Language attitudes in Galicia: using the matched-guise test among high school students
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Adolescents’ attitudes towards standard Galician, non-standard Galician and Spanish are examined in this study using a matched-guise test. Results show that adolescents perceive standard and non-standard Galician differently and that different values are attached to the three linguistic varieties investigated. Our findings confirm that certain stigmas are still attached to speaking non-standard Galician and to having a Galician accent when speaking Spanish. Finally, results provide evidence of gender-related trends in regard to standard and non-standard Galician, and also reveal a covert social disapproval of women.
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Introduction: attitudes and language

A cornerstone in the field of social psychology (Edwards 1994, 97), the concept of ‘attitude’ has been the core of numerous sociolinguistic studies since Labov’s groundbreaking study on the social stratification of English in New York City (1966), although it has proved to be difficult to define. One of the most widely used definitions is the one formulated by Fishbein and Ajzen (1975, 6), who describe attitudes as the individual’s learned predisposition to react favourably or unfavourably towards a given object. However, recent work suggests that this perspective is overly simple, as attitudes ‘may subsume both positivity and negativity’ (Haddock and Maio 2004, 1), which speaks of the multilayered and complex nature of attitudes. The idea of attitudes as an internal, not directly observable, mental state (Appel and Muysken 1987, 16; Fasold 1984, 147) reflects the mentalist approach, upon which most research work on attitudes is based (see Baker 1992). In contrast, the behaviourist approach views attitudes as overt responses, and thus directly observable.

Traditionally, attitudes are described as having three components: affective, which refers to a person’s feelings about the attitude object; behavioural, which entails how such attitude influences our behaviour; and cognitive, which involves a person’s knowledge about the attitude object. The three components are usually linked, although recent research in social psychology suggests that not all three are always present in a given attitude, nor can they always be distinguished from one
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another (Bohner and Wanke 2002). Also, it has been shown that the cognitive and affective components sometimes do not match with an individual’s behaviour towards the attitude object (see Garrett 2010). This is particularly relevant to the study of language attitudes, as a speaker may deem a specific linguistic variety important and profess positive feelings towards it, but choose not to include it in his/her everyday linguistic repertoire.

Investigation of language attitudes is especially important in the case of minority languages because attitudes play a key role in their successful transmission, revitalisation and survival. Galician, once a linguistic variety of low prestige associated with lack of education and low socioeconomic status, received the official recognition of ‘language’ with the instauration of the Spanish democracy in 1978. Within this newly established democratic system that acknowledged and celebrated the linguistic and cultural pluralism within Spain, the region of Galicia was given exclusive control of certain areas, such as education and culture, essential to the defence and promotion of the autochthonous language. These political and structural changes resulted in a process of linguistic normalisation involving the standardisation of Galician, the expansion of its social functions and the creation of public bilingual immersion programmes. All these measures have helped to partially raise the status of Galician, but ironically, they have not prevented the dramatic decline of L1 Galician speakers among adolescents. In fact, as the Galician Secretary of Language Planning recently stated, ‘A mocidade é un dos principais retos para a lingua galega’ (‘Adolescents are the main challenge for the Galician language’).²

Despite the stark reality of minority language loss among adolescents, there is a surprising lack of sociolinguistic studies focusing on this age group. Our study begins to fill some of these gaps by examining, from a mentalist perspective and by means of a matched-guise test, urban and rural Galician adolescents’ covert attitudes towards standard Galician, non-standard Galician and Spanish.

**Mapping Galicia(n)**³

When the region now known as Galicia came under the rule of the Crown of Castile in the twelfth century, the linguistic variety spoken in that area started to differentiate itself from Portuguese.⁴ Spanish was introduced by the dominant classes first as a received speech and later as a spoken variety (Ramallo 2007), and as a consequence, Galician began to steadily lose social prestige and speakers to Spanish. The following centuries witnessed an increase in the use of Spanish by the more privileged groups, along with a gradual devaluation of Galician dialects, which came to be associated with the uneducated, rural and poor speakers (Freixeiro Mato 1997; Lorenzo Suárez 2009; Mariño Paz 1998; Monteagudo Romero 1999).

