Hawkey, J. (2020). Language attitudes as predictors of morphosyntactic variation: Evidence from Catalan speakers in southern France. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 24(1), 16-34.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12375>

Peer reviewed version

License (if available):
Other

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1111/josl.12375](https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12375)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the accepted author manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Wiley at <https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12375> . Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

**LANGUAGE ATTITUDES AS PREDICTORS OF MORPHOSYNTACTIC VARIATION:
EVIDENCE FROM CATALAN SPEAKERS IN SOUTHERN FRANCE.**

ABSTRACT

This article explores the potential role of attitudes as motivating factors in language variation and change. This study represents an important departure from existing scholarship through its consideration of quantitative measures of language attitudes as factors in multivariate analyses of linguistic data. Four morphosyntactic variables in Northern Catalan (an obsolescent variety spoken in France) will be examined in order to determine which factors significantly correlate with use of local or supralocal variants. Linear regression modelling reveals firm correlations for two of the variables, wherein positive evaluations of Catalan varieties on the status dimension (cf. Carranza and Ryan 1975, Woolard 1989 *inter alia*) align with supralocal variant use. We will see that attitudes can be helpful in uncovering motivations for language variation, but that qualitative ideological data is indispensable in the interpretation of findings.

KEYWORDS

Language attitudes, morphosyntax, variationism, regional and minority languages, language contact, Catalan.

SHORT RUNNING TITLE

Language attitudes and morphosyntactic variation

RÉSUMÉ

Cet article porte sur le rôle potentiel des attitudes en tant qu'éléments motivant la variation et le changement linguistique. Cette étude représente une innovation importante grâce à l'usage des mesures quantitatives des attitudes linguistiques en tant que facteurs dans une analyse multivariée des données sociolinguistiques.

J'examine quatre variables morphosyntaxiques en roussillonnais (une variété de catalan parlée en France qui tombe en désuétude) afin de découvrir les facteurs corrélés à l'emploi des variantes locales ou supra-locales. Des modèles de régression linéaire montrent des corrélations statistiquement significatives dans le cas de deux variables, où des évaluations positives des variétés catalanes sur la dimension du « statut » (cf. Carranza et Ryan 1975, Woolard 1989, entre autres) correspondent à l'usage des variantes supra-locales. Les attitudes nous sont donc très utiles dans la recherche des motivations de la variation linguistique, mais il faut tout de même exploiter des données idéologiques qualitatives pour mieux comprendre nos résultats.

MOTS-CLÉS

Attitudes linguistiques, morphosyntaxe, variation linguistique, langues régionales, contact linguistique, catalan, roussillonnais.

LANGUAGE ATTITUDES AS PREDICTORS OF MORPHOSYNTACTIC VARIATION: EVIDENCE FROM CATALAN SPEAKERS IN SOUTHERN FRANCE.

INTRODUCTION

In its search to understand the ways in which language use conveys and constructs social meaning, variationism has often sought insight from related academic disciplines. Social psychology, particularly the study of language attitudes, has long influenced approaches to the treatment of variationist data (cf. Kristiansen 2008, Soukup 2013), but scholars thus far have not utilised the full quantitative potential of attitude measurements when trying to account for speaker behaviour patterns. This article seeks to address this by using language attitude scores as a factor in multivariate analyses of sociolinguistic variables. This work will provide a helpful new explanatory perspective on linguistic data through its means of considering attitude as motivation for language change. As such, it constitutes an important and rigorous development in sociolinguistic methods. The theoretical context will first be presented, comprising an overview of the synergies between the social psychological study of language attitudes and variationist sociolinguistics. In this article, I focus on Catalan speakers in southern France, and so will offer a description of the research context, before outlining the specific morphosyntactic variables under consideration. Finally, the results will be presented and discussed, in order to provide a clear answer to the question of how language attitudes can be utilised as predictors of linguistic behaviour patterns.

