Social prestige and linguistic identity. On the ideological conditions behind the standardisation of Galician

Luzia Domínguez-Seco
Universidade da Coruña

Proxecto "Comunicación e novas tecnoloxías"
Departamento de Galego-Portugués, Francés e Lingüística
Facultade de Filoloxía, Campus de Elviña s/n
15071-A Coruña (Galiza), Spain
luziads@hotmail.com

Abstract

This work deals with what is termed here as the *criteria of idiomatic correction*: there is a correct manner, a "good" way of speaking, as compiled in grammars or dictionaries, which is the shared model for all speakers. This criteria unifies the diverse varieties of language via a standard while, at the same time, distinguishing between what is "speaking properly" (educated, formal registers, pertaining to the higher classes) and "speaking badly" (dialectal and vulgar varieties pertaining to the lower classes). In contemporary Galiza, the dominant ideologies affecting the Galician language have incorporated this distinction. Although this fact implies a dignifying effect (our language is no longer "uneducated"), the fact is often overlooked that "educated" and "uneducated" speakers are not on an equal footing in terms of how "dignity" is shared out. This article looks at the communicative effect of the correction criteria as manifested in the linguistic practices of a young group of friends. Here, segments of interactions are analysed as examples of *what this people do*, and of *what they say* about language.
Key words: sociolinguistics, linguistic ideology, interactional analysis, identity, Galician, linguistic purism.

Resumo

Este traballo ocúpase do aquí chamado *criterio de corrección idiomática*: existe unha forma correcta, "boa", de falar, recollida en gramáticas e diccionarios, que é o modelo común para todos os falantes. Este criterio unifica as diversas variedades da lingua a través do estándar e, ó tempo, distingue o "falar ben" (rexistros cultos e formais, propios de clases máis altas) do "falar mal" (variedades dialectais e vulgares propias de clases máis baixas). Na Galiza actual, as ideoloxías dominantes sobre o idioma galego incorporaron esta distinción. Se ben este feito implica unha dignificación (a nosa lingua xa non é "inculta"), adoita esquecerse que os

Copyright © *Estudios de Sociolingüística* 3(2) 2002 & 4(1) 2003, pp. 207-228

falantes "cultos" e "incultos" non están en igualdade de condicións na distribución da "dignidade". Neste artigo observarase a operatividade comunicativa do criterio de corrección a través da súa manifestación nas prácticas nun grupo de amigos xoves. Utilízanse para iso segmentos de interaccións, tomadas como exemplo *do que fan* co idioma as persoas investigadas e *o que din* del.
Palabras clave: sociolingüística, ideoloxía lingüística, análise interaccional, identidade, galego, purismo lingüístico.

1. Linguistic normality and social prestige[1]

The operating capacity of languages to act as symbolic constructs is well known, and by which numerous social meanings linked to the socio-economic structures of micro- and macro-social order are expressed. Since its beginnings, sociolinguistics has continually drawn attention to language's capacity to express, within such meanings, those associated with social prestige. Thus, when a country has a dominant language and another or others that are assigned to a minority or dominated, the dominant language is that which is identified by the correct form of speech, with the most prestige, and as being particular to social groups with a greater economic and cultural capital. The non-dominant language or languages, however, are linked to opposing values and groups: incorrect, stigmatized, particular to "the poor" and "uneducated". In cases of a single language, standardised as that which is particular (the own language) to a country, it is this standard which acts as a dominant language or, in the words of the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (1982), as a legitimate language, by its opposition to the non-standardised varieties. In this regard, the standard is not only a regularised variety, but is rather a set of recognisable linguistic practices, both for its form and for its contexts and modes of social relationship with which these practices are associated.

The standard is, therefore, linked to what Milroy & Milroy (1985) term *ideology of the standard*, a conception of language in terms of which there is a correct way of speaking. This correct mode of speaking is able, symbolically, to draw together the society as a whole. The linguistic standard tends to exclude all non-standard forms comprising the linguistic variation present in a community, frequently termed "internal varieties" of the language (dialects, sociolects, etc.). Due to the dominance of the ideology behind the standard, a correctional criteria associated with the standard model would imply that the forms not included in the

1 This article is largely due to the encouragement given, while preparing my doctoral thesis, at the *Pontificia Universidade Católica* (Río de Janeiro, Brazil), made possible thanks to a Placement Abroad Grant from the Autonomous Government of Galiza. I am grateful for the collaboration of the *Interactional Sociolinguistic Research Group,* for the contributions from professors Maria do Carmo Leite de Oliveira, Liliana Cabral Bastos and Maria das Graças Dias Pereira for their assistance with my research work.

standard are omitted, stigmatised or mythicized in the more prestigious practices. Thus, only the standard model fits into High Culture (legitimate culture), it being particular to educated and economically sound people. All other models would be particular to "ancient" or "low" cultures. They would be speech forms particular to a non-legitimate culture, and in general, would be linked to groups and individuals with low symbolic (low "culture") and economic capital.

In accordance with Pierre Bourdieu (1979), a distinction can be made here: legitimate language, and likewise legitimate culture, is accepted as shared, and therefore agglutinant, in terms of the society using it. At the same time, legitimate language and culture distinguish between people for their linguistic and social practices, in terms of a scale of prestige associated with the unequal distribution of material and symbolic capital in society, i.e., associated with social class. When the ideology behind a standard is the norm in a society, the criteria of a correct language and of (some) other incorrect language(s), in other words, it is a common sense assumption, one of the unquestioned evidences underlying our social activities. Due to this natural manner, it is often overlooked that the "normality" of a language is not neutral in terms of the class-based inequalities present throughout society.

2. Normality and prestige in Galiza

2.1. Political change and the (socio-) linguistic situation

During the Franco dictatorship (1939–1975), the dominant Spanish ideology established that Spanish was the only legitimate language. Other linguistic varieties were its "dialects" or, quite simply, incorrect forms of speaking. Following the arrival of the democratic system, however, Spanish institutions reorganised in terms of an acknowledgement of the so-called historic nationalities, and drew up a State comprising Autonomous Communities. Out of these communities, Galiza, Catalonia, the Balearic Isles, the Valencia Region, the Basque Country and Navarre (the latter included in the Basque-speaking areas) now had two co-official languages, Spanish plus each Autonomous Community's "own language".

Consequently, throughout this period an ideology of the standard became consolidated for Galician. This language changed from being an "incorrect" form of speech to having a socially accepted standard model deemed "correct" and, in theory, comparable to correct Spanish. Furthermore, this own language now has some "incorrect" (vulgar or impure) and some "non-shared" varieties (dialects). So the political restructuring of the State and the Galician Autonomy has been accompanied by a reorganisation of linguistic prestige in terms of the co-existence of the two languages and their respective "non-shared" varieties.