In the nineteenth century, Spain underwent several sociopolitical and socio-economic changes that exacerbated the process of social replacement of Galician and its loss of prestige. The process of urbanisation, along with the devaluation of the traditional self-sustained economy, the implementation of mandatory schooling and the increased influence of the central administration made knowledge of Spanish not only socially valuable in Galicia but also necessary (Freixeiro Mato 1997; Lorenzo Suárez 2009; Mariño Paz 1998; Monteagudo Romero 1999). Consequently, Galician stereotypes grew stronger and were even internalised by Galician speakers themselves (Labraña 1999; Lorenzo Suárez 2009).
At the turn of the century, Galician found itself in a precarious situation. Spanish was enjoying social prestige and was being used in familiar contexts, those in which Galician had traditionally been used, and Galician was undervalued and associated with lack of social mobility. This situation worsened as Galicia became more urbanised and industrialised, and certain areas became economically and socially isolated (Freixeiro Mato 1997; Lorenzo Suárez 2009; Mariño Paz 1998; Monteagudo Romero 1999).

Later, during Franco’s highly centralised, right-wing dictatorship (1936–1975), Galician was not explicitly prohibited, but his regime exercised educational, administrative and political practices that supported the use of Spanish only. During this period, the deep-seated stigmas towards Galician and the high/low dichotomy between both languages became more apparent, leading to the consolidation of the process of linguistic substitution (i.e. Galician being replaced by Spanish) and to a steady increase in bilingualism (Lorenzo Suárez 2009; Ramallo 2007).

With Franco’s death in 1975 came a period of transition to a democratic constitutional monarchy that entailed the decentralisation of power and the ensuing reshaping of Spain into Autonomous Communities, making the new system ‘one of the most decentralised in the Western world’ (Mar-Molinero 2000, 92). The new administrative mapping of Spain was directly connected to one of the first achievements of the 1978 democratic government, namely, the restoration of the basic and fundamental rights that had been suppressed by Franco’s regime (Beswick 2007, 72; Mar-Molinero 2000, 84–6). Under this newly established democracy that recognised Spain’s multilingualism and people’s linguistic rights (see Article 3:3 of the Spanish Constitution below), the Autonomous Communities were afforded some degree of self-governance, allowing Galicia, Catalonia and the Basque regions to ‘have their languages recognized and established as official markers of their distinctive identities’ (Beswick 2007, 79). Thus, although the 1978 Spanish Constitution clearly states that Spanish is the official language of Spain, the co-official status of Galician, Catalan and Basque is also recognised:

3:1 El castellano es la lengua española oficial del Estado. Todos los españoles tienen el deber de conocerla y el derecho a usarla.
(Castilian is the official Spanish language of the State. All Spaniards have a duty to know it and the right to use it.)

3:2 Las demás lenguas españolas serán también oficiales en las respectivas Comunidades Autónomas de acuerdo con sus Estatutos.
(The other Spanish languages will also be official in their respective Autonomous Communities, in accordance with their Statutes.)

3:3 La riqueza de las distintas modalidades lingüísticas de España es un patrimonio cultural que será objeto de especial respeto y protección.
(The wealth of Spain’s distinctive linguistic varieties is a cultural patrimony that will be the object of special respect and protection.)

Constitución española (Spanish Constitution)\(^5\)

The Galician Statute of Autonomy, ratified in 1982, gave back certain administrative powers to Galicia, such as the exclusive control of the educational system and the cultural and linguistic issues. As a consequence, in 1983, the regional government endorsed the Law of Linguistic Normalisation (Lei de Normalización Lingüística), which until today constitutes the main body of the legislation for the use, protection and promotion of Galician. It should be noted, though, that this legislative scenario has failed to allow Galician to reach full legal equality with Spanish, as Galicians
have the duty to know Spanish (see Article 3:1 of the Spanish Constitution above), but only the right to know Galician (García Negro 1991):

Artigo 1: O galego é a lingua propia de Galicia.
Tódolos galegos teñen o dereito de coñecerlo e de usalo.
(Article 1: Galician is the own language of Galicia.
All Galicians have the right to know it and use it.)

