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Abstract With the background of the multilingual situation in Spain, which has undergone a very rapid change in the past decade, this study centres in the intergroup perception of social groups who share Castilian (Spanish) with their own ethnic languages, Catalan, Basque, Galician or Valencian. A sample of 165 university students answered several questions related to language competence, attitudes, social status and ingroup social identity. Using the matched-guise technique they also evaluated speakers representative of the five linguistic communities. Results show that the content of social categories (stereotypes) and language attitudes vary according to ingroup social identity and subjective vitality of their languages.

Introduction

The multilingual character of the Spanish state is defined by the coexistence of four languages: Castilian, Catalan, Basque and Galician. Valencian is often considered a geographical variety of Catalan though there is some disagreement on its status in relation to Catalan.

The 1978 Constitution acknowledges Castilian as the national language of the state and grants the rest of the languages, formerly dialects, the co-officiality in their respective ‘Comunidades Autónomas’ (from now on C.A.). The official status that C.A. languages enjoy today was not the norm in the recent history of Spain. In contrast, the people who speak these languages have been constantly beset by obstacles which frequently negated their right to use them. In fact, it is difficult to understand the revitalisation of their ethnolinguistic identities without a reference to the historical relations of these languages with Castilian. This relation has been and is still today, especially in the case of Galician and Basque, a diglossic relationship (Ferguson, 1959). Castilian was the only language of educa-

0261-929X, 87 03 0243-1 292 400
JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY
1987 M. Ros and J. I. Cano
Vol. 8, Nos. 3 and 4, 1987
243
tion, administration and legislation, while use of the other languages was restricted to informal contexts like the family. Diglossia reached its peak after 1940. With Franco's victory, all languages except Castilian ceased to be official and were lowered to dialects. Education, administration and mass media were Castilianised. Furthermore, the use of minority languages in public was interpreted as a sign of separatism and treated accordingly.

The policy of linguistic assimilation increased illiteracy in the minority languages. Socialisation patterns converged to the dominant language, particularly for those attempting upward mobility. The reduction of these languages to more rural, informal and uneducated contexts did not completely deter their use. Catalans were the most successful group in keeping their mother tongue as a language of certain prestige.

This diglossic situation began to change slowly after the restoration of democracy in 1977. Political autonomy for 'Comunidades Autónomas' and the rising status of their languages started a new period of normalisation at all institutional levels. Their use has been increasing slowly but systematically in administration and mass media (Catalan, Basque and Galician have their own community television channels). Nationalistic movements have regained vitality and are expressing it through the linguistic dimension.

However, this trend of normal language use still shows a certain imbalance in favour of Castilian at present. According to the model of sociolinguistic vitality (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977) we can draft the different vitality that these languages enjoy today by presenting an approximate outline of the situation. We think that their vitality has to be considered interdependently and in relation to Castilian (see Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Demography</th>
<th>Institutional Support</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castilian</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Med-High</td>
<td>Med-High</td>
<td>Med-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencian</td>
<td>Med-Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Med-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galician</td>
<td>Med-Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Med-Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Castilian is the national language of Spaniards. Widely used in most countries of Central and South America, it enjoys a remarkable position in status, demography and institutional support.

Catalan is the native language of over six million people. It is spoken in all levels of society, including the cultural and economic realms. Understanding Catalan has become necessary for upward mobility. In Catalonia, Castilian is predominant among industrial immigrants who amount to over one and a half million people. However, most people who live in Catalonia identify themselves as Catalans and see this language as the basic dimension of their social identity (Strubell, 1981).
Valencian does not have strong vitality (Ros & Giles, 1979). It is predominantly used in rural areas; people in urban areas, especially Valencia city, speak mostly Castilian (Mira, 1981). Furthermore, as people ascend in their educational level or social status Castilian becomes predominant (Ros, 1984). Institutional support for the language is much weaker than in Catalonia. Some Valencians do not feel that their language is an important feature of their social identity. Others strive to define their 'psychological distinctiveness' (Giles, 1973) by enlarging the difference with Catalan and regard theirs as a unique variety.