In daily linguistic practice, the forms of speech responding to the linguistic contact between Spanish and Galician are first evidenced as a *continuum* of varieties

rather than as two clearly differentiable languages[2]. Both the more Galicianized varieties of Spanish, and the more Castilianised forms of Galician, are very frequent among the lower classes with a lower cultural capital; here the term *semi-lingualism* may be applied, in the sense that these speakers frequently do not dominate a differentiating use of the two languages in their diverse registers[3]. This idea of semi-lingualism, however, largely referring to speakers' capacity to dominate the educated registers of both languages, should not lead us to overlook the fact that, in every day practice, both the interference and the alternation between the two languages constitutes a communicatively efficient form of managing the bilingual repertoire (for further comments on this issue, see, for example, Álvarez Cáccamo, 1998; Argente & Payrató, 1990; or Argente & Lorenzo, 1991).

2.2. The defining features of the language itself in dominant ideologies

The sociolinguistic difference between Galician and Spanish has played a vital role in the development of the nationalist and regionalist political positions of the 20th century. The "own" language (Galician) would, from the viewpoint of both these positions, stand for the uniqueness of Galician (its own identity, as expressed in the language), be it considered as national or regional. In general lines, it may be stated that, throughout the century, two different angles have gradually extended in our society as regards contact between the languages: one, more culturally orientated and linked to conservative regionalist positions, which generally considers that bilingualism does not involve any (socio-)linguistic conflict. The other more politicised version, often linked to a Marxist rooted nationalism, takes the view that bilingualism expresses the (socio-)linguistic conflict associated with a colonial relationship between Spain and Galiza.

The current autonomous regional government (under the Partido Popular political leadership) assumes, to a considerable extent, the discourse of the country's own identity and language, based more on conservative regionalist approaches than on more strictly nationalist ones. In this discourse, the Galician territory is considered as an entity with an autochthonous and autonomous culture and language, recognized by the political structure of the Autonomous Community. The abnormality (i.e., controversial nature) of the previous sociolinguistic situation has been accepted, and mechanisms have been put in place to achieve a "linguistic

2 The idea of a *continuum* for Galician bilingualism has been formulated by Álvarez Cáccamo (1989). From a different viewpoint, Rodríguez Yáñez (1997) highlights the existence of a (socio-)linguistic continuum. For the application of the concept of *continuum* to written forms, see Álvarez Cáccamo & Herrero Valeiro (1996). Prego Vázquez (2000) presents a detailed view of this notion. Other references are found in Kabatek (2000).

3 See Portas Fernández (1997) on this issue.

normalisation". In this regard, institutional intervention, commencing at the close of the seventies and early eighties (Law of Linguistic Normalisation, norms for schooling in and of Galician, and orthographic standardisation) stems from the declared intent to achieve the symbolic advantage of prestige for the language.

Nationalist opposition, for its part, has been capitalised by the Bloque Nacionalista Galego. In the discourse tabled by this sector, Marxist ideology bears a good deal more weight, linking the sociolinguistic conflict with class domination. In this manner, language and culture are involved in a fight for recognition that is at once ethnic-national as well as class orientated, where dignifying speech forms is considered an extremely important factor for the people.

In line with these ideological formulations regarding the languages of the country, the conception of Galician as the "own" language (the *lingua propia*) of Galiza as opposed to Spanish —"shared" or "non shared" to places in Spain, depending on the different political positions before the State[4]— is clearly evident even in the technical discourse of the philology. This implies that the normal defining features of a legitimate language are applied to Galician (Bourdieu, 1982; for further discussion on these dominant defining features in our societies, see also Blommaert & Verschueren, 1992): it is a "shared" language, which draws together and represents the entire society. It is an "educated" language, which differentiates between "good speaking" and "bad speaking", the high and the low, the representative and the particular. But in the case of Galician, the appearance of this latter distinction poses problems for many experts, particularly for those involved in education[5].

In this regard, the fact that the normalisation of Galician has been approached in terms of dignifying popular language is important. Thus, there is a need to settle a historic debt with Galiza and with the Galician speaking population (Beramendi, 1997, talks of a "síndrome de aldraxe" [outrage syndrome]). In dominant discourses, the dual idea is noted that language is an essential element in the expression of the identity of the "pobo" [people], and that the essence of that language lies in

4 Some discourse analyses on language highlight this and other defining features of Galician. See, for example, Álvarez Cáccamo (1997) or Herrero Valeiro (1993, 2000).

5 See Domínguez Seco (1993), where I observed certain teacher's books and guides, which show a concern for this issue. Roseman (1995) also deals with this question: "In order to replace standard Spanish with Galician as the code used for formal functions, it became an urgent political task to agree on a unified standard and, ironically, to teach this standard to communities of Galician speakers who were the grassroots citizens who kept the language alive for centuries" (p. 7). "Activists, many of them educators, are therefore aware of the danger of vernacular dialects being regarded as less valid than the standard" (p. 11). The greater prestige enjoyed by the standard and resistance to it is not, on the other hand, a new question for sociolinguistics, as this has been noted previously by authors such as Bernstein, Labov, Trudgill or Haugen, *inter alia*.

vernacular speech (Domínguez Seco, 2000). Following this approach, it is very frequent in technical discourse to highlight the need to "collect", "recover" and "dignify" ways of speech, a view which we can find as the basis for the new Spelling Standards established in the eighties (see the analysis by Domínguez Seco, 2000). Such attention to vernacular speech, however, does not prevent it being mythicized into reductionist attributes, where vernacular varieties are identified with the stereotype of a traditional culture, which must be protected and are disconnected from other social categories, such as social class and the social networks in which speakers go about their social lives (Milroy, 1980). Furthermore, the fact that the standard excludes (as it inevitably does) certain popular forms, contributes to perpetuating or generating processes involving social stigmatisation that affect such forms and those who use them.

These are the issues which, in my view, are the most relevant as far a (socio-) linguistic redefinition of the Galician identity is concerned in terms of social inequalities. My research presented in this article sets out to reveal these issues in the daily communicative practices of a group of young speakers. To do so, the underlying premise is that the micro-social practices are the reflection, the origin and product of macro-social structures and, therefore, it is assumed that the micro-level is the basis on which sociological research may further understanding of the macro-level, and vice versa.

