, mainly ethnic Catalans had the linguistic ability to actively use the Catalan language, so although it was official, real access to use it was only available to L1 speakers. Furthermore, Catalan, even though now official, had come to symbolize solidarity of a closed and socioeconomically elite group which shared other characteristics besides language. Even if linguistic ability was gained by non-Catalans, other social qualifications could be missing. As a result of political turn about, there may also have been some backlash which may have decreased the perceived legitimacy of L1 Castilian speakers to use Catalan. On the public and official level, the only requirement to become a speaker is to learn Catalan, if necessary, and to use it. However, on the person to person level, there may be other criteria involved.

2.2.3 Sociolinguistic Norms

The division between public and private uses of Catalan was politically removed; however, the

norm of using Castilian in mixed group interactions sometimes continued. It was established under conditions where there was no choice politically nor functionally for communication with the many monolingual Castilian speaking immigrants, but the norm continues under the new conditions where the choice of using Catalan exists for many non-ethnic Catalans as well.

Though accommodating the L1 Castilian speaker by using Castilian on the part of L1 Catalan speakers may overtly be for purposes of courtesy or facilitating conversation, it may sometimes result in the restriction of the use of Catalan by non-native speakers.

3.0　Discussion

It seems that the Franco policies were able to impose Castilian, and deflate the value of Catalan officially, but without empowering Castilian as linguistic capitol except by default. During the same period, large groups of Castilian speaking immigrants moved to Catalunya, but the Franco policies oppressing Catalan language and culture did not allow the immigrants, or their children born in Catalunya, to assimilate linguistically. And even after forty years, many immigrants were still new comers, linguistically, with the new co-official language policy. But from other perspectives, such long term immigrants could also be viewed as persons who had never bothered to learn the regional language in spite of their long residence there.

Though there was a political and official redistribution of power and changes in the language policies with the new constitution, there was not necessarily a rapid change in attitudes or behavior norms on a wide spread basis.

In view of the many factors influencing the language contact situation in Catalunya, there are still concerns regarding the long term future of Catalan (Bastardas i Boada, 1996). There are incentives to become a legitimate speaker of Catalan, but the qualifications may be difficult to acquire, and Castilian is still a choice. Officially the Catalan language is encouraged and promoted through education and other efforts, but the sociocultural value systems of some speakers make transitions more slowly than political changes, and slow changing sociolinguistic norms could still occasionally pose some resistance to Catalan as an official language as it continues to become normalized (see Woolard and Gahng, 1990).

There is also the issue of the prestige of Castilian; there are two prestige languages in contact (see O'Donnell, 1988). Castilian is still an important additional language for L1 Catalan speakers, and for some socially mobile L1 Castilian speakers, modifying their speech toward standard Castilian is an option rather than moving towards Catalan (Báez de Aguilar González, 1997).

The new sociolinguistic market conditions present double binds for both groups. L1 Castilian speakers are living in Catalunya where Catalan should be used, but as ethnic outsiders, they may not be entitled to imply a claim to the solidarity symbolized by the Catalan language. For L1 Catalan speakers encouraging the use of Catalan by outsiders seems to conflict with the solidarity norm while at the same time they should exercise their right to speak and cultivate the use of Catalan in Catalunya. From a group distinction point of view (Tajfel, 1974; Bourdieu, 1984), linguistic ability in Catalan was a good criteria or qualification for Catalan identity before bilingualism became extensive in the non-Catalan ethnic population. In the past ethnic group characteristics reinforced each other to a large extent (see Gal, 1979). But as bilingualism increases on the part of L1 Castilian speakers, language becomes a less reliable marker of group membership. Based on the information cited, Figures 3a and 3b speculate an estimation of the

coincidence of language group with ethnic group before and after 1975.

1936~1975

Ethnic Catalan group			Ethnic Non-Catalan Group		
Many	Some	Few	Many	Some	Few
Bilinguals CT-CS	Bilinguals CS-CT	Monolinguals CS Monolinguals CT	Monolingual CS	Bilinguals CS-CT	
Catalan Language Group			Castilian Language Group		
Many	Some	Few	Many	Some	Few
Catalans: L1	Non-Catalans: L2	Catalans: L2	Non-Catalans:L1 Catalans: L2	Catalans: L1	

Figure 3a

1975~More recently

Ethnic Catalan Group			Ethnic Non-Catalan Group		
Many	Some	Few	Many	Some	Few
Bilinguals CT-CS	Monolinguals CS		Monolinguals Bilinguals CS-CT		
Catalan Language Group			Castilian Language Group		
Many	Some	Few	Many	Some	Few
Catalans: L1 Non-Catalans: L2	Catalans: L2 Non-Catalans: L1		Non-Catalans:L1 Catalans: L2	Catalans: L1	