Lei de Normalización Lingüística (Law of Linguistic Normalisation)

The goal of Galicia’s language policy is to accomplish the restoration of Galician in all domains through corpus, status and acquisition efforts. As part of the corpus planning measures, a standard variety that unified Galicia’s dialectal variation and that would be suitable for a modern-day society was developed and promoted. However, several issues have complicated its codification. First, while interdialectal comprehensibility is high, most spoken Galician dialects are strongly influenced by Spanish due to the historical language contact. Thus, for standard Galician to be more Galicianised and also to avoid assimilation into the Spanish out-group, it has become necessary to ‘purify’ the standard norm of these forms (Ramallo 2007; Recalde 2002). On the other hand, the existence of two differing ideological interpretations of the sociolinguistic reality of Galicia has led to unremitting heated debates and disputes regarding orthographic norms (Herrero-Valeiro 2003). Summed up briefly, reintegrationists view Galician as a diachronic variety of Portuguese and suggest that it conforms to the Portuguese orthographic standard, while isolationists consider Galician an autonomous language, and thus propose a standard variety as uninfluenced as possible by Spanish and Portuguese (Beswick 2007; Herrero-Valeiro 2003). In the latest version of the standard (approved in July 2003 by the Galician Royal Academy and the Galician Language Institute), certain reintegrationists’ proposals were incorporated, such as the use of the suffix -bel (singular)/-beis (plural) as in amábel/amabeis ‘friendly’. This inclusion of Portuguese elements in the standard variety may be interpreted as ‘an attempt to build a consensus among different sides of the debate and to put an end to the so-called normative wars’ (O’Rourke 2011, 73).

From a status planning perspective, multiple measures were taken with the aim to change negative attitudes towards Galician and to increase its presence in formal domains where Spanish had traditionally been the norm, such as public administration and official events (Lorenzo Suárez 2009, 28–29). As for acquisition planning, the most significant provisions were made in education (O’Rourke 2011, 75) and involved promoting the acquisition of Galician through its incorporation into the school curriculum, both as subject matter and as language of instruction. In Galicia’s bilingual programmes, both Spanish and Galician are used to teach content, and students are never segregated into groups according to their L1 (Fernández Paz et al. 2008). Because of this approach to language and content teaching, the Galician model has been described as one of immersion (Pérez Vidal 1998), although in reality, it is an ‘additive language learning situation, for the authorities did not envisage the functional replacement of Castilian in all contexts’ (Beswick 2007, 92).

Up until 2007, the study of Galician was compulsory at non-university level, and at least two other non-language subjects had to be taught in Galician in every grade, a decision ultimately determined by the demographics of each school and by
teachers’ L1. For example, while collecting our data in 2006, up to 70% of non-language subjects were taught in Galician at the rural high school, while its urban counterpart strictly adhered to the minimum of two non-language subjects. In June 2007, with the regional government ruled by a coalition between the Partido dos Socialistas de Galicia (Galician Socialist Party) and the Bloque Nacionalista Galego (Galician Nationalist Bloc), a new education decree was issued (124/2007) requiring that a minimum of 50% of non-language subjects be taught in Galician, a requirement that was already being met and even exceeded by some schools (such as the rural high school in our study). In another effort to further normalise the use of Galician among the younger generations, this coalition government created the so-called *galescolas*, nursery schools for children aged from 0 to 3 years where Galician is the only language used. When the conservative Partido Popular de Galicia (Galicia’s People’s Party) took office in 2009, attempts were made to introduce a trilingual decree that would entail teaching a third of the school subjects in Spanish, a third in Galician and a third in English. This initiative caused an uproar for it was perceived as a direct attack to the Galician language and an attempt to diminish its presence in schools (Moreno 2010). In May 2010, the regional government issued the multilingual decree (decree 79/2010), a revised version of the 2009 trilingual proposal, whose main stated objective is to guarantee that, by the end of secondary education, students have achieved full and equal competence in Spanish and Galician and have acquired knowledge in one or more foreign languages. Under this decree, only Spanish and Galician are the languages of instruction of content subjects, while in foreign language subjects, the target language is also the language of instruction (e.g. English is to be taught in English).