3. Design and development of this research work

3.1. Methodology

The data used here are the result of fieldwork conducted from October 1995 to May 1996, in the town of Santiago de Compostela, the capital of Galiza. The method used is that of participant observation, whereby the researcher is integrated in a collective (in this case, a group of twenty years old) to acquire a view from the inside of the social practices.

Data gathering and analysis involved the selective use of the methodology provided by conversation analysis (e.g., Atkinson & Heritage, 1984), micro-sociology (Goffman, 1967), interactional sociolinguistics (Gumperz, 1982), critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1995; Pedro, 1997) and certain elements of pragmatics. The general approach as to how linguistic ideologies may be linked to linguistic practices and to sociolinguistic change at a micro-social level, primarily derives from works in linguistic anthropology (Briggs, 1986; Woolard, 1989), a school of thought which, in turn, draws together diverse contributions from sociology and sociolinguistics.

3.2. The participants

For participant research, I contacted Sofía (fictitious name[6]) and I joined her group of friends, establishing bonds, to a greater or lesser extent. Initially, field notes were used to gather data, and from January onwards, following an experimental stage, the tape recorder was used in addition (in a covert manner, although with the prior or subsequent authorisation of the speakers). In the final two months, furthermore, three unconcealed video recordings were made, which included a group interview. Following this, I had available a corpus of 33 hours of recorded discourse (for analysis of the same, see Domínguez Seco, 2000).

The group observed comprised people from diverse backgrounds (Galician villages, small towns and cities), with ages during the research ranging from 19 to 26. On most occasions, meetings were held at the home of the informant, Sofía, who acted as group leader. Members were speakers with identities linked, in different measures, to vernacular Galician, although within the group, the majority of the participants behaved as Galician speakers. The degree of literacy in the language was diverse, and in general terms incomplete, since they belonged to the first generations receiving Galician as a subject in the academic curriculum, experiencing the initial years of an educational structure previously non-existent.

Some use Spanish more frequently, although as a group, they show themselves to be advocates of Galician, both in their practices and in their explicit statements in this regard. This forms an integral part of the collectively constructed identity, a phenomenon which is obvious when group informants who normally speak in Spanish, switch to Galician as a means of collective integration; or when going through procedures which, apparently, are aimed at preserving the group's public image in a situation of an unhidden recording. In order to interpret the data, therefore, it must be taken into account that group practices are not oblivious to ideological militancy through the language, or rather, to standing up for the dignity of Galician as a shared language belonging to its people, linked to a given social identity.

In most interactions presented here, three of the participants are most actively involved in the research, namely Sofía, Salgado and Lali. Sofía and Salgado are the most consistent Galician speakers in the group who, to a greater extent, made their voices heard in the conversations on linguistic issues. Lali is Salgado's girlfriend and, with frequent switching of language, he barely uses Spanish and communicates in a broad dialectal Galician. Sofía, on the other hand, switches and mixes both languages, although it is clear that, as she herself states, "her" language is Galician. Sofía and Salgado say they are monolinguals in Galician, and show a committed position in the defence of the language.

6 All names have been changed to keep confidentiality.

3.3. Some results

Examination of the collective activities of the group reveals the incidence of the institutionalisation and legitimisation of Galician in the linguistic practices and ideologies of the group under observation. As shown later, it is possible to describe certain communicative processes as indices for correction criteria, as referred to earlier, both as regards reproducing it and in resisting against it. It was noted that the group takes on a characterisation of Galician as a "shared" language very much their "own", standing for a collective Galician identity. We refer here to this assumption as a reproduction of the ideology of the standard, as it expresses the characteristic nature of the language in terms of the Galician collective. Within the group, this is a common sense assumption, which occasionally leads to the practical application of a correction criterion. No consistent reproduction, however, derives from a correction criteria in terms of the standard model. On the contrary, in the more explicit conversations on language the idea arises of a linguistic model which is no longer the "own" of Galiza, but rather the "own" of each individual speaker. In this manner, processes resistant to a shared model for the language (the "own" in reference to collective identity) are generated.

4. A language model: Authority and idiomatic correction

One of the most striking aspects, as far as the ideology of the standard is concerned, is how the informants switch from a "correct" frame of reference (Goffman, 1974) to another "natural" or "native" one. In this regard, the participants' awareness that they are being observed is a relevant factor: certainly correction would not be so evident if it were not for the presence of the observer and her recording equipment. In the group, correction criteria following a shared model is evident in the systematicity of self-repairing (almost always, aimed at avoiding lexical interference with Spanish). These practices are opposed to the systematicity of a spontaneous *Castilianism* accompanying the *juvenile* and *dialectal* speech of the informants. *Repairing* entails avoiding or reformulating (correcting) certain linguistic forms, as evidenced in markers such as vocalic lengthenings, false-starts, etc., signs that reveal that the speaker is selecting a given form or reconstructing a given statement (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks, 1977, among other works).

By way of an example, see case 1:

Case 1

[Context: Isabel talking to the researcher about a common acquaintance].

1 Isabel:	parecía o xudío que sa-	1 Isabel:	he looked like the Jew[a] who came-
2	o xudeu que salía na:	2	the Jew[b] who came out in:

A fairly frequent movement in our group interactions occurred here, although it was occasionally used by almost all the participants in the presence of the observer. Also, on rare occasions, the speakers correct their interlocutors, generally in a jocular manner. A general consensus is even reached on terms used by the group, i.e., some take from others a word belonging to a variety of Galician to replace a Castilianism. So, we have the following case, where Ricardo incorporates the word "borralleiro" ("ashtray") generally used by Sofía instead of his usual "cenicero" (a Castilianism). In this action, it must be taken into account that Sofía behaves as group leader, both in general and as far as linguistic issues are concerned.

Case 2

[Context: at Sofía's home, watching the television. Ricardo addresses the researcher].

1 Ricardo:	Pásame aí o:	1 Ricardo:	Pass me the:
2	o borralleiro	2	the ashtray

As does Ricardo with "borralleiro", so do other participants with "cinceiro" (another purist alternative for "cenicero"). Some other members will tend to alternate between "cinceiro" and "borralleiro", or finally opt for using one of these possibilities, steering clear of the word in Spanish. Towards the end of the research, one of the members of the group asks Sofía and the researcher (language "authorities" within the collective) about the distinction between "cinceiro" and "borralleiro", which highlights the relevance taken on by these terms in subsequent meetings.