Basque, recently standardised around the 'Batu' variety, is spoken by 27% of the population of the Basque C.A. Native speakers are called 'euskladunas' and they are concentrated mainly in rural areas. Industrialisation brought a mass of Castilian-speaking immigrants to the Basque C.A., which today constitute about 40% of the population. They are called 'eraldunes'. That is, Basque people who can only speak Castilian. Although in the past Basque native speakers seeking social mobility spoke Castilian to their children, the changing status of the language has altered this trend — the young and more educated are now learning and speaking the language (Ruiz Olanbuenag et al., 1983). Institutional support for the language is growing, encouraging its use in primary and secondary education as well as in the mass media. Despite this rather diglossic situation in favour of Castilian, the Basque language seems to be the best symbol of their social identity (Ugalde, 1979). This positive 'psycholinguistic distinctiveness' is based on two aspects: their language is not shared by any other social group and it has unique historical roots as a very antique variety.

Galician is spoken by approximately 83% of the population, who live mostly on agricultural and fishing resources. The majority of Galician speakers live in rural areas. Cities, especially the capitals of the four provinces, speak mainly Castilian. Vilarino (1981) points out a direct relationship between social class and language preference, Castilian having the higher status. Even though institutional support is slowly increasing the use of Galician in education, Castilian continues to be more instrumental. Favourable attitudes towards the community language use are not as strong as in other C.A. Research on the relation between language and secondary education reveals that teachers have better expectations concerning students' achievement when they come from urban, Castilian-speaking contexts than from rural Galician-speaking ones (Rojo, 1981). Moreover teachers consider that speaking Galician is a hindrance for learning.

In short, we can see that the overall vitality of these languages is quite different: Castilian holds the dominant position, followed by Catalan, Basque, Valencian and finally Galician. We suspect that these various patterns of sociolinguistic vitality will differentially affect the role of language in their ethnic identity.

**Theoretical Framework**

Many social groups can be categorised readily by their distinct language varieties. Some ethnic and national groups also choose language as the most salient dimension of their social identities (Fishman, 1977; Ryan & Carranza, 1977; Ryan
& Giles, 1982). When we consider language as a salient dimension of intergroup relations in Spain, we acknowledge the existence of several ethnic groups that have their own ingroup language as well as Castilian, the national language of the state. These groups are redefining their statuses in a more favourable direction and expressing it by means of a wider use of their languages.

Two theoretical frameworks seem most adequate for the explanation of language behaviour in our intergroup context: Tajfel’s (1978, 1981) theory of intergroup relations and social change and Giles et al. (1977) theory of language in ethnic group relations. Stated in its simplest form, Tajfel’s theory suggests that members of a group, in search of a positive social identity, compare themselves in a number of valued dimensions with members of outgroups. The aim of these intergroup social comparisons is to obtain ingroup distinctiveness through positive differentiation from the outgroup. Tajfel devotes much of his theoretical attention to groups which possess a negative social identity and to the means to restore it. Ingroup identity in Tajfel’s theory is the result of a comparative process of the ingroup vis à vis outgroups in search of psychological distinctiveness. Even though the theory has proposed ingroup identity in relational terms, most measures of this concept have been done in an absolute way. Therefore ingroup identity has been often measured on its own, without considering the outgroup in relation to which ingroup identity has meaning. This strategy does not pose much of a problem when there is a single possible outgroup preselected in a binary way (e.g. men/women). However, when the concept is applied in an intergroup setting, where multiple comparisons can be made, it becomes more problematic and needs to be considered in a more relational way.

When applied to the role of language in ethnic group relations, Giles et al. (1977) propose an integration of Tajfel’s theory and Giles’ theory of interpersonal accommodation through speech (Giles, 1973). The theory analyses the sociostructural factors which can influence whether an ethnolinguistic minority will or will not seek to establish its own ingroup language as a viable means of communication. These factors are status, demography and institutional support, all of which form the ethnolinguistic vitality of social groups. The theory is also concerned with the speech strategies of convergence and divergence when referring to an interethnic context. When members consider their inferior status as fair they will attempt to leave their ingroups converging socially and psychologically. They might do this by adopting the outgroup language, a strategy called ‘linguistic convergence’ (Giles, 1973).

However, when groups in a subordinate position feel their status to be illegitimate, they will tend to dissociate themselves from the outgroup by stressing their social identity via language behaviour, a strategy called ‘psycholinguistic distinctiveness’. By diverging or emphasising their own ethnic accent, dialect or language, ingroup members accentuate the differences between themselves and the outgroups on a valued dimension of their group identity (Bourhis & Giles, 1977; Bourhis et al, 1979).

Research done on the social categorisation of groups whose language is the best symbol of their ethnicity has revealed that the content of social categorisation (e.g. stereotypes) depends on the social status that their speakers have as a group
in larger society (Giles & Hewstone, 1986). Therefore, speakers of standard varieties are ascended over speakers of non-standard varieties on status and prestige and devalued on interpersonal attraction (Giles & Powesland, 1975; Ryan & Carranza 1977; Ros, 1984).