A decade after the implementation of legislative measures, the Sociolinguistic Map of Galicia (González González et al. 1994, 1995, 1996), the first large-scale survey on language attitudes, use and competence in the region, reported that attitudes towards Galician were in general favourable, receiving 4 on a scale from 1 to 5. However, a decrease in the number of Galician speakers among the youth was also revealed: only 34.4% of the 16- to 20-year-olds spoke Galician habitually, as opposed to 81.8% in the group aged 65 years and over. The younger group, though, reportedly displayed the most positive attitudes towards the autochthonous language (1996). The latest Sociolinguistic Map of Galicia (González González et al. 2007) shows that, after three decades of language planning and bilingual education, the number of L1 Galician speakers continues to decline, while the presence of Spanish is becoming stronger among the youth. In fact, only 16.6% of the speakers in the 15- to 24-year age group have Galician as L1 (as opposed to 30.8% in the 45- to 54-year age group), which represents a drop of almost 50% since 1996. Furthermore, the majority of L1 Galician speakers still belong to a lower economic status, are less educated and work in the fishing and agricultural sectors (González González et al. 2007).

In the past decade, smaller-scale studies have confirmed that Galician youth show strong support for the maintenance and transmission of Galician (O’Rourke 2011). However, they have also shown that the distribution of Galician = rural/Spanish = urban has become consolidated (Iglesias Álvarez 2003), and that deep-rooted prejudices against the language have not been fully dissipated among the youth. For example, O’Rourke’s participants, undergraduate students from the city of Vigo, produced adjectives such as ‘ugly’, ‘inferior’, ‘uncultured’ or ‘stupid’ when referring to speaking Galician (2006, 193), and González González et al. (2003) found that people who spoke with a Galician accent were perceived as less socially successful by the youth.
Recent research also shows that new stigmas and conflictive attitudes are projected onto standard Galician and its speakers. While standard Galician is considered more appropriate for formal uses, such as writing (Loureiro-Rodríguez 2008), it is also viewed negatively because of its phonetic closeness to Spanish, and thus is described as ‘artificial’, ‘fake’ or ‘unnatural’ (Iglesias Álvarez 2003; Loureiro-Rodríguez 2008). Speakers of standard Galician or neofalantes, ‘new speakers’, those individuals (often young, middle class and urban) who are raised speaking Spanish and later in life make the conscious choice of switching to Galician as their habitual language for ideological reasons, are considered innovative and socially successful (González González et al. 2003). However, their behavior is considered deviant, as it is perceived as politically motivated (Loureiro-Rodríguez 2008; O’Rourke and Ramallo 2011) or trendy (Iglesias Álvarez 2003).

Methodology

Research questions
To investigate language attitudes towards standard Galician, vernacular Galician and Spanish among bilingual adolescents, we administered a modified version of the matched-guise test in an urban high school and a rural high school in northwestern Galicia. The high schools were chosen based on (1) our ease of access to them (we have acquaintances working in both schools), (2) the rural/urban quality of their location (with population sizes of approximately 1500 and 240,000, respectively) and (3) the fact that they are located within the same isogloss (i.e. the same dialectal variety of Galician is spoken in both locations). Carrying out research in high schools also allowed us to test a large number of subjects at the same time in a context where the completion of a listening test is considered a meaningful activity (Woolard 1989).

Based on recent research findings on language attitudes among the Galician youth (see Mapping Galicia(n)), our matched-guise test was designed to answer the following questions:

(1) Do urban adolescents hold different language attitudes from rural adolescents?
(2) Do male adolescents hold different language attitudes from female adolescents?
(3) Does adolescents’ habitual language influence their perception of non-standard, standard and Galician speakers?
(4) Are standard and non-standard Galician speakers perceived differently when speaking Spanish?
(5) Are male and female speakers regarded similarly, independent of the language they speak?

Matched-guise test
The matched-guise test is an indirect approach to study language attitudes originally developed by Lambert et al. (1960) to unearth covert attitudes towards English and French in Montreal. In this methodology, speakers record several controlled samples (the same passage) in different linguistic varieties. Then, research subjects are asked
to listen to these recordings and rate each voice they hear (i.e. each ‘guise’), unaware that each speaker has spoken more than once. The matched-guise test is considered an indirect approach because participants, although aware that it is an attitude-rating task, do not know what exactly they are rating (Garrett 2010, 41).