Movements aimed at correction intensify in the meetings specifically organised for recording on video, a fact which I interpret as the result of the relevance of a public reference frame (by the presence of a camera): the speakers act in what the sociologist Ervin Goffman (1967) terms *anterior region*, a scenario set apart from the more private environment of informal practices. Indeed, now not only is the researcher-colleague present, but she also takes on, at this point, the role of expert observer while the informers become the observed, and at the same time, it is assumed that other experts in the subject are going to see the recordings. This same context gives rise to shows of a position of resistance or humoristic distancing from the standard, i.e., in terms of the public context and the expert language observers, with metalinguistic jokes, as in case 3:

Case 3

[Context: in a situation where a video recording is in progress, Sofía attempts to convince her boyfriend, Pablo, to go down to the supermarket nearby to buy something sweet. The use of "enrólate" ('get into it') instead of the usual "enróllate" by Sofía and others, is an obvious metalinguistic reference. The informant highlights the word by pronouncing it more slowly

(line 8; lines 11 to 15). The Galicianized form replaces the Spanish, which is normal in young people's slang, when they speak both in Galician and in Spanish. Evidently, the observer's response (Obs) spurs Sofía on to reiterate her meta-reference, which is to continue after the positive response from all participants, who laugh at her joke (line 12). Line 15 not only continues a slowed down statement, but also adds the phonetic deformation of "chocolate": the phoneme /tʃ/ (dygraph <ch>) is pronounced [ʃ], and not as the standard [tʃ]. Both in Galician and in Spanish, the correct form is [tʃ]; [ʃ] does not exist in Spanish, and in Galician it is the standard pronunciation of the phoneme /ʃ/, and not of /tʃ/. Thus, the pronunciation of this word is strange both for the Galician speaker and for the Spanish speaker. In this case, what is relevant is the rareness of the pronunciation, something that does not necessarily "evoke identities" loaded with social meaning, but rather quite simply reveals the efficiency with which humour infringes or blurs "natural" conceptions of just what languages are, without invalidating such conceptions].

1	Sofía	pablo
2		<1>
3		si baixas despois o fagho
4		<3>
5		si *eso ... eso
6		si baixas despois
7		<5>
8		te podías enrolar [risos]
9		<2>
10	Obs	enrolar
11	Sofía	enrólate
12		<1.5> [risas de Lali, Salgado y Obs]
13		e báixame ..
14		por unhas palmeiriñas ...
15		de chocolate ([´ʃokolate])

1	Sofía	pablo
2		<1>
3		if you go down after I'll do it
4		<3>
5		yes *right ... alright
6		if you go down after
7		<5>
8		you could get into it [laughs]
9		<2>
10	Obs	get into it
11	Sofía	get into it
12		<1.5> [laughs from Lali, Salgado and Obs.]
13		go down and get me
14		some palmerita cakes ...
15		with chocolate ([´ʃokolate])

Likewise, the informants occasionally orientate their actions to adapting to speech, in that they avoid using "vulgar" or "bad sounding" words in front of the camera. In case 4, as in the previous case, this is a Spanish expression commonly used in Galiza, so that it would not be relevant as indexical of Spanish language in all contexts. In this example, it appears to stand out as "bad sounding" and not as "Castilianising".

Case 4

[Context: starting with an interview, recorded on video. Sofía says to Salgado, "machácatela" (the inference is, "machácate la polla = penis" = 'jerk your prick off' or something similar), i.e., a very coarse expression used by Lali to correct his girl friend as he realises that the camera is operating. Perhaps Salgado's reply on line 16 is aimed at denying the inadequacy by Lali when repeating the verb as a kind of schoolboy insult based on an altered verbal

conjugation, and by doing so, making it all the more plain to see. His immediate conclusion ("come on") supports this interpretation, since the repetition is a part of a conclusive movement, which may be paraphrased as follows, "we all say *jerk yourself off* and it's not of the slightest importance, let's carry on with what we're doing"].

1	Lalí	*hazme un favor*	1	Lalí	do me a favour
2		*bájale la voz*	2		turn the sound down
3	Sofía	pero ti preghúntalle en voz alta	3	Sofía	but you ask him out loud
4	Lalí	*si le baja la vo- la voz ya está no?*	4	Lalí	if you turn the sou- sound down, that's it, isn't it?
5	Sofía	así?	5	Sofía	just like that?
6	Salgado	báixalla de todo	6	Salgado	turn it right down
7	Sofía	bueno SI	7	Sofía	ALRIGHT then
8		machácatela [a Salgado]	8		jerk yourself off [to Salgado]
9	Lalí	*está grabando yo?* [a Obs]	9	Lalí	is it recording now? [to Obs.]
10	Sofía	coño e por que? [a Salgado]	10	Sofía	hell, and why not? [to Salgado]
11	Obs	si: [a Lalí]	11	Obs	yes, it is [to Lalí]
12	Lalí	*coño*	12	Lalí	hell
13		*ti machácatela* [a Sofía]	13		you jerk yourself off [to Sofía]
14	Sofía	fff [risos]	14	Sofía	fff [laughs]
15	Obs	he he he	15	Obs	hahaha
16	Salgado	*ti machácala y yo machácala*	16	Salgado	you jerk yourself off and I jerk myself off
17		veña	17		come on

Consequently, during the recording sessions, the standard and attention to linguistic form in general are more present, so that the speakers give an account of a linguistic ideology, whereby there is a register more appropriate for public activities. By showing their skill or care for the language, the speakers accept such ideologies; by showing distancing in terms of the model, they put up resistance to the same. In other words, with these humorous games, the participants indicate that what is "correct" is not always "their own", while at the same time exerting a role of (trivial) resistance typically found in groups of young people (similar attitudes were noted in Pujolar's study, 1997). In any case, as correction is used to correct "their own language" (Galician) from "the other language" (Spanish), what is "not natural" may be incorporated into the own repertoire[7].

This in the first place, points to an expectation among the speakers, noted by Álvarez Cáccamo (1993: 10) in their analysis of public discourse events: the expectation that they have to produce a discourse "in Galician", more particularly in correct Galician, that is to be identifiable as the authorised code of the language.

7 This differentiation between the own and the other was put forward by Gumperz (1982), who talks of "we-code" and "they-code".

This also points to a distancing of this group in terms of the expectation itself, which is not applied in a systematic practice; that is always overlooked and hardly appears as a symbolic index of acceptance of a given view of the varieties of the "own language". This view, although not completely assumed, is not openly queried, except when the particularities of the model in any way contravene the linguistic intuitions of the members of the collective, or when some type of imposition or social control comes into play.