Moreover, when social categorisation is made salient between groups of different ethnolinguistic vitality — Quebecois versus English speakers in Canada (Lambert et al., 1960); Mexican-Americans versus English-Americans (Carranza, 1982) or Valencian speakers versus Castilian speakers in Valencia (Ros, 1984) — there is a tendency among speakers of a language with low vitality to upgrade outgroups on status dimensions and ingroups on solidarity dimensions. Ingroup members compensate their inferior position by enhancing interpersonal attraction in this way.

Past intergroup research has not studied the conjoint relation of subjective ethnolinguistic vitality of groups, social identity and intergroup social categorisation. Moreover, research on social categorisation in intergroup terms has been concerned mainly with one ingroup and one outgroup. Nevertheless, adopting Tajfel’s concepts in a multiple group comparison, we may find that the notions of one ingroup and one outgroup are restrictive.

It would seem quite reasonable, given the historical roots of the present intergroup situation, that Castilians should be the most prominent outgroup. However, we think that this would not hold true when ingroups have low ethnolinguistic vitality or do not perceive their language as the central dimension of their social identity. This would imply further consequences for the social evaluation of ingroup and outgroup members. Evaluations have been made via semantic differential scales. Our study was designed to test whether the central dimensions obtained in previous studies converge with trait dimensions obtained when subjects are allowed to respond freely.

The Empirical Study

Our research focused on the subjective ethnolinguistic vitality of five different ‘Comunidades Autónomas’ in Spain: Castile, Galicia, the Basque Country, Catalonia and Valencia. Through indirect measurement, we explored their language competence and their attitudes and values towards the two languages (Castilian, that is, Spanish, and their respective languages). Identification with the different social groups, objective and subjective social status and the saliency of language in their definition of their social identity were also considered.

Using the matched-guise technique we elicited categorisation of the ingroups and outgroups, attempting to assess the content of these social categories through free responses. We also examined the affective reactions aroused by each language.

A sample of 500 students divided by age (three subsamples of twelve, fifteen and eighteen-year-old subjects) was selected for the four bilingual C.A. and for Madrid. Data will only be shown from the subsample of eighteen-year-old students. The sample consisted of a total of 165 university undergraduates (around
30 for each community) in the first course of History. Thus, they were matched reasonably regarding age, social and economic status.

Subjects were asked to complete a questionnaire related to their language usage, attitudes towards this use, their linguistic skills in both languages, and their level of national identification, apart from various items about their perception of their linguistic group situation.

Next, following the matched-guise technique (Lambert et al., 1960), a tape was played for the subjects and they heard the same weather forecast in each of the five languages. The order of the messages was randomised for every community. However, all subjects listened to their ingroup language in the last position. In addition, Basque never appeared first for it is the only language that is not understood outside its C.A. and, therefore, the meaning of the message could have been misinterpreted. The voices, though belonging to different speakers for the sake of native accents, had been matched in pitch and pace as far as possible. A small test among native judges confirmed all the voices as native.

After hearing each of the five speakers, students filled in another short questionnaire where they were asked to identify the speaker's language and to describe in their own manner the people who speak that language. They also were provided with seven-point scales to rate the feelings evoked by each message (the adjectives were joy, pleasantness, fear, contempt, shame and laughter). These scales were placed in opposite evaluative directions to avoid automatic sets of responses. Subjects were not aware of the nature of the task before they came into the classroom.

Results and Discussion

Language and social identity: Basic findings

The matters covered in the first questionnaire included the following basic dimensions: (1) Use of Castilian and the C.A. language. (2) Linguistic competence in both languages. (3) Attitudes towards the use of language: language preference. (4) Identification with the ingroup and various outgroups. (5) Instrumental and integrative value accorded to each language. (6) Feelings aroused by the C.A. language. and (7) Perceived status of the ingroup, both from the perspective of the respondent himself and from the outgroups'.

In some cases single questions were used to measure the dimension, while in some others several questions were averaged to compute global indexes. An index to account for the level of C.A. ingroup identification was constructed. The item directly asking ingroup identification, however, turned out to have a high mean for practically all cases and a small standard deviation, which did not enable us to correlate it with other variables. Therefore, we constructed an index (Idausus) by subtracting the identification with Spain from the original identification with the C.A. ingroup. 'Idausus' was used as a measure of identification, always allowing for the fact that it was not a direct standard but a subtractive one. The way the scales were presented, one after the other, leads us to believe that the number
marked on each scale acquires its full meaning in comparison with the others.