Because of its broad use in the investigation of language attitudes in multilingual and multicultural contexts since Lambert et al.’s study, the matched-guise test has attracted a great deal of scrutiny mainly concerning the content of the reading passage and the authenticity of the linguistic variables being measured (Garrett 2010 for a detailed overview). Another issue concerns the validity of this technique; thus, it is recommended that the matched-guise test be supported with direct approaches (Edwards 1982). Accordingly, recent language attitude studies have employed a combination of questionnaires and matched-guise tests, such as Pieras-Guasp’s work on Catalan and Spanish in Mallorca (2002), Hoare’s (2001) work on Breton and French in Brittany and Ihemere’s (2006) work on Nigerian Pidgin English and Ikwerre in Port Harcourt City, among others. To overcome the validity issue, we also used open-ended questionnaires and interviews (Loureiro-Rodríguez 2008) to investigate language attitudes in this population.

In our matched-guise test, respondents listened to four people reading the same passage, a description of a TV show, twice. One male speaker and one female speaker read the passage in Spanish and standard Galician. Both these speakers had Spanish as their first language. Another set of male and female speakers with vernacular Galician as their first language read the passage in Spanish and vernacular Galician. The speakers were not required to read in all three linguistic varieties because it is difficult to find an L1 Spanish speaker who can read vernacular Galician without sounding artificial, as this is a variety acquired at home and not at school. In fact, having learned (standard) Galician as an L2, new speakers of Galician commonly superimpose certain phonetic and prosodic characteristics of Spanish on their Galician (Regueira 2004, 83–4). For example, when reading the passages in standard Galician, our two Spanish speakers replaced the open [a] with a close [o] in the word votar, as it would be pronounced in Spanish. They also omitted the gheada, which is a stigmatised phonetic phenomenon (Kabatek 2000; Thomas 2005) present in the dialectal variety of the area and which consists of producing a velar fricative /x/ in place of the voiced velar /v/. This feature, traditionally associated with social backwardness and lack of education, appears in many Galician dialects, but has not been incorporated into the standard variety. Finally, the passages contained several lexical differences between the standard and vernacular passages (e.g. standard lixo vs. vernacular basura ‘trash’).

In the classrooms, respondents were told that they would listen to eight different speakers. In order to reduce the possibility that respondents would notice the repetition of speakers, we arranged the recordings so that the two versions of each speaker (i.e. each speaker’s guise) were maximally spaced apart. Within each high school, all students were surveyed, and all respondents listened to the recordings in the same order. In order to assure data quality, the following inclusion and exclusion criteria were established: we only included responses from subjects of Galician origin, and responses with evidence of malingering (e.g. all responses were ‘0’) were disregarded (n = 10).

After listening to each speaker, respondents rated the speaker on 25 personal attributes on a Likert scale (0 = not at all, 5 = very) (Table 1). The list of traits was inspired by Woolard’s use of the matched-guise test to investigate language attitudes...
Attributes were grouped a priori into four sets of traits and ordered randomly on the rating sheet: personal appeal (attributes n. 2, 4, 5, 6, 10, 13, 15 and 19), social correctness (attributes n. 3, 12, 16, 20 and 23), progressiveness (attributes n. 7, 9, 14, 21 and 24) and capability (attributes n. 1, 8, 11, 17, 18, 22 and 25). The quantitative score for each trait is the average of its contributing attributes.

**Statistical methods**

The five trait scores were modelled separately for the two subsets of guises. That is, for each trait, the male and female speaking Spanish and dialectal Galician were compared, and the male and female speaking Spanish and standard Galician were compared. Each trait score was modelled with linear regression with fixed effects of speaker gender, speaker language, student language, student gender and student location. A random effect was included for individual students to account for possible dependence on trait scores obtained from the same student (Johnson 2008). The assumption of normality of the residuals was assessed graphically with box plots and numerically with the Kolmogorov–Smirnov goodness-of-fit test (Gibbons 1971). All data manipulations and statistical analyses were carried out using Stata version 11.2 MP.

**Results**

**Descriptive statistics**

Participants (n = 288) ranged in age between 16 and 20 years, and attended public bilingual programmes in an urban (n = 129) and a rural (n = 159) location. Fifty-one per cent of the participants were female (n = 146) and 49% were male (n = 142). In terms of habitual language (Figure 1), 12% of the respondents in the rural high school reported using only Galician, as opposed to 71% who reported using both Galician and Spanish. In the urban high school, the percentage of bilinguals was lower (62%) but the percentage of only-Spanish users was substantially higher than that in the rural location (38% vs. 17%). Additionally, no students from the urban location reported using only Galician.
In both locations, the percentage of bilingual speakers was higher among males, while the percentage of Spanish-only users was significantly higher among females (Table 2). The percentage of Galician-only users was higher among males, although this group was small \((n = 19)\) in comparison with the other two.