So therefore, in their lexical choices, these people assume the existence of a correct linguistic model. This correction is nearly always orientated towards avoiding Castilianisms and, occasionally, to suppressing forms inadequate for public and/or institutional contexts, in other words, avoiding uneducated registers. In these activities, Galician appears as One, as opposed to the oneness of Spanish, the former as an agglutinator of a shared Galician identity, governed by the standards of a "purer" way of speaking than everyday Castilianized speech. At the same time, in cases such as (3) and (4), the naturalness of a mixed form of speech becomes more evident, and this frequently highlights the interlinguistic frontiers in a humoristic manner, serving to infringe the "normality" of a correct standard for Galician in an ironic way.

5. Models and models: Recognition of diversity

Infringement in terms of the standard model and interlinguistic frontiers is, initially, unimportant. This is based on common sense aware of the difference between the correct and the incorrect, as found in public or educated contexts and in ordinary speech. It is a common behaviour in groups of young people, and does not necessarily imply a conscious resistance to the ideology of the standard; on the contrary, as occurs with self-repairing, it is usually indicative of the fact that these young people share the social norms involving the reproduction of the ideology of the standard, in other words, that for them, the "normal" is also correction.

But, to some extent, this infringement is associated with other more transparent practices in terms of the expression of linguistic ideologies. In conversations on language matters, it became clear that the criteria of correction posed a problem regarding the social identities of the speakers concerned, so that resistance to it made sense as a form of expression of such identities. Here we come across social realities, which any standardisation process contributes to removing: local identities, identities which are generated within the social networks of its speakers; class identities, whereby such speakers acknowledge their ownership of a given cultural and economic capital ranking them at some point on the hierarchic ladder. Note the following exchange:

Case 5

[Context: four participants, three of whom (Sofía, Salgado and Lali) are professional cooks. They are taking a look at a publication of the Xunta de Galicia (Autonomous Regional Government of Galiza) showing the diversity and culinary excellences of Galician fish. They start to argue over the term "nécora" (currently the standard; 'velvet crab') which, as far as Sofía is concerned, is perfect Galician, whereas for Salgado it is a Castilianism. The observer is in Sofia's room; she does not take part in the conversation, as she is working ("on her thesis") on Sofía's computer. Sofía goes to her bedroom to consult the dictionary. She asks the observer (Obs) how to say "nécora" ('velvet crab') in Galician, and the latter replies that she does not know. At this, Sofía returns to the other room with the dictionary and reads from it].

1	Sofía	noca	1	Sofía	velvet crab[a]
2		noca	2		velvet crab[a]
3	Salgado	nocra	3	Salgado	velvet crab[b]
4	Sofía	crustáceo -	4	Sofía	crustacean -
5	Salgado	nocra	5	Salgado	velvet crab[b]
6	Lali	nocra	6	Lali	velvet crab[b]
7	Ana	nocra	7	Ana	velvet crab[b]
8	Sofía	noca	8	Sofía	velvet crab[a]
9		crustáceo marino	9		marine crustacean
10	Salgado	NOCRA	10	Salgado	VELVET CRAB[b]
11	Sofía	non vén -	11	Sofía	it's not in -
12	Salgado	nocra	12	Salgado	velvet crab[b]
13	Sofía	non ten razón o libro eh	13	Sofía	this book's not right, eh
14		é nocra	14		it's velvet crab[b]
15		porque o pon no libro do ghrove	15		because the book from O Grove says so
16	Salgado	xx xx [protesta entre dentes]	16	Salgado	xx xx [protesting under his breath]
17	Obs	he he he	17	Obs	ha ha ha

Line 1 of this segment is the start of a movement in which Sofía, reading the literal definition in the dictionary, positions her lexical selection within the frame of institutionally acknowledged linguistic knowledge. Sofía asserts the validity of "noca" based on the authority of the dictionary, despite the fact that as far as she is concerned, the animal in question is a "nécora" ('velvet crab', also termed "noca" in this exchange). Salgado acts only as his own voice, that of a spontaneous speaker; Lali and Ana recognise this voice as their own as they establish a conversational alliance with Salgado by repeating the word that he puts forward ("nocra", lines 6-7). The group leader, however, gets round these replies and proceeds with her reading (lines 8 and 9).

The "NOCRA" from Salgado (with a rise in volume, line 10) is an indication of the fact that he does not act what Sofía attempts to impose. But the speaker keeps the line of interaction on his own ground by replying to his friend, in the same neutral tone with, "it's not in" (line 11); i.e., she responds to the protest from within the

same frame whereby said "marine crustacean" is termed "noca" and not the other; a frame in which neither Sofia's own "nécora" nor Salgado's "nocra" exist. This speaker, for his part, reverts back (line 12) to "nocra" and to the neutral prosody, in what appears to be a sign that he is keeping to his position without looking for an argument, or that he is taking no notice of what his friend is indicating with her use of turns in the conversation. Sofía, also keeping her position (lines 13 to 15), resorts to irony and playing around the book ("the book from O Grove") to delegitimize Salgado's authority, in a direct face to face, which entails his local identity (the town where he lives, O Grove). In this manner, she adopts the position of the ideology of the legitimate language by pointing out what "truly exists" (appearing in the dictionary) while rejecting what is a mere local construction. The relevance of Sofía's movement as an attack becomes obvious in the corresponding murmur of disagreement uttered by Salgado (line 16). The dispute continues, although we shall leave the analysis at this point.

On other occasions, Sofía once again provokes an argument about language, bringing onto the scene the conceptual background of the language model. The case described below (case 6) takes place just over a month later, in a situation where, as in the previous case, it is the spontaneity of the speakers, in the context of an informal meeting, which leads to reverting to the issue of idiomatic correction. Despite the naturalness in the introduction of the themes, the context of research appears to be a factor affecting Sofía's behaviour: she stands up to her friends with irony, especially to Salgado, and takes on a role of "competent authority", which the researcher herself does not assume. In my opinion, it is highly likely that this role and the reference markers set in motion by it, would not have appeared if it were not for the group's awareness of being subjected to a "linguistic investigation".

Case 6

[Context: four participants (Lali, Sofía, Salgado, Obs). In a spontaneous chat, the issue of culinary terminology turns up again, and a cook known by all and who uses a Galician which "you can't understand" is criticised. According to Salgado, this is because he speaks Portuguese, while according to Sofía and Lali it is because he uses standard Galician. The fact that around this time, Sofía and the observer had commented on the appearance in the newspaper of a study on *gheada* and the fact that it was looked down upon, has some bearing here; both Sofía and Salgado frequently use *gheada*[8]. Lali normally speaks Spanish].