The use of Spanish was predominant over the C.A. language, while attitudes point to a clear preference for the community language. This apparent contradiction can be explained partly by the significantly better knowledge people claim to have of Spanish ($F = 41.88; df = 1,144; p<0.001$). Competence in the community language is perhaps not good enough to allow further use (which respondents seem to wish).

Subjects identified more with their community than with Spain ($F = 70.5; df = 1,166; p<0.001$). They reported a greater integrative value for their language than for Spanish ($F = 105.38; df = 1,141; p<0.001$). The feelings evoked by the community language were systematically positive. The valuation of one's own community was also very high, significantly higher than the perceived outgroup evaluation of one's own group ($F = 111.89; df = 1,165; p<0.001$). This is confirmed by the rating that subjects expressed about the fairness or unfairness of this valuation (mean = 1.63; 1 = fair, 2 = unfair). This suggests that communities feel underestimated as a whole. The change in this underestimation, if it is ever to take place, should be undertaken in a collective way according to the subjects (mean = 1.86; 1 = individually; 2 = collectively). 85% of them expressing that this change will come or at least may come in the future.

A factor analysis of the contexts of language use and the contexts of attitudes towards the use was carried out and the results showed three factors: (1) formal contexts of language use; (2) formal contexts of attitudes; and (3) familiar contexts both of use and of attitudes. Two conclusions can be drawn from this. The first is that familiar and formal contexts form two quite different blocks where linguistic use and preference differ considerably. The second is that while in formal contexts, the use and the attitudes towards language seem to follow different paths, both dimensions (usage and attitude) are apparently very close when in familiar contexts. In simpler words, people seem to speak the language they want to when they are at home, but not in other situations.

Another factor analysis was executed using responses to questions on identification with various groups to determine the extent they were considered ingroups. We also included the subtractive index we had created (idiusus). Two factors were obtained, one, again defined rather by familiar and informal indexes (family, friends) and the other directed towards wider political and social groups.

The next step was to examine the structure of the seven main dimensions to see how they covaried with one another. The results of the principal factors confirmed our expectation and revealed a close relation between most of the dimensions. Mastery of C.A. language, use of it, preference for its use compared to Castilian, positive attitudes aroused by this language and identification with the community all saturated very high in the first factor. The nearest correspondence is found indeed between the linguistic preference of using C.A. language and the subtractive identification ($r = 0.74$), between the feelings evoked by the C.A. language and the subtractive identity ($r = 0.58$) and between the feelings and the attitudes of preference ($r = 0.73$). These three variables form what we might call an affective-attitudinal dimension regarding the ingroup and its language. The other two variables, mastery and use, lead us to think of a more objective behavioural
dimension whose relation with the first one is not as close because it also depends on external factors.

We can then picture an image of members strongly identified with their ingroup who know and use their language, preferring it to Spanish, and who accordingly experience positive feelings when listening to it. At the other extreme we would have members not very identified with the ingroup, who neither master nor use their language, and who would rather speak Spanish. It should be noted that the correspondence between the evaluation of one's own group (valorsub) and the level of identification with it is not very high (r idausus-valorsub = 0.17; r idau

valorsub = 0.40). Thus, it is not uncommon to find individuals who, despite their clear identification with the ingroup, acknowledge its inferiority (at least on some dimensions).

The second factor represents the values accorded to the language, both instrumental and integrative. While the integrative value had a moderate correlation with the first factor, the instrumental one seems to rely on other external causes encountered in reality.

There is a significant relationship (F = 4.59, df = 1,161; p<0.05) between the degree of ingroup identification (Idau) and whether respondents think the other groups fairly assess theirs. The greater the identification with the ingroup, the more underestimation perceived.

Finally, a regression analysis was carried out, where the attitudes or preference for either language was used as the dependent variable. The independent variables were linguistic mastery, use of the language, feelings when hearing it and subtractive identification. The preference for the language to use depended first on the level of identification (subtractive) with the ingroup (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.56$), second on the feelings aroused by the local language (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.64$ for both variables) and third by the actual use of the language (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.69$ for the three variables). We find here again a relative discrepancy between the preference for a language and the actual use of it. The level of identification determines the preference for the language, but not the actual use. With the use of language as the dependent variable, the identification was not included in the regression equation due to its lack of significance (the stepwise method used rejects variables when their F is smaller than 3.84 or its p higher than 0.05).