THEORETICAL CONTEXT: ATTITUDES AND VARIATION

This work is informed by the disciplines of language attitudes and variationism. Language attitudes scholarship (and the social psychological study of attitudes more widely) is motivated by the pursuit of understanding how our attitudes are connected to behaviour patterns. Indeed, it has been claimed that ‘there wouldn’t be much point in studying attitudes if they were not, by and large, predictive of behaviour’ (Gass and Seiter 1999: 41). So, what is meant by ‘language attitude’ and ‘linguistic behaviour’? This study embraces Garrett’s (2010: 20) definition (after Sarnoff 1970) of a language attitude as an ‘evaluative orientation to a social object... [in this case] a language’, which takes the form of a ‘disposition, [thereby] having a degree of stability that allows it to be identified.’ⁱ The ‘behaviour’ in question here is language variation – Labov (2001: 33) describes his pioneering New York City study of variation as addressing ‘the behaviour of the individual speaker.’ⁱⁱ This section will interrogate the attitude-behaviour link by examining the role played by attitudes in existing studies of language variation (i.e. studies of speaker behaviour). Several developments in the discipline of variationism will be shown to have influenced the present study, as they rely on language attitudes and speaker evaluations. These are the ‘evaluation problem’, the Labovian notion of ‘unconscious attitudes’ and its methodological consequences, the ‘driving-force issue’, and the advent of cognitive sociolinguistics – each will be addressed in turn.

From studies in social psychology, we have learned that attitudes (not just about languages) are ‘based on cognitive, affective and behavioural information’ (Maio and Haddock 2010: 4, after Rosenberg and Hovland 1960), and that different components can show alignment with one another – positive beliefs may correspond to positive affect and positive behaviours.ⁱⁱⁱ Aware of this potential alignment, the

very earliest examples of variationist scholarship acknowledged the role of speaker attitudes. Weinreich, Labov and Herzog (1968: 181, 186) highlighted the importance of ‘systematic evaluative reactions to linguistic features which the listener cannot consciously perceive’ in building a comprehensive theory of language change, which must also ‘establish empirically the subjective correlates of [such] evaluations.’ Approaches to the so-called ‘evaluation problem’ sought to elucidate the links between ‘the general attitudes and aspirations of the informants and their linguistic behaviour’ (Labov 1972a: 162). The present study forms part of this long tradition within variationist scholarship, which seeks to understand how speaker attitudes feed into processes of language variation and change.

The idea of ‘consciousness’ pervades Labovian explanations of variation, not only as an axis of differentiation between the famous concepts of change from above and below (Labov 1972b: 178-180), but also when presenting means of analysing speaker reactions to linguistic variation – Labov (2001: 194, my emphasis) sought to access ‘subjects’ *unconscious attitudes* towards languages and dialects.’ The pursuit of unconscious attitudes has methodological consequences and informs the present work. Many experimental designs have been advanced in the study of language attitudes over the last sixty years, including direct elicitation strategies (such as surveys and questionnaires), indirect elicitation methods (such as the ‘matched guise technique’ developed in Lambert *et al.* 1960, or the ‘implicit association test’ pioneered by Greenwald *et al.* 1988), societal treatment studies, and folk linguistic approaches, including perceptual dialectological studies (cf. Preston 1989, *inter alia*). Kristiansen (2011: 270) maintains that the ‘unconsciousness’ of Labov’s attitudes ‘refers more to the data-collection technique

than to the nature of the data.’ As such, conventional empirical techniques, whether they use direct or indirect elicitation methods, tend to offer information about what Kristiansen (2011) terms ‘overt’ attitudes. This is noteworthy because the findings of the LANCHART project at the University of Copenhagen reveal that only ‘covert’ attitudes are in accordance with the directionality of language change (Kristiansen 2011: 277). This is not the case for overt attitudes, be these obtained using direct elicitation methods (as we shall see here) or indirect elicitation techniques as in Labov (2001). This debate on the importance of overt and covert attitudes was instrumental in the formulation of the methodology of the present work and will be discussed in further detail in the ‘variables studied and methods used’ section.