**Statistical analysis**

**Participant language**

No statistically significant differences were found when comparing participants’ scores according to their habitual language (for all four traits, \(p\)-values were \(> 0.05\) for \(F\)-test of student language indicators when comparing Spanish vs. standard Galician and Spanish vs. non-standard Galician). In other words, the language or languages participants use every day did not affect how they perceived the speakers.

**Spanish and non-standard Galician guises**

*Progressiveness.* No statistically significant differences were found between each speaker’s guises for the progressiveness trait (all \(p\)-values were \(> 0.05\) when comparing Spanish vs. non-standard Galician; see Table 3). The same is true for the female speaker. Urban and rural listeners found both speakers equally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban high school ((N = 129))</th>
<th>Rural high school ((N = 159))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galician only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish only</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
progressive when speaking either linguistic variety. All listeners found the female speaker to be more progressive than the male speaker when speaking either linguistic variety.

**Capability.** Rural and urban female listeners found the female speaker more capable when speaking Spanish. The female speaker was found more capable than the male in both guises, with the urban high school showing the largest effect size. Urban listeners found the female speaker more capable than rural listeners in either guise.

**Personal appeal.** Urban and rural female listeners perceived the male speaker more personally appealing when speaking Spanish than when speaking non-standard Galician. Rural males found the male speaker to be more personally appealing when he spoke Spanish. The female speaker was perceived more personally appealing than the male in either guise, with male participants showing the largest effect size. Urban listeners gave higher personal appeal scores than rural listeners to both speakers when speaking non-standard Galician. Female urban listeners gave higher personal appeal scores than female rural listeners when both speakers were speaking Spanish, although this difference was not found for male listeners.

**Social correctness.** Male and female participants found the female speaker less socially correct when speaking Spanish, while only female participants perceived the male speaker as less socially correct when using Spanish. However, this difference did
not reach significance at the 5% level for males listening to a male speaker. Furthermore, the female speaker was found less socially correct than the male speaker when speaking either Spanish or non-standard Galician, with urban participants showing the largest effect size (Figure 2). Urban listeners found the female speaker less socially correct than rural listeners in either guise.

**Spanish and standard Galician guises**

*Progressiveness*. No statistically significant differences were found between each speaker’s guises for the progressiveness trait (all *p*-values were >0.05 when comparing Spanish vs. standard Galician; see Table 4). In other words, the male speaker was found to be equally progressive when speaking Spanish as when speaking standard Galician by all listeners, regardless of their gender or location. The same is true for the female speaker. All participants except for rural males, who found both speakers equally progressive, found the female speaker more progressive than the male speaker in either linguistic variety. Urban and rural listeners found both speakers equally progressive when speaking either linguistic variety.

*Capability*. All participants found the male speaker more capable when speaking standard Galician than when speaking Spanish. Urban males found the female speaker more capable when speaking standard Galician, but this difference did not reach significance at the 5% level for urban females and rural participants. The female speaker was found to be more capable than the male in both guises. Urban females found the male speaker more capable when speaking standard Galician than rural females. Urban males found the female speaker more capable when speaking Spanish vs. standard Galician: social correctness trait.
standard Galician than rural males. Urban and rural male listeners found the male speaker equally capable when speaking either linguistic variety.

**Personal appeal.** Female participants found the female speaker more personally appealing when speaking standard Galician than when speaking Spanish, but this difference did not reach significance at the 5% level for male participants. The male speaker was found to be equally appealing when speaking either linguistic variety. The female speaker was found to be more personally appealing than the male when speaking Spanish and standard Galician. Urban females found the male speaker more personally appealing when speaking Spanish than rural females. Urban females also found the female speaker more personally appealing in either linguistic variety than their rural counterparts.