Language and social identity: Profile of each community

From the point of view of linguistic competence in C.A. languages, Catalans had a significantly higher degree of competence than Valencians or Galicians with the Basques in the middle of these two extremes (F = 8.81; df = 3.141, p<0.001). The specific means were: Galicians = 4.06, Catalans = 5.40, Basques = 4.73, and Valencians = 3.60 (1 = no idea, 7 = perfect mastery).

This description of linguistic skills is in accordance with the frequency of language use they claim to have. Catalans seem to use their language significantly more often than all the other communities, be it written or oral usage. Basques appear once again between the pole of Catalans in one direction and the pole of
Valencians and Galicians in the other (F = 15.44; df = 3.141; p<0.001). The specific means were: Valencians = 1.49, Galicians = 1.55, Basques = 1.84, and Catalans = 2.37 (1 = only Spanish, 3 = only the C.A. language).

The difference between Catalans and the other groups increases when we focus on written use, not because Catalans write more often in their language than they speak it, but because writing Basque, Galician and Valencian seems to be clearly less generalised than speaking them (F = 31.09; df = 3.141, p<0.001). The specific means were: Galicians = 1.13, Valencians = 1.17, Basques = 1.28 and Catalans = 2.21.

Catalans are also the only group which uses its language orally more frequently than Spanish, the others using Castilian in far many more contexts than their own language (F = 5.87; df = 3.141, p<0.001). The specific means were: Galicians = 1.57, Valencians = 1.60, Basques = 1.84 and Catalans = 2.21.

As for the attitudes towards the usage (preference), the situation changes. It is now Basques who favour most the use of their language compared to Spanish, Catalans in second place. These two groups together with Galicians advocate the use of their language rather than Spanish, while Valencians are not clearly inclined to one or the other. The differences in this dimension are significant between the two extreme groups, Basques and Catalans (F = 6.55; df = 3.141; p<0.001).

As far as the feelings aroused by the C.A. languages are concerned all bilingual communities expressed positive ones towards their ingroup language. Catalans showed the least positive feelings this time while the Basques marked the most positive ones almost in every occasion.

The next dimension where groups differ is the integrative and instrumental value accorded to the languages. All groups except Valencians assessed their language as significantly more integrative than Spanish (F = 105.38; df = 1.141; p<0.001). However, only Catalans and Basques expressed that their respective language has more instrumental value than Spanish, and the difference is significant only for the first case (F = 14.10; df = 1.39; p<0.001). Thus, Catalans were the only community to express that their language is significantly more integrative and more instrumental than Castilian. The other groups conferred Spanish a higher instrumental value though not significantly.

The five communities displayed roughly the same distribution when they were asked the degree to which their language was integrative or instrumental. On the other hand, there was a wide dispersion when they were asked the same questions for Castilian. Catalans, for instance, were of the opinion that Spanish is neither really integrative nor truly instrumental.

The various groups do not differ in the degree of identification with the ingroup, which is extremely high in most cases, so a new index of subtractive identification (identification with C.A. minus identification with Spain) was developed, as explained before. This subtractive variable shows a dramatic difference between Basques and the remaining groups (F = 16.28; df = 4.162; p<0.001). The specific means were: Castilians = -0.34, Valencians = 0.35, Galicians = 1.23, Catalans = 2.65, and Basques = 4.24. (minimum = -6, maximum = +6). A similar but inverse discrepancy is found in the identification with Spain. The Catalan group
follows Basques and both of them are then significantly more identified with their community (subtractive identification) than some other groups below like Valencians and Castilians. Being Catalan or Basque seems to mean being less of a Spaniard. Castilians are the only ones to be more identified with Spain than with their C.A. ($F = 23.70; \text{df} = 4.162; <0.001$). The specific means were: Galicians = 4.63, Catalans = 3.31, Basques = 2.22, Valencians = 6.04, and Castilians = 6.00 (minimum = 1, maximum = 7.0).