Increasing attention has been devoted to the ‘driving-force issue’, namely does linguistic change motivate attitudinal change, or vice versa (cf. Kristiansen and Jørgensen 2005)? Labov, in seeking to establish correlations between attitudes and variation, makes no overt commitment about potential causal relationships. Kristiansen (2011), however, perceives a clear shift in focus between earlier Labovian work – which attributes the spread of variables to social evaluative concerns, i.e. attitudes are a motivator of change – and more recent studies, which accord little or no explanatory potential to language attitudes (cf. Labov 2001, Labov 2007). This does not mean that variationist scholarship has turned its back on the possibility that attitudes can drive change (or vice versa). Kristiansen and Jørgensen (2005) underline the importance of what they term the ‘subjective’ factors motivating (rather than causing) language change, referring to the social-psychological perspectives brought by language attitude findings. They clearly differentiate between motivation and cause, since language is a social phenomenon, which

ultimately serves the human purpose of communicating lived experience. The idea of motivation foregrounds speaker participation (if not exactly agency) and reinforces the idea of language variation and change as goal-driven (insofar as the goal is to maintain effective communication), whereas causation downplays human involvement:

The driving force behind language variation and change should be sought in terms of motivation, rather than causation. If we state, for instance, that the convergence of dialects is *caused* by geographical and social mobility in the population, there may – or may not – be a social-psychological factor involved. But when we think of *motivation* for language change, the subjective factors become the centre of attention, as they should be if we are interested in answering the *why* question [of variation and change] (Kristiansen & Jørgensen 2005: 287, emphasis in original).

Developing this point, motivation can be interpreted as a constraint (i.e. one of a set of conditions for change) rather than a direct cause of variation and change.

According to Kristiansen and Jørgensen (2005), language is a tool used by speakers. Language variation and change thus take place in order to ensure the continued effectiveness of this tool, which is dependent on the form of the language in question. This study attempts to formalise and quantify the links between attitudes and their associated behaviours, and as such, the idea that subjective (social-psychological) factors influence language form will prove of great importance to the analysis.

The discipline of cognitive sociolinguistics (cf. Kristiansen and Dirven 2008) has sought to establish a theoretical framework which, through usage-based

research, is able to fully integrate attitudinal findings into variationist studies.

Kristiansen (2008) draws on Speech Accommodation Theory (Giles *et al.* 1987) in her proposal of a multi-phase model which explains precisely how attitudinal motivations are linked to processes of variation and change at the level of style-shifting. She maintains that, due to the fact that ‘structured linguistic patterns relate in systematic ways to social meaning’ (Kristiansen 2008: 82), speakers are able to attitudinally orient themselves towards specific perceived social identities, which in turn can lead to changes in linguistic inventories. The status of language attitudes as potential motivating factors in language variation and change has thus been acknowledged by variationist scholars since the inception of the discipline, but only in recent years, have sophisticated models (cf. Kristiansen 2008, Soukup 2013) attempted to explain exactly how any causal links between language attitudes and linguistic behaviours may be operationalised. This study is influenced by these cognitive sociolinguistic studies, in their attempts to rigorously explain the processes of speaker orientations towards identity categories which result in language variation and change.^{iv}

In short, this work draws on a series of theoretical and analytical advances that seek to understand the links between language attitudes and linguistic variation. The ‘evaluation problem’ highlighted the importance of attitudes to the variationist enterprise from the inception of the discipline. The status of language attitudes as ‘unconscious’ representations of speaker belief systems was posited by Labov (2001) and problematised in Kristiansen (2011), provoking of the question of whether unconsciousness can be accessed in experimental settings, which informs the methodological choices of this study (discussed later). Examinations of the ‘driving-force’ issue (cf. Kristiansen and Jørgensen 2005) foregrounded speaker

involvement in the motivation of language variation and change, placing yet further emphasis on attitudes as integral to understanding developments in linguistic form. Finally, developments in cognitive sociolinguistics have shown us how empirical methods and sophisticated modelling can be used to elucidate the link between language attitudes and linguistic behaviours. The present study proposes to use attitudinal measurements as independent variables in the analysis of language variation found in data obtained from Catalan-French bilinguals in southern France. In doing so, I aim to provide quantitative evidence of how attitudes may function as motivators of language variation and change.