8 *Gheada* is a phonetic phenomenon of Galician whereby the phoneme /g/, with a standard pronunciation as [g], becomes [ħ] or [x] or other variations ("gato" / "ghato"). It is widely used in speech, although the standard does not include it. In the opinion of some researchers, it occurs due to the influence of Spanish; conversely, others consider it an evolution of Galician itself. On the evaluation of *gheada* among young people, see Recalde Fernández (1995); for comments on how *gheada* is viewed in Santiago de Compostela, see Dubert García (1999).

1 Salgado	diche	1 Salgado	he tells you
2	home ti non sabes falar ghallegho	2	man, you can't speak Galician
3	señor perdona pero eu	3	look sir, if you don't mind, I
4	eu falo ghallegho desde que nacin	4	I've been speaking Galician since I was born
5	non a(g)ora collo o libro e ando a chulear	5	What I don't do is pick up a book and start parading around [as if I knew the language just by reading the book]
6	o sea que a min non	6	so, not me
7	xx	7	xx
8 Obs	non sabes	8 Obs	you don't know
9	diche?	9	he tells you?
10 Salgado	mm mm [asentindo]	10 Salgado	mm mm [nodding in approval]
11	non desiame non?	11	he told me, you know?
12	porque	12	because
13	como falo e tal non?	13	how I talk and that, you know?
14	porque ao mellor digho ghato	14	because maybe I say *ghato*
15	e tal non?...	15	and so on, you know?
16	ti non sabes falar ghallegho desía [el	16	you can't speak Galician [he said
17 Sofia	[porque non sabes	17 Sofia	[because you don't know
18	[a ver di ghato ghaliña ghaliñeiro	18	[come on, say *ghato, ghaliña, ghaliñeiro*
19 Salgado	[non falo dese portughés e gha- e desíalle eu	19 Salgado	[I don't speak that Portuguese and *gha-* and I told him
20	perdona =	20	sorry =
21 Sofia	SAL [a Salgado, diminutivo]	21 Sofia	SAL [to Salgado, diminutive]
22 Salgado	= pero eu falo ghallego do meu pai e do meu abuelo	22 Salgado	= but I speak the Galician spoken by my father and grandfather
23	ti fala o ghallegho que che ..	23	speak [you] the kind of Galician that
24	que a(g)ora che enseñan os chulitos que nunca o falaron	24	taught by those smart guys who've who've never spoken it
25 Sofia	a ver	25 Sofia	let's see
26	di ghato ghaliña e ghaliñeiro	26	say *ghato ghaliña* and *ghaliñeiro*
27 Salgado	mm?	27 Salgado	mm?
28 Obs	he he he	28 Obs	ha ha ha
29 Salgado	ghato ghaliña e ghaliñeiro	29 Salgado	*ghato ghaliña* and *ghaliñeiro*
30 Sofia	a ver	30 Sofia	let's see
31	como?	31	what?
32 Salgado	ghato ghaliña e ghaliñeiro	32 Salgado	*ghato ghaliña* and *ghaliñeiro*
33 Obs	ghato ghaliña e ghali-	33 Obs	*ghato ghaliña* and *ghali-*
34 Salgado	que? [ton defensivo, a Sofia]	34 Salgado	what? [defensive tone, to Sofia]
35 Obs	ghaliñeiro	35 Obs	ghaliñeiro
36 Sofia	non joder	36 Sofia	no fuck
37	que ese é o rollo da gheada	37	that's the thing about the *gheada*
38	que nós facemos	38	that we use
39	ghato ghaliña e ghaliñeiro e =	39	*ghato ghaliña* and *ghaliñeiro* =
40 Salgado	[e nós tamém	40 Salgado	[so do we
41 Sofia	[=parece que	41 Sofia	[=it sounds like
42	parece que é unha *jota* parece que é unha cousa mui rara aí	42	it sounds like a jota it sounds like it's something really weird there
43	...	43	...
44 Obs	boh	44 Obs	uff
45	pero si o fai todo dios de toda a vida	45	but everybody does that all the time

46 Salgado	pero joder	46 Salgado	but fuck
47	eso é a maneira de fa*lar	47	that's the way of speaking
48 Sofia	pero está guai	48 Sofia	but it's cool
49	que a min me mola meu	49	I like it, my old son
50	e logho meu?	50	and what about that, my old son? ["my old
	["meu", forma dialectal de Salgado]		son", a dialectal form used by Salgado]
51Salgado	é a maneira [de falar DE ALÍ	51 Salgado	that's the way [of speaking ROUND THERE
52Sofia	[e isso que ti	52 Sofia	[and bearing in mind that you
	arre mi má me cagho en diola		fuck that!
53 Salgado	é a mane-	53 Salgado	it's a way …
54 Sofia	[arre mi má meu	54 Sofia	[leave it out, son!
55 Salgado	[é a maneira de falar dos meus abuelos	55 Salgado	[it's the way my grandparents spoke
56 Lali	he he he	56 Lali	ha ha ha

Lines 1-24 in this fragment are a brief narrative by Salgado, telling how Manuel Molete (a cook, like Salgado, but older and with more prestige than Salgado) had told him that he cannot speak Galician, because of his use of forms such as the *gheada*. Note how the speaker legitimates his language through speaking like he has done all his life ("since I was born", line 4*)* and the way of speaking of family tradition (line 22); he sets this in opposition to the language of "those smart guys who've never spoken it" (in line 24) and to a "speaking by-the-book": "What I don't do is pick up a book and start parading around [as if I knew the language just by reading the book]", he said in line 4. In this discourse, an explanation is given of the difference in prestige associated with language competence as well as an act of outright resistance to this difference. Sofía answers her friend by competing with him by control over the conversation, and asks for a speech sample, as if she herself were the researcher. This movement takes the frame of the conversation from that of spontaneous knowledge defended by Salgado to a knowledge from outside or "objective" of language. In terms of *gheada*, a considerably stigmatized phenomenon, the speaker makes no judgement, although her action may be interpreted as a denial of Salgado's language competence if read in the scope of the direct attack of line 17, "because you don't know".

Sofía has to insist so that her friend accepts her control over the interaction, and he reacts in a defensive tone, but without any outright resistance (line 34). Note the "we" used by Sofía (line 38) and the "us too" (line 40) by Salgado, where these collective first person plurals are associated (van Leeuwen, 1997) based on a given linguistic use. The association, expressed in the agency shared, implicitly establishes a vague difference between the *us*, with *gheada*, which identifies these informants, and the *us Galicians* or *us,* who speak Galician (not all use the *gheada,* what is more generic. It is understood from the observer's and Salgado's reply, in lines 44 to 47, that Sofía's viewpoint is rejected.