Speaking the C.A. language was mentioned as the main feature of the ingroup self-definition by Catalans and Basques. Living in the community was also cited as important by these two groups, but neither of these differences with the other groups was significant. Having been born in the region was the crucial characteristic for Galicians and Valencians and it was also important though not predominant for Catalans. On the other hand, Basques conferred a significantly smaller relevance to this factor as definition of their identity ($F = 4.44; \text{df} = 3.136; p<0.01$). Speaking Spanish was considered an irrelevant component of their identity by all the bilingual groups. Speaking both languages was judged a more important constituent of their belonging to the group though not a prominent one. Valencians grant this characteristic a significantly higher position than the other groups ($F = 5.42; \text{df} = 3.133; p=0.01$), thus confirming their neutral position as regards the use of Castilian or their local language. It must be noted that speaking the C.A. language was a more relevant factor than speaking Castilian for all four communities; the differences ranging from the case of Basques (the highest difference between both languages) to that of Valencians (the lowest). We can then draw the conclusion that the linguistic identity therefore was based on the local language rather than on Castilian.

The analysis of the last dimension, the perception of the ingroup social status indicated that Catalans and Castilians share the belief that they are reasonably well valued within the Spanish state, in a degree which is significantly higher than that of the other groups. Galicians at the other extreme are convinced of their general devaluation by the outgroups ($F = 15.32; \text{df} = 4.162; p<0.001$). The specific means were: Galicians = 2.13, Basques = 3.51, Valencians = 3.57, Catalans = 4.47, and Castilians = 4.93 (minimum = 1, maximum = 7).

Parallel to this, Galicians disagreed most with this perceived status, while Castilians and Catalans had self-evaluations which were nearest to the external evaluation they claim to receive. The difference between these latter and Galicians or Valencians is statistically significant ($F = 7.75; \text{df} = 4.161; p<0.001$). The specific means were: Castilians = 0.65, Catalans = 1.00, Basques = 1.91, Valencians = 2.46, and Galicians = 3.31. $(-6 = \text{highest perceived social evaluation compared to one's own}, +6 = \text{lowest perceived social evaluation compared to one's own}).$

Summarising, the profile of each linguistic group would come out as follows. Catalans have a definite mastery over their language and they use it very often, in fact more than Spanish. Their attitude towards this usage is consistent with it, preferring Catalan to Castilian. The feelings evoked by their language are not particularly positive, probably because they are accustomed to using it every day and it is, therefore, nothing extraordinary for them. Catalan seems to be integrative and also instrumental in their opinion, while Castilian is not. This confirms that
Catalan is established firmly in most social contexts. They show quite a high level of identification with Catalonia and they affirm that speaking Catalan is important for the Catalan identity. They do not feel underestimated by the other groups.

*Basques* do not have as high linguistic skills as Catalans and they do not use their language as often, especially for writing. Spanish is still predominant, partly due to its instrumental value. On the other hand, their attitude towards the use of languages is the most radical one and they see the Basque identity as based on speaking the language, which they do not always do since they have not mastered it. This 'unsatisfied militant' attitude is accompanied by a great distance from Spain (and accordingly from Spanish) and by very positive feelings aroused by their language. A language with which they are not as familiar as the Catalans are with theirs.

*Galicians* have a narrower knowledge of their language than the other two groups and they use it much less often (very seldom when writing). Their preference for their language is also milder than in the case of Catalans and Basques and they see Spanish as slightly more instrumental. Their level of subtractive identification is in the middle, but they still have a higher identification with their community than with Spain. Their most distinctive feature is their conviction of being severely underestimated by the other groups.

*Valencians* are the group that has the least knowledge of their language. Its use is not very widespread, at a level similar to Galician. They show no inclination for Valencian or Castilian and their identity is not significantly related to their language, which they judge slightly less instrumental than Spanish. Their identification with Valencia is practically the same as their identification with Spain. In short, they do not have a strong linguistic identity for they do not have a strong Valencian identity. They also feel that they are underestimated.

*Castillians* are the most peculiar group in the study because they are not bilingual and they share their only language with the other groups. Their identity is understood best in a Spanish, rather than a Castilian sense. They favour the use of Spanish, even in other C.A. They have no special feelings when hearing Spanish, possibly because they have no other language to compare it with. They do not appear to have a linguistic conflict to produce a differential identification. They believe they are well considered in other parts of the state.