RESEARCH CONTEXT: CATALAN IN FRANCE^v

Catalan is a Romance language spoken by approximately ten million people and is an autochthonous variety across Spain, France, Italy and Andorra. As spoken vernaculars descended from Vulgar Latin started to diverge from one another, the Romance languages became distinct, and present-day Catalan varieties are descended from Vulgar Latin as spoken in an area retrospectively referred to as *Catalunya Vella* (Old Catalonia), spreading along the eastern Pyrenees. Today, this area is split between France and Spain, with the Autonomous Community of Catalonia on the southern side, and the French administrative *département* of Pyrénées-Orientales to the north; it is this latter region that will constitute the focus of the present study (see figure 1). The present Pyrénées-Orientales is largely coterminous with a linguistic and cultural entity known as Northern Catalonia, and this area has been Catalan-speaking for as long as the Catalan language can be considered independent from its neighbours, i.e. over a thousand years. After

considerable fluctuation, the French-Spanish border was fixed in 1659, and Northern Catalonia has been under French jurisdiction ever since. As in other parts of France, the general population was not overwhelmingly French speaking until the early twentieth century, although centralising language policies in favour of the sole use of French (operating on both administrative and ideological levels) had been firmly in place since the French Revolution. Throughout the twentieth and into the twenty-first century, the situation for Catalan in France has been increasingly bleak, with large-scale societal shift towards French and a near-total lack of institutional support for regional and minority languages throughout the country. In recent years, Catalan in France has been somewhat bolstered by funding from the autonomous government of Catalonia (Spain) and private enterprise, which provides limited education and visibility for the language. However, such efforts remain marginal, and demand for services in Catalan has been shown to far outstrip supply (cf. Hawkey 2018: 196-201). Demographically, the Pyrénées-Orientales is dominated by the city of Perpignan, with the wider metropolitan area of the city comprising approximately 70% of the region's population. As of 2015, there are an estimated 130,979 speakers of Catalan in the Pyrénées-Orientales, corresponding to 35.4% of the population (Generalitat de Catalunya *et al.* 2015: 4), with Catalan oral competence higher in rural areas (45.8%) than the urban centre (33%) (Baylac Ferrer 2016: 16). It should be noted that, given the self-report nature of such language competence statistics, numbers of speakers with a high level of proficiency in (at least spoken) Catalan may be much lower.^{vi vii}

Figure 1: Map of Northern Catalonia, highlighting the fieldwork sites (Perpignan and Serdinya) and including the Autonomous Community of Catalonia

The Catalan language in southern France is far from homogeneous. Linguists refer to the traditional autochthonous variety as Northern Catalan (*català septentrional* in Catalan) or Rossellonese Catalan (*rossellonès* in Catalan, *roussillonnais* in French, taken from the name of the province of Rosselló/Roussillon). While for centuries this was the only form of Catalan used in the region (outside the Roma community who continue to speak a distinctive variety, cf. Escudero 2004), in recent years, there has been growing influence from Catalan as spoken south of the French-Spanish border. Central Catalan (*català central*) is the standardised prestige variety used in and around Barcelona, and increasing cross-border influence (for example,

due to political activism, or the aforementioned support provided by the government of the Autonomous Community of Catalonia in terms of teacher training) has led to a greater presence of Central Catalan features in the Catalan spoken in southern France. While Northern Catalan and Central Catalan are typologically similar, there are clear differences in phonetics and phonology, morphology and lexis. Hawkey (2018: 115-148) provides a full account of how local Northern Catalan features coexist with supralocal Central Catalan traits in present-day Northern Catalonia, through the examination of phonetic variables. The current work extends this analysis to encompass morphosyntactic variation.