Without replying to his friend's statements (in lines 48 to 50, 52 and 54), Salgado specifically makes allusion to a geographical place and the family as central

elements of his argument about language skills: It is "normal" or "good" the way of speaking of a given place (line 51, "that's the way [of speaking ROUND THERE"), and the way of speaking of family tradition (line 55, "it's the way my grandparents spoke"). This tradition had appeared earlier as a counterpoint to the "by-the-book" Galician (lines 22 to 24, "but I speak the Galician spoken by my father and grandfather, speak [you] the kind of Galician taught by those smart guys who've never spoken it"). Once again, a type of resistance is established in this informant's action in the face of the appropriation of language competence by authorised knowledge.

But Sofía's reply is repeatedly superposed on her friend's statements. Contradicting the latter's inferences, the speaker uses a language which we may describe as a display of a language model of her own, different from the legitimate one (with forms from young people's jargon, dialectal and markedly colloquial forms). The very propositional content of the statements and prosodic indications of emphasis are added to these contextualisation cues (Gumperz, 1982). All this points to a social knowledge shared with Salgado, in such a manner that the frame of juvenile and local identities is highlighted, speech forms of their own shared by the speakers. The statements are orientated, therefore, to bringing back the solidarity damaged by the implicit presence (by means of Sofía's sequential control and challenge) of a viewpoint interpreted as a delegitimizing factor of their language practices.

These communicative movements associated with language symbolism, are possible by reference to a social world and values, which are related to language and its uses. In interactions such as this and other subsequent ones, the group constructs, under Sofía's and Salgado's leadership (who play at being allies and attacking each other), an ideological representation of language where it is re-thought and where a native authority of spontaneous speakers is legitimized. Such a representation is made up in subsequent exchanges throughout the investigation, although the fact that the process had already begun previously in the interactional history of the participants should not be dismissed. In this process, the speech uttered by each of them as an expression of identity, specifically with a rural identity[9] is highlighted, and arises as a reason for pride, accompanied by a public show of linguistic-cultural skill.

To what extent this may be a reproduction of ideological values linked to left-wing nationalism (which to a large extent, extol these local identities) is not, in my opinion, a priority interest: the speakers may be gathering watchwords also found in their social medium, but there appears to be no doubt about the fact that, in terms of how they deal with the standard as something particular to authorised elites, they conceive these dialectal speech forms as *truly their own*, such as the one expressing

9 Rural and urban identities linked to forms of speech have been studied, from an interactional standpoint, in works by Prego Vázquez and Rodríguez Yáñez; see, for example, Prego Vázquez (2000) or Rodríguez Yáñez (1994).

their identity and allowing them to establish group solidarity links with other Galician speakers, as such, regardless of the fact that they speak in a different way: their own way of speaking is *tan galego* (as Galician) as that of others. Likewise, the "vulgar" or "juvenile" elements are relevant (although not the same identifying contents), making it possible to contextualise actions in frames of informality and open communication, establishing links of solidarity, both with Galician speakers and with Spanish speakers.

6. Final considerations: Language, identity and ideological resistance

In the data presented, the communicative actions of the group under study are illustrated. By means of what the participants do with language, particularly in repair practices, the hegemony of so-called "shared Galician" is represented: an educated, valid standard for the speakers as a whole, which is over and above (or is preferable to) other forms of speech. Note, however, that this repair work, humorous use of correction, is appropriate for front regions, more public environments, where behaviour patterns are more consciously enacted by the speakers. In back regions, more appropriate for spontaneous practices, a "natural" use of speech is maintained, where neither repairing nor humour are necessary since the issue of the standard is irrelevant. So the criteria of correction appears as assumed in certain of the actions by the speakers; meanwhile, these speakers show their independence from —or indifference to— the standard by what they most frequently do when speaking. Finally, the humorous use of criteria validates it at the same time as invalidating it: as has frequently been repeated, breaking the norm highlights its very standardising nature while making it possible to go beyond its narrow limits.

In the conversations on language (what the speakers say about their language), belonging to a shared model becomes increasingly explicit. The overall result of these conversations is the fact that, towards the end of the investigation, the members of the group play at exchanging humorous corrections and become more increasingly involved in conversations where the standard is brought into question, and its shared nature is denied (see Domínguez Seco, 2000). The distancing of these people from a regulated model becomes evident here, a model which, in their very interactions, leads them to omit or devalue speech forms considered by the speakers as "their own". These interactions focus on the more visibly symbolic elements of shared Galician (lexicon, *gheada*), elements which may come into conflict with Castilianized, dialectal, colloquial or vulgar forms (all of which are shared by the speakers). In these counter positions between language forms, the issue of prestige and distinction become clearly visible, as they are forms linked to ways of speaking. Precisely because of this visibility, the participants show resistance to language ideologies which, in other contexts they would enact, or from which they keep a distance, in a humorous and trivial manner.

It may be inferred from these spontaneous practices that the ideology of idiomatic correction is largely unimportant in the daily interactions of the speakers. The same participants, however, attribute a thoroughly ideological meaning to these "natural" behaviour patterns, which ignore the principle of authority and the criteria of correction. As observed in the data presented here, what they say ("I speak Galician since I was born", etc.), both as what they do through interaction, is oriented towards a different view of the language. This view may not be separated from the assumption and expression of an identity other than that of mother country or of an autonomous region (i.e., other than that of the politicized social identity) or that of High Culture (i.e., other than that of acknowledging correction and authority). Following this approach, with or without the institutionally acknowledged authority, native speakers such as Sofía and Salgado are competent: native authority prevails. Also, native speech is associated with a local identity, whose language forms appear to be sanctioned by a given group tradition, not dependent on a theoretically shared standard created by and for the cultural elites.

We are, therefore, concerned here with speakers who, in subsequent meetings, entail an indexical opposition between two frames associated with the Galician language: represented as particular to the participants, the world of local or family tradition arises in conversation. This tradition is associated with an identity, which is, in most cases, rural, represented by uneducated speech forms learnt and reproduced in everyday conversation. The everyday "vulgar" and "juvenile" forms occasionally used by the speakers are their own. Alternating between "own" and "not-own", this world of the everyday is counterpoised with the more abstract, "common" world symbolised by standard Galician. The standard is alien to the extent that its most evident symbolic markers (the correct forms replacing Castilianisms) are somewhat relevant in group practices. It is represented, however, as their own language inasmuch as it is reproduced, in the repair operations, as a representation of a shared identity where own language is opposed to the "other" language, which is Spanish.