**C.A. groups stereotypes**

The descriptions of C.A. groups generated from the free answers of the subjects after listening to the five recorded messages were content analysed according to a system of 70 categories generated for this purpose. This category system was exhaustive and all categories were mutually exclusive. The unit of analysis was each phrase which expressed an independent idea. Every unit was also rated in terms of its evaluative aspect as positive, negative or neutral. Once the content analysis was performed, only categories that had been used several times in the description of one or more groups were retained. Others were collapsed into larger categories according to similarity in theoretical terms. Thus the number of
categories was reduced to build a summarised system, which varied slightly for each particular analysis. In the case of the analysis we are going to present now the categories were as follows:

1. **Competence and achievement.** Intellectual (e.g. intelligent–stupid), cultural and professional.
2. **Sociability.** Relational traits (e.g. rough–gentle; nice–unpleasant; warm–cold).
3. **Personality.** Personality traits not included in the previous category.
4. **Ambitious/Active — Passive.**
5. **Morality.** Traits that involve a clear moral evaluation (e.g. mean–generous; selfish–altruist; honest–deceitful).
6. **Sociopolitical attitudes.** For example: conservative, centralist, progressive.
7. **Sociodemographic characteristics.** For instance, young, old, rural, urban.
8. **Subjective evaluation.** This category reflects:
   a) the subject's evaluation (acknowledged by the subject himself as his personal opinion) towards C.A. groups and their language.
   b) explicit support or criticism of the group in its attempt of self-assertion.
   c) emotional reaction towards the group.
   d) references to personal experiences with the group.
11. **Lack of identity.** Explicit mentioning of the absence of the aspects referred to in the previous category.
12. **Melting pot.** Description of the group as a mixture of different types of people.
13. **Evaluation by society.** Evaluation that the group receives by society at large.
14. **Ethnocentrism.** Reference to outgroup rejection.
15. **Group cohesion.** Reference to intragroup solidarity.
16. **Others.**

As it can be seen in Table 2 the three categories most frequently used to describe C.A. groups are ‘Sociability’, ‘Personality’ and ‘Identity’. These three seem to be the most salient for group description. Other dimensions found are ‘Competence’, ‘Morality’, ‘Characteristics of the Language’ and ‘Sociopolitical Attitudes’.

The images of the five linguistic groups obtained in this study, which should be considered as tentative, are as follows. Galicians are viewed as politically conservative, rural, lacking in competence and very sociable. They are positively assessed in moral traits and perceived as having cultural identity.

Catalans are described as competent but unsociable. They are seen as unkind and they are thought to feel superior. They are also viewed as stingy. Other dimensions used to define Catalans are a strong group identity and a tendency to reject outgroups.
### Table 2  C.A. groups descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Galician</th>
<th></th>
<th>Catalan</th>
<th></th>
<th>Basque</th>
<th></th>
<th>Valencian</th>
<th></th>
<th>Castilian</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(2.19)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(1.25)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(1.62)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(1.5 )</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(1.6 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>(1.92)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>(2.5 )</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>(2.39)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>(1.77)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>(1.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>(1.99)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>(1.84)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>(1.84)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>(1.57)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>(1.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(1.87)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(1.76)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1.33)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1.5 )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.6 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morality</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(1.34)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(2.41)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(1.08)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(1.83)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(1.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociopolitical</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociodemographic</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject evaluation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(2.19)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(1.75)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(2.78)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(2.11)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(1.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of language</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(1.71)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(2.12)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(2.12)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(2    )</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(2.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(1.85)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(1.64)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(1.91)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(1.85)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(1.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of identity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melting pot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation by society</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(2.33)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.33)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2    )</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group cohesion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1.83)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(2.05)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2    )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1    )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. % of subjects using the category.
2. Evaluation (in parentheses) ranges from 1 = positive through 2 = neutral to 3 = negative.
Table 3  Dimensions of intergroup categorisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Castilians</th>
<th>Catalans</th>
<th>Basques</th>
<th>Galicians</th>
<th>Valencians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+*</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>=*</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morality</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>−*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High ethnolinguistic vitality groups  
Low ethnolinguistic vitality groups

+  Positive evaluation  
=  Neutral evaluation  
−  Negative evaluation

Basques are described negatively in sociability traits, probably because of the frequent attribution of the trait 'aggressive'. On the other hand, they receive a better evaluation in other personality features. The other common dimension used to picture the Basques is their identity.

The image of Valencian speakers consists mainly of sociability and other positive personality traits. In fact, this group receives the best evaluation in these two salient dimensions.

Castilian speakers have a rather neutral image both as regards personality and sociability. Accordingly their outlook is that of a group conceived as a mixture of various kinds of people, i.e. a melting pot.

A synthetic picture of the five C.A. groups is presented in Table 3. We show the main dimensions combined with the evaluation that accompanies them when used in relation to the different groups. In this table the status of groups in ethnolinguistic vitality is also taken into account.