VARIABLES STUDIED AND METHODS USED

Labov (1972a: 188) defines variants of a sociolinguistic variable as ‘alternate ways of saying the same thing.’ For decades, scholars (cf. Lavandera 1978 *inter alia*) have questioned the extent to which the notion of the variable can be applied beyond examples of phonetic/phonological variation, since many variants of morphosyntactic variables do not possess the same truth value as one another, do not differ in social meaning (King 2013: 446), and have been revealed not to share the same underlying structure (Adger & Trousdale 2007: 269-270). However, the earliest Labovian work examines morphosyntactic as well as phonetic/phonological variation (cf. Labov 1972a on negative concord in AAVE), and studies into grammatical variation are commonplace. In response to more conservative concerns about the amenability of morphosyntactic data to variationist analysis, a relatively relaxed interpretation of what constitutes a variable has developed, with morphosyntactic variants able to exist in a hyponymic rather than just synonymic

relationship, for example (Adger 2017: 615). The present analysis focuses on four morphosyntactic variables, each with local (Northern Catalan) and supralocal (Central Catalan) variants:^{viii}

1. (1SG). Present-tense verbal morphology distinguishes Catalan varieties from one another. The first person singular indicative present tense morpheme in Central Catalan is ‘-o’, while in traditional varieties^{ix} of Northern Catalan, it is ‘-i’. The form ‘I sing’ is thus *canto* in Central Catalan (this is the supralocal variant) and *canti* in Northern Catalan (this is the local variant).
2. (PRET). Most varieties of Catalan (along with other Romance varieties like Peninsular Spanish) distinguish between hodiernal and pre-hodiernal past tenses by means of verb tense choice. In Catalan, the present perfect is used for actions that have occurred earlier on the day of utterance, and the preterit (formed using a periphrastic construction based loosely on the verb *anar* ‘to go’ plus infinitive) expresses events prior to the day of utterance. Use of the present perfect for the pre-hodiernal past is ungrammatical, as in (1c):

(1) *Central Catalan*

a.	avui	he	treballat
	today	have.AUX.1SG	work.PST.PTCP
b.	ahir	vaig	treballar
	yesterday	go.AUX.1SG	work.INF
c.	*ahir	he	treballat
	yesterday	have.AUX.1SG	work.PST.PTCP

However, attested varieties of Catalan in Northern Catalonia do not rigidly follow this pattern, likely under influence from the majority language, French, which has lost the distinction between hodiernal and pre-hodiernal past tenses, using the present perfect in both cases, as in (2) and (3):

(2) *French*

- a. aujourd'hui j'ai travaillé
 today have.AUX.1SG work.PST.PTCP
- b. hier j'ai travaillé
 yesterday have.AUX.1SG work.PST.PTCP

(3) *Northern Catalan (under influence from French)*

- a. avui he treballat
 today have.AUX.1SG work.PST.PTCP
- b. ahir he treballat
 yesterday have.AUX.1SG work.PST.PTCP

Additionally, traditional varieties of Northern Catalan exhibit a local conjugation for the present tense (indicative) of the auxiliary *haver* 'to have', as in table 1 below (data from Gómez Duran 2016: 117):

	1sg	2sg	3sg	1pl	2pl	3pl
Central Catalan	he/haig	has	ha	hem	heu	han
(supralocal)						
Northern Catalan	som	ets	ha	sem/hem	seu/heu	han
(local)						

Table 1. Present tense (indicative) conjugation of haver 'to have' in Central and Northern Catalan.

Therefore, in total there are (at least) three potential variants that can be placed on a continuum from least to most local:

- supralocal variant: *ahir, vaig treballar* (preterit for pre-hodiernal past, as in other varieties of Catalan).
- moderately local variant: *ahir, he treballat* (present perfect for pre-hodiernal past, supralocal conjugation of auxiliary *haver*).
- extremely local variant: *ahir, som treballat* (present perfect for pre-hodiernal past, local conjugation of auxiliary *haver*).^x