**Social correctness.** Urban participants found the male speaker more socially correct when speaking Spanish than when speaking standard Galician. Urban males found the female speaker more socially correct when speaking Spanish, but this difference did not reach significance at the 5% level for female participants. The female speaker was found to be less socially correct than the male speaker when speaking either Spanish or standard Galician, with urban participants showing the largest effect size (Figure 3).

Rural participants found both speakers equally socially correct when speaking either linguistic variety. Rural participants found the female speaker more socially correct.

### Table 4. Mean trait scores for Spanish vs. standard Galician speakers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Listeners’ gender</th>
<th>Speakers’ gender</th>
<th>Urban high school</th>
<th>Rural high school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Standard Galician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Span</td>
<td>Standard Galician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressiveness</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capability</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal appeal</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social correctness</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Spanish and standard Galician different at the 5% level for urban adolescents (comparing adjacent cells across row in same location).
*bSpanish and standard Galician different at the 5% level for rural adolescents (comparing adjacent cells across row in same location).
*cUrban and rural adolescents give different trait scores to Spanish speakers at the 5% level (comparing cells across row in Spanish column).
*dUrban and rural adolescents give different trait scores to standard Galician speakers at the 5% level (comparing cells across row in standard Galician column).
*All differences by speaker gender are significant except for rural male listeners.
correct than urban participants in either linguistic variety. Urban female participants found the male speaker more socially correct than their urban counterparts in either linguistic variety.

Discussion

Galicia’s current sociolinguistic landscape, with the number of bilingual adolescents outnumbering the Galician- and Spanish-only users, is accurately represented in the high schools surveyed in our study. This widespread bilingualism suggests that the regional government has succeeded in achieving its goal of encouraging the learning of Spanish and (standard) Galician, a concept introduced through the diverse mechanisms of language planning and, more specifically, through textbooks and the educational system (Domínguez-Seco 1995). However, as González González et al. (2007) note, the advance of bilingualism is detrimental to the vitality of the autochthonous language, a trend we have also observed, as only 12% of adolescents in the rural high school reportedly speak only Galician. Additionally, our data show a higher percentage of monolingual Spanish speakers in the urban high school (38%), corroborating previous studies that point to an increase of Spanish-only users in urban and semi-urban locations (Fernández 1993; Rodríguez Neira 2002).

Just as in González González et al.’s (2003) matched-guise experiment, we found that participants’ habitual language did not determine their attitudes. However, in our research, the urban/rural variable did prove significant. Standard Galician was rated higher in the urban high school than in the rural school, in spite of rural participants receiving more exposure to this variety through their school curricula (as mentioned earlier, 70% of their content courses were being taught in standard Galician vs. 30% in the urban school). Nevertheless, while non-standard Galician is
associated with and used in rural areas, standard Galician has become the linguistic variety of choice for the urban and more educated new speakers of Galician (Bouzada Fernández 2003). These characteristics associated with new speakers of Galician, along with the institutional uses of standard Galician, as well as its presence in both the media and in the culture, may help explain why standard Galician guises are rated as progressive as Spanish guises.

We have previously demonstrated that adolescents consider standard Galician to be circumscribed to an elite group of politicians and intellectuals (Loureiro-Rodríguez 2008). Taking into account that this elite is mostly composed of males, it is understandable that the male speaker was found more capable when speaking standard Galician than when speaking Spanish. It should also be noted that speaking standard Galician implies a high degree of bilingualism, as it is a school-acquired bilingualism, which accounts for its association with higher capability. However, urban adolescents found speakers more socially correct when speaking Spanish than when speaking standard Galician, which shows that Spanish is still more socially valued in the cities.

Our findings support recent research claiming that attitudes towards Galician among the younger generations may not be as favourable as the Sociolinguistic Maps of Galicia had suggested (González González et al. 2003; Iglesias Álvarez 2003; O’Rourke 2011). While it is true that both speakers were found equally progressive when speaking Spanish and non-standard Galician, suggesting that the traditional association between non-standard Galician and lack of sophistication may be starting to fade away, certain stigmas towards the vernacular continue to exist. For instance, female participants perceived the male speaker more personally appealing when speaking Spanish than when speaking non-standard Galician, and male participants agreed to a lesser extent. This difference in ratings could be explained by the fact that women generally have more positive attitudes towards standard varieties and use more standard forms than men to signal their social status linguistically (Milroy 1987; Trudgill 1972). Interestingly, though, the female speaker was found to be more socially correct when using non-standard Galician than when using Spanish by all participants, as was the male speaker by female participants, which suggests that the Galician pitch pattern in Spanish is still stigmatised. In other words, having a noticeable Galician ‘accent’, although acceptable and expected when speaking Galician (Loureiro-Rodríguez 2008), is socially disapproved of when speaking Spanish, especially for women. This apparent trend of assessing women’s linguistic behaviour more severely than men’s is supported by González González et al. (2003), who found that women speaking Spanish or Galician with a Galician accent were also given lower ratings.