When we consider the status dimension in ethnolinguistic terms, we see that our results are in accordance with other studies in the area of intergroup relations: the superiority of high status groups in competence, and that of lower status groups in sociability and moral characteristics. Additionally, two of the high status groups in our study are viewed as superior in a highly valued dimension: identity. At present, within the Spanish context of transference of power from the central state to the ‘Comunidades Autónomas’, national identity is often held as an important dimension for the negotiations between the central state and the different C.A.

Conclusions

When we consider language as the salient dimension of intergroup relations in Spain, we acknowledge the existence of several social groups that speak their
ingroup language, as well as Castilian. Two factors, ingroup identity and ethno-linguistic vitality, seem to account for the intergroup relations that exist. Social identity theory has focused attention on polarised social situations characterised by one ingroup and one outgroup, while many social settings allow for multiple comparisons between groups, and the same outgroups may serve very different functions.

In our study all subjects seem to identify strongly with their ingroup. However, subtractive identity seems a better relational measure to reflect ingroup identification in this context. Through the use of this index different patterns of relation to the Spanish group seem to emerge: Basques and Catalans dissociate more extremely, while Valencians and Galicians appear less distant. Furthermore, for this latter group Spaniards do not appear as an outgroup at all. Finally, Castilians are the only group to identify more with Spain than with their ingroup. Therefore, the same group can have different meanings in a multiple intergroup context: for some groups Spain becomes a salient outgroup, while for other groups it is a supracategory where the ingroup itself feels included. Interestingly, this pattern clearly correlates with the importance groups attach to their ingroup languages as part of their social identities.

As for subjective vitality, the results show that the use of Castilian (Spanish) is predominant over the other standard languages. However, the attitudes and integrative value attached to the use of Castilian point to a clear preference for the C.A. language. Three variables seem to be highly intercorrelated, subtractive identification, feelings towards the language and attitudes of preference for ingroup language (an affective-attitudinal dimension referred to identification and language). One end of this dimension consists of members strongly identified with their ingroups, who know and use their language rather than Castilian, and experience positive feelings when listening to it. At the other extreme, there are members who do not identify strongly with their ingroup, who neither master nor use their language and who would rather use Castilian. Subjective status of the ingroups and identification are not correlated. Thus, it is not uncommon to find ingroups perceiving their status as inferior.

When it comes to group evaluation by society, the more subjects identify with the ingroup, the more they feel underestimated by the rest of society. There seems to be no direct relation between this perception and the choice for individual or social strategies of change.

When we consider the language profiles regarding subjective vitality a clear picture seems to emerge. Castilian has the highest overall vitality regarding competence, actual use and instrumental values. Catalan is quite close to the former on these dimensions. Basque comes next since it is not as widespread as Castilian in the Basque Country. However, Basques have the most radical favourable attitude towards the use of the ingroup language. Finally, Galician and Valencian varieties have a more restrictive use and less instrumental value in relation to Castilian.

Taking into account both factors, social identity and language vitality, the groups seem to cluster in the following way: Catalans are simultaneously high on both dimensions. Basques have a medium vitality and high identity while Gali-
cians and Valencians are low on both dimensions. When intergroup categorisation is carried out on the bases of the language dimension, the subjects seem to give a comprehensive yet rather accurate view of the situation. Castilians, the only non-bilingual group, have a low identity and a high language vitality. However, this vitality should not be attributed directly to the Castilian group since their language is not restricted to one C.A., but used nationwide. They tend to upgrade those groups with high vitality and/or high identity (Castilians, Catalans and Basques) in competence and to some extent downgrade the same groups in sociability. While the opposite trend seems to happen with respect to groups low in vitality and identity (Galicians and Valencians), which are conversely highly valued in moral traits.

As it was mentioned before, general results in the studies concerning relations between groups of different status show that high status groups are characterised in terms of competence and economic success and lower status groups in terms of warmth and interpersonal attraction. One could interpret that reinforcing this mutual image works in favour of maintaining the status quo of the intergroup structure, while allowing some dimensions of positive distinctiveness for the inferior groups involved. The basic dimensions (competence, personality, sociability and morality) found in other studies (Giles, 1973; Ryan, 1979) also tend to emerge when content analysis of free responses is used.
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Notes

1. ‘Comunidades Autónomas’ are the present semi-federal divisions of the Spanish state, some of which also have a language of their own as we have seen.
2. Madrid was taken as the representative of Castile for practical reasons. Although it constitutes at present a ‘Comunidad Autónoma’ by itself, it has been historically the capital and the geographical centre of Castile.
3. ‘Idau’ is the direct index of identification, not subtractive.
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