3. (MEU). Central Catalan possessive pronouns show agreement for number and gender, whether or not they occur prenominally. Traditional Northern Catalan possessives overtly show agreement when they occur non-prenominally or pre-vocalically, but not pre-consonantly, as in table 2 below (data partly taken from Gómez Duran 2016: 70):

		Non-prenominal	Prenominal: _V	Prenominal: _C
Central Catalan (supralocal)	masc/s	<i>és meu</i> 'it (m.) is mine'	<i>el meu amic</i> 'my friend (m.)'	<i>el meu veí</i> 'my neighbour (m.)'
	g			
	fem/sg	<i>és meva</i> 'it (f.) is mine'	<i>la meva amiga</i> 'my friend (f.)'	<i>la meva veïna</i> 'my neighbour (f.)'
	masc/pl	<i>són meus</i> 'they (m.) are mine'	<i>els meus amics</i> 'my friends (m.)'	<i>els meus veïns</i> 'my neighbours (m.)'

	fem/pl	<i>són meves</i> ‘they (f.) are mine’	<i>les meves amigues</i> ‘my friends (f.)’	<i>les meves veïnes</i> ‘my neighbours (f.)’
Northern Catalan (local)	masc/s	<i>és meu</i> ‘it (m.) is mine’	<i>el meu amic</i> ‘my friend (m.)’	<i>el meu veí</i> ‘my neighbour (m.)’
	g			
	fem/sg	<i>és meua</i> ‘it (f.) is mine’	<i>la meua amiga</i> ‘my friend (f.)’	<i>la meu veïna</i> ‘my neighbour (f.)’
	masc/pl	<i>són meus</i> ‘they (m.) are mine’	<i>els meus amics</i> ‘my friends (m.)’	<i>els meu veïns</i> ‘my neighbours (m.)’
	fem/pl	<i>són meues</i> ‘they (f.) are mine’	<i>les meues amigues</i> ‘my friends (f.)’	<i>les meu veïnes</i> ‘my neighbours (f.)’

Table 2. Possessive pronouns (first-person singular) in Central and Northern Catalan.

This table also reveals that, when feminine agreement is overtly realised in Northern Catalan possessives, the intervocalic element is a glide [w] (written here as ‘u’ in ‘meua’), rather than the fricative [v] (‘meva’) of Central Catalan. This is a trait shared with Valencian and North-Western Catalan. But as we see in table 2, this agreement is not overt in traditional Northern Catalan varieties when preceding feminine singular, masculine plural and feminine plural nouns beginning with a consonant. Therefore, as with the (PRET) variable, for feminine nouns (singular and plural) starting with a consonant, there is a continuum of potential variants, from least to most local:

- supralocal variant: *la meva veïna, les meves veïnes* (overt agreement on possessive, intervocalic fricative).
- moderately local variant: *la meua veïna, les meues veïnes* (overt agreement on possessive, intervocalic glide).
- extremely local variant: *la meu veïna, les meu veïnes* (no overt agreement on possessive).

For masculine plural nouns starting with a consonant, given the lack of potential intervocalic fricative, there are only two variants:

- supralocal variant: *els meus veïns* (overt agreement on possessive).
- local variant: *els meu veïns* (no overt agreement on possessive).

Masculine singular nouns starting with a consonant cannot be analysed, since both Northern and Central Catalan varieties realise these identically (see Table 2).

4. (LLUR). The third-person plural possessive marker *llur* has fallen out of use in all spoken varieties of Catalan except Northern Catalan, where it is potentially reinforced by the French cognate *leur* (Wheeler, Yates & Dols 1999: 116). In Central Catalan, the third-person singular possessives *el seu/la seva/els seus/les seves* now function as third-person plural possessives. According to Gómez Duran (2016: 70-72), *llur* in Northern Catalan demonstrates the same gender and number agreement as the first-person possessives (in Table 2), i.e. no overt marking before feminine (singular and plural) and masculine plural nouns with a word-initial consonant. However, this is not borne out by the present data, with participants employing various agreement patterns, and so here we maintain a simple split between

local and supralocal variants: the use of Central Catalan, as in *el seu gat* (here, 'their cat') constitutes the supralocal variant, and the use of *llur* (or any related form), as in *llur gat*, is the local Northern Catalan variant.