Only expressions of outright resistance arise towards this shared Galician used "by the elite" when it is defined in conversation as an imposition of the foreign or denial of the own (i.e., when it appears as a differentiating element in the sense coined by Bourdieu, 1979). The greater prestige of the legitimate language over the "natural" way of speaking, or the omission of spontaneous, traditional forms, are viewed as contrary to the "truly" shared nature of own language. In this regard, the standard is not a shared language. The shared language collectively legitimized by these speakers takes the form of the different models which each of them has for the use of language. The standard is treated as just another model, or as an "artificial" model diversely linked to power. The legitimisation of the diverse is the collective solution to the problems deriving from the dominance of a shared model for a language: it is a form of resistance as opposed to the deligitimization and stigmatization of non-standardized variants, variants that people consider as "own" and "shared", such as that of the standard language.

Appendix: Transcription criterion

The lines in the transcription are established by means of segmentation into intonational units. The following aspects are also noted:

	Galician
	Spanish
[abc	
[def	superimposing of voices
-	truncated segment
=	turn continued below, inserting another speaker
xx	unintelligible fragment
bla[a], bla[b]	in translation, this convention reflects the existence of two forms for the same word in the original
(=)	standard form (where considered necessary)
gh	digraph indicative of *gheada*
[laughs]	margin note
..	pause of approximately 0.5 seconds
...	pause of approximately 0.75 seconds
<>	pause of one second or more
:	sound lengthening
*	emphatic accent on following syllable
CAPS	high volume in short segment

Bibliographical references

Álvarez Cáccamo, C. (1989). "Variaçom lingüistica e o factor social na Galiza". *Hispanic Linguistics* 2(2), 253-98.

Álvarez Cáccamo, C. (1993). "The pidgeon house, the octopus and the people: the ideologization of linguistic practices in Galiza". *Plurilinguismes* 6, 1-26.

Álvarez Cáccamo, C. (1997). "Construindo a língua no discurso público: Práticas e ideologias linguísticas". *Agália* 50, 131-50.

Álvarez Cáccamo, C. (1998). "From 'switching code' to 'code-switching'. Towards a reconceptualisation of communicative codes". In P. Auer (ed.), *Code-switching in Conversation. Language, Interaction and Identity*. London & New York: Routledge, 29-48.

Álvarez Cáccamo, C. & M.J. Herrero Valeiro (1996). "O continuum da escrita na Galiza: entre o espanhol e o português". *Agália* 46, 143-56.

Argente, J.A. & Ll. Payrató (1990). "Towards a pragmatic approach to the study of languages in contact: evidence from language contact cases in Spain". *Pragmatics* 1(4), 465-80.

Argente, J.A. & A.M. Lorenzo (1991). "A relevancia social da alternancia lingüística". *Cadernos de lingua* 3, 91-109.

Atkinson, J.M. & J. Heritage (eds.) (1984). *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beramendi, J.G. (1997). "Conciencia étnica e conciencias nacionais en Galicia". In G. Pereira-Menaut (coord.), *O feito diferencial galego*, vol. II. Santiago de Compostela: Museo do Pobo Galego & A Editorial da Historia, 277-300.

Bourdieu, P. (1979). *La distinction*. Paris: Minuit.

Bourdieu, P. (1982). *Ce que parler veut dire. L'économie des échanges linguistiques*. Paris: Fayard.

Briggs, Ch.L. (1986). *Learning how to Ask: A Sociolinguistic Appraisal of the Role of the Interview in Social Science Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Domínguez Seco, L. (1993). "Na construção do galego como língua legítima. Uma análise dos textos de língua do bacharelato". *Agália* 34, 147-66.

Domínguez Seco, L. (2000). *Una aproximación interaccional a la conceptualización del habla. Las ideologías lingüísticas en Galiza como índice de la diferencia social*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Universidade da Coruña, A Coruña.

Dubert García, F. (1999). *Aspectos do galego de Santiago de Compostela* (= *Verba, Anuario Galego de Filoloxía*. Anexo 44). Santiago de Compostela: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis. The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual*. New York: Anchor Books.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis*. New York: Harper and Row.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discouse Strategies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Herrero Valeiro, M.J. (1993). "Guerre des graphies et conflit glottopolitique: lignes de discours dans la sociolinguistique galicienne". *Plurilinguismes* 6, 181-209.

Herrero Valeiro, M.J. (2000). *Glotopolítica y genealogía del poder: el proceso de institucionalización del gallego desde la perspectiva de una (macro)política de la lengua*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Universidade da Coruña, A Coruña.

Kabatek, J. (2000). *Os falantes como lingüistas. Tradición, innovación e interferencias no galego actual*. Vigo: Edicións Xerais.

Leeuwen, Th. van (1997). "A representação dos actores sociais". In E.R. Pedro (org.), *Análise Crítica do Discurso*. Lisboa: Caminho, 169-222.

Milroy, L. (1980). *Language and Social Networks*. New York: Basil Blackwell.

Milroy, J. & L. Milroy (1985). *Authority in Language. Investigating Language Prescription and Standardisation*. London & New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Pedro, E.R. (org.) (1997). *Análise Crítica do Discurso*. Lisboa: Caminho.

Portas Fernández, M. (1997). *Língua e sociedade na Galiza*. A Coruña: Bahía.

Prego Vázquez, G. (2000). *Prácticas discursivas, redes sociales e identidades en Bergantiños (Galicia): la interacción comunicativa en una situación de*

cambio sociolingüístico. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Universidade da Coruña, A Coruña.

Pujolar, J. (1997). *De què vas, tio?*. Barcelona: Empúries.

Recalde Fernández, Montserrat (1995). "Unha aproximación ás actitudes e prexuízos cara á gheada (dos alumnos de 2º de BUP de catro centros galegos)". *Cadernos de lingua* 12, 5-31.

Rodríguez Yáñez, X.P. (1994). *Estratexias de comunicación nas interaccións cliente-vendedor no mercado da cidade de Lugo: as alternancias de lingua galego/castelán e a negociación da escolla de língua (estudio etnográfico e sociolingüístico da interacción campo-cidade nun espacio urbano)*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Universidade da Coruña, A Coruña.

Rodríguez Yáñez, X.P. (1997). "Aléas théoriques et méthodologiques dans l'étude du bilinguisme. Le cas de la Galice". In H. Boyer (ed.), *Plurilinguisme: 'contact' ou 'conflit' de langues?*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 191-254.

Roseman, S. (1995). "'Falamos como falamos': Linguistic revitalization and the maintenance of local vernaculars in Galicia". *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 5(1), 3-32.

Schegloff, E.A., G. Jefferson & H. Sacks (1977). "The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation". *Language* 53(2), 361-82.

Woolard, K. (1989). *Double Talk: Bilingualism and the Politics of Ethnicity in Catalonia*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.