Figure 3b

Individuals cannot change assigned identity components such as one's natural parents or place of birth and there is little control over the process of learning one's first language, but one may acquire components such as new languages, attitudes, education and perhaps wealth. For individuals from immigrant families who have acquired the Catalan language, it is possible to see an analogy with people who have new money vs. old money, meaning people who have changed economic status but not necessarily their earlier class related behaviors and tastes (Bourdieu, 1984). A person may acquire new linguistic capitol by becoming capable in the Catalan language, but does not necessarily have other traits in common with ethnic Catalan speakers. It is also possible that some people may not think it is appropriate that such a person have that kind of capitol, precisely because they do not have the other characteristics (se Austin, 1962), and may not facilitate his/her efforts to exchange that capitol in the market by refusing to recognize that person as a legitimate speaker.

An individual speaker may take the risk to choose a language that coincides with his/her desired

social identity, but the implementation of the choice is dependent on cooperation from the interlocutor. In mixed group conversations language may be used in various ways for members of different groups to assert their identities, sometimes in opposition to each other. In some cases, *In order to maintain the distinguishing power of one's L1, a person may be asserting their identity more by NOT using his/her native language with out group interlocutors as compared to insisting on using it.*

4.0 Final Comments

Even a first language must be acquired, but first language abilities usually seem more 'natural' than second language abilities. And people whose families have lived for many generations in the territory seem more 'natural' than those from immigrant families. Probably, things like childhood education and generations of the same family living in the same area will allow the person or their descendents to acquire the characteristics of 'natural' and 'legitimate' group members.

Though language ability is not the only factor in gaining recognition as a legitimate speaker of a non-native language, learning a new language well and becoming literate requires effort and is a long term proposition. Speakers who succeed in becoming recognized have probably put in the effort to deserve recognition and have likely learned many more things associated with their target group besides language and have thus socialized themselves to the point that native speakers may award some legitimacy and access.

This paper has offered an interpretation of the transitions of the sociolinguistic market in Catalunya since the Civil War. The situation seems to be characterized by the following:
  a. From prohibition and marginalization to officialized elite status for Catalan in the early transition.
  b. Immediate linguistic and social mobility for L1 Catalan speakers in the transition.
  c. Lack of linguistic mobility, and to some extent, lack of social mobility for L1 Castilian speakers as a result of the earlier monolingual language policy.
  d. In combination with new overt norms, continuation of previous norms, such as the use of Castilian in mixed first language conversations.
  e. The prestige and market value of the Catalan language seems to have been preserved through the preservation of the non-linguistic characteristics of its speakers both before and after the transition.
  f. During the Franco years, the Castilian language was able to 'draft' speakers in Catalunya, whereas before and after that period, the Catalan language was and is able to attract new speakers because of its prestige and economic utility in the region.

The linguistic market has been dynamic and continues to change. As bilingualism becomes more widespread and as immigrants' descendents continue to live in Catalunya, and place of birth becomes a similar characteristic in both ethnic groups, group identity will probaly change; the role of language in identity and the options for sociolinguistic mobility may also change. The interaction between Castilian and Catalan makes the overall sociolinguistic market very dynamic; continuing to observe the status of bilingualism as well as language policies and normalization should prove interesting and offer insights into understanding the symbolic functions of language in inter-group

relationships and the connection between language and identity.

---

[1] An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 5th International Conference of the Association of Iberian and Latin American Studies of Australasia, held in Sydney, Australia, July 6, 2001.

[2] *Catalunya* is the name of the Autonomous Region of Spain as it is written in the Catalan language. Some sources have used the English spelling, Catalonia.

[3] Sáez, Armand. 1980. Catalunya, gresol o explotadora? Notes sobre immigració i creixement. In *Immigració i reconstrucció national a Catalunya* (pp. 25-35). Barcelona: Editorial Blume.

Pinela de Heras, Esteban. 1979. *Immigració i mobilitat social a Catalunya, vol 2*. Barcelona: Institut Catòlic d'Estudis Socials a Barcelona.

------1979. *Estudios sobre cambio social y estructuras sociales en Cataluña*. Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas.

[4] This was also seen in Gal's (1979) study of Hungarian and German speakers in Oberwart, Austria, where language was a good indicator of group identity *if* other characteristics were also relatively present throughout the group.

[5] See Gal (1979) regarding the concept of redistribution of values in the Oberwart language contact situation.

References

Austin, J. L. 1962. *How to do things with words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Báez de Aguilar González, Francisco. 1997. *El conflicto lingüístico de los emigrantes castellanohablantes en Barcelona*. Universidad de Malaga.