Finally, we have found a striking contradiction regarding how adolescents perceive females. Our analysis reveals that, regardless of the linguistic variety they are speaking, women are perceived as more capable and personally appealing than men. We could argue that the higher ratings for the personal appeal trait might be due to the fact that the characteristics associated with it (i.e. being kind, attractive, etc.) have traditionally been more highly valued or expected in women than in men. As for adolescents’ perception of women as being more capable, it may be attributable to the greater presence of women in post-secondary education, as well as their entry into the workplace and, in particular, into high-prestige professions historically only accessible to men, in the past decades. The contradiction resides in that, despite receiving higher ratings than men for the aforementioned traits, women were
considered less socially correct by all raters. We speculate that these results indicate a covert disapproval of Galician women breaking traditional gender roles, moving away from spaces traditionally allocated to females.

We are aware that the dynamics of each Galician community are different, and that the use of the vernacular language is uneven across this region, making our findings not easy to extrapolate to all Galician adolescents. We also recognise that, since we collected our data in 2006, Galicia has undergone substantial political and educational transformations, making language attitudes more liable to change. For all these reasons, and the fact that ours is a small-scale study focusing on a specific age group and location, we do not claim far-reaching conclusions based on these findings. That being said, our study offers a valuable account of the attitudes towards standard Galician, non-standard Galician and Spanish among this particular subgroup and area, and our sample is large enough to support recent research findings about the status of Galician among the youth.

We have shown that adolescents’ location and gender, as well as the speaker’s gender, play a decisive role in language attitudes. We have also provided evidence of new gender-related trends in regard to standard and non-standard Galician, which indicates that future attitudinal research needs to address gender differences as well as distinguish between both linguistic varieties. Furthermore, our results have demonstrated that, while speaking non-standard Galician is held in high regard, it has yet to achieve the social acceptance that Spanish enjoys in urban areas. Finally, our findings indicate that certain stigmas are still attached to speaking non-standard Galician and to having a Galician accent when speaking Spanish, which may help understand the current loss of speakers of Galician to Spanish among adolescents.

Acknowledgements
We would like to thank Irene Moyna, Virgina Fajt, Frances Getwick, Jill Zarestky, and Georgianne Moore for their extensive feedback on earlier drafts of this paper. We are also very grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their detailed comments and valuable observations. Of course, all errors are our own.

Notes
1. For a typology of minority language situations, see Edwards (1997, 2010).
3. For a comprehensive sociolinguistic history of Galician, see Mariño Paz (1998), Rodríguez (1991) and Beswick (2007).
4. Mariño Paz (1998) and Monteagudo Romero (1999) point out that a Galician-Portuguese koine was spoken in the west of the Iberian Peninsula up until the thirteenth century.
7. The Real Academia Galega ‘Galician Royal Academy’ and the Instituto da Lingua Galega ‘Galician Language Institute’ collaborate in the standardisation and publication of the standard variety.
11. http://www.xunta.es/hemeroteca/-/nova/001206/feij%C3%B3o-avanza-novo-modelo-educativo-trilingue-que-blinda-equilibrio-entre-linguas
The Galician vocalic system comprises seven oral vowel phonemes in tonic and pretonic position (/o/, /a/, /ã/, /e/, /i/, and /u/), while Spanish comprises five (/o/, /a/, /ã/, /e/, /u/).

For an account of the differences between standard and non-standard varieties of Galician, see Beswick (2007, 131–7) and Regueira (1999, 2004).

Participants were given the option to fill out a standard Galician and a Spanish version of the rating sheet.

The grouping was done a priori and not based on responses, thus no further statistical testing was needed.

Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte: http://www.educacion.gob.es
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