Balcells, Albert. 1996. *Catalan Nationalism: Past and present*. New York: St. Martin's Press (English translation of original Castilian version by Jacqueline Hall with Geoffrey Walker.)

Bastardas i Boada, Albert. 1996. *Ecologia de llengües*. Barcelona: Edicions Proa.

Baumeister. 1986. *Identity: Cultural change and the struggle for self*. New York: Oxford.

Benet, Josep. 1995. *L'intent franquista de genocidi cultural contra Catalunya*. Barcelona: Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat. (First published, 1973, *Catalunya sota el règim franquista. Informe sobre la persecució de la llengua i la cultura de Catalunya pel règim del general Franco*, Paris: Edicions Catalanes de París.)

Blau, Peter. 1964. *Exchange and power in social life*, pp. 88-97. New York: Wiley.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social Science Information*, 16 (6), 645-668.

------1982. *Ce que parler veut dire*. Fayard.

------1991. *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

------1984. *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. (Translated by Richard Nice, originally published in 1979, *La Distinction: Critique sociale du jugement*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.)

Bourhis, R. and H. Giles. 1977. The language of intergroup distinctiveness. In Howard Giles (Ed.), *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations* (pp. 119-135). London: Academic Press.

Fishman, Joshua. 1977. Language and Ethnicity. In Giles, Howard (Ed.), *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations* (pp. 15-57). London: Academic Press.

Gal, Susan. 1979. *Language shift: Social determinants of language change in bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press.

Giles, Howard (Ed.). 1997. *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations* (pp. 307-346). London: Academic Press.

Giles, H., R.Y. Bourhis, D.M. Taylor. 1977. Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In Howard Giles (Ed.), *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations* (pp. 307-346). London: Academic Press.

Giles, Howard and Philip Smith. 1979. Accommodation theory: Optimal levels of convergence. In Howard Giles and Robert N. St. Clair (Eds.), *Language and social psychology* (pp. 45-65). Oxford: Blackwell.

Giles, Howard and Patricia Johnson. 1987. Ethnolinguistic identity theory: a social psychological approach to language maintenance. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 68, pp. 69-99.

Heller, Monica (Ed.). 1988a. *Codeswitching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.

Inglehart, Ronald F. and Margaret Woodward. 1967. Language conflicts and political community. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 10, 27-45.

Jones, Norman L. 1976. The Catalan question since the Civil War. In Paul Preston, *Spain in Crisis* (pp. 234-267). New York: Harper Row.

Milroy, Lesley. 1980. *Language and social networks*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Milroy, Lesley. 1982. Language and group identity. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 207-216.

O'Donnell, Paul E. 1988. Catalan and Castilian as prestige languages: A tale of two cities. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 12 (3), pp. 226-238.

Reixach, Modest, Emil Boix, Jacqueline Hall, Jordi Porta, Josep Rucabado, Cristina Sánchez, Joaquim Torres. 1997. *El Coneixement del català: anàlisi de les dades del cens lingüístic de 1991 de Catalunya, les Illes Baleares i el País Valencià*. Barcelona: Departament de Cultura de la Generalitat de Catalunya.

Shabad, Goldie and Richard Gunther. 1982. Language, nationalism and political conflict in Spain. *Comparative Politics*, pp. 443-477.

Shafir, Gershon. 1995. *Immigrants and nationalists: Ethnic conflict and accommodation in Catalonia, the Basque Country, Latvia and Estonia*, pp. 69-86. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Simmons, Margaret. 1998. Language maintenance and shift in Barcelona: Changing abilities and uses of Catalan and Castilian. *Comparative Culture: The Journal of Miyazaki International College*, 4, pp. 77-93.

------2000. Value and exchange of linguistic products: Theoretical framework and the case of Catalonia. *The Bulletin of Nagano University*, vol 22, no 1, pp. 10-33.

------2002. Linguistic networks and linguistic mobility. *The Bulletin of Nagano University*, vol 23, no 4, pp. 14-31.

------Forthcoming. Language Shift and Linguistic Markets in Barcelona. In Sayahi, L. (Ed.). *Selected proceedings of the first workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistcs*. Caseadilla Press.

Tajfel, Henri. 1974. Social identity and intergroup behavior. *Social Science Information*, 13 (2), pp. 65-93.

Woolard, Kathryn A. 1989a. *Double Talk*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

------1989b. Language convergence and language death as social processes. In Nancy Dorian (Ed.), *Investigating obsolescence: Studies in language contraction and death* (pp. 355-367). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

------1993. *Identitat i contacte de llengües a Catalunya*. Barcelona.

------and Tae-Joong Gahng. 1990. Changing language policies and attitudes in autonomous Catalonia. *Language in Society*, 19, pp. 311-330.