A key methodological debate in language attitudes research focuses on the differences between direct and indirect methods. The research protocol consisted of a questionnaire (i.e. a direct method) to elicit language attitudes, followed by a wordlist translation task to ascertain linguistic behaviours. The choice of a direct attitude elicitation method is connected to the debate around 'unconscious attitudes' discussed in the 'theoretical context' section. While Labov (2001) favours indirect methods (such as the matched guise test) as they allow access to what he calls 'unconscious attitudes', Kristiansen (2011: 270) rightly points out that even indirect approaches tend to yield information about attitudes that are somewhat conscious in nature, given the formality of experimental settings (indeed, such limitations are acknowledged in Labov 2001: 24, 216). In order to elicit covert attitudes, members of Kristiansen's LANCHART project played stimulus tapes to participants containing accent variation that is prevalent in the Danish speech communities under investigation. While the limits of direct elicitation methods are clear (i.e. that the linguistic focus of the stimulus questions means that participants are primed that language is the designated attitude object), the methods such as those used in the LANCHART project to elicit covert attitudes were not chosen for a number of reasons. Attitude questionnaires allow the researcher to gather data from a broad cross-section of the speech community in a relatively short space of time. Indirect methods (such as the matched guise test or the IAT) are near-impossible to administer in situations of language obsolescence, where many speakers are older

(several were hard of hearing) and geographically isolated. Moreover, in the LANCHART project, speakers of Danish formed part of communities where accent variation was prevalent and often possessed clear indexical value. In the case to be discussed here, speakers of Catalan were often unaware of prestige norms that originated outside of their community (indeed, the existence of a ‘Catalan speech community’ in rural France is questionable, given the high degree of obsolescence and isolation of the speakers). This being said, while the present study only elicits overt attitudes using direct methods (and thus constitutes something of a methodological departure from the LANCHART project), future work could focus on urban varieties of Catalan that are faced with a lesser degree of obsolescence. Such cases, as more analogous to those examined in the LANCHART project, would benefit from the discussion of covert attitudes.

Participants were first required to complete the language attitudes questionnaire (modelled after Kircher 2009), the answers to which provided scores for each respondent along the key evaluative dimensions of status and solidarity for both French and Catalan (these scores were then used as independent variables for analysis). The two dimensions of *status* (‘the desire to get ahead in some way’, Woolard 1989: 90) and *solidarity* (‘the desire to be accepted by another group’, Woolard 1989: 90) have remained popular since the earliest language attitude studies (cf. Carranza and Ryan 1975; Ryan, Carranza and Moffie 1977 for early usage; cf. Kircher 2009, Kircher and Fox 2019 for recent iterations), given the ability of these two categories to capture a comprehensive range of attitudinal motivations. Examples from the questionnaire (offered to participants in French or Catalan) are:

(To ascertain status evaluations) Q7/Q15: Having knowledge of Catalan/French will increase my chances of employment. Rate on a scale from 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree).^{xi}

(To ascertain solidarity evaluations) Q5/Q17: Catalan/French is a language which lends itself well to the expression of feelings and emotions. Rate on a scale from 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree).

As part of the questionnaire, participants also self-reported their own language competence in the four skill areas (reading, writing, speaking, listening), with ratings on a Likert-like scale from 1 (no competence) to 5 (total fluency).

Participants then undertook a wordlist translation task, in which they were presented with a number of stimuli in French (words and short phrases) and asked to translate what they saw into Catalan. The use of a translation task in morphosyntactic research is innovative and benefits from the fact that translation between Catalan and French would be a natural activity for these bilingual participants. Nevertheless, as with all experimental protocols, there are inherent limitations. Translation of random stimuli is a somewhat decontextualized activity and may elicit formal registers as a result. However, this is not such a pressing concern in the Rossellonese context, since there is not a clear connection between formality and use of supralocal forms (indeed, if there is, this is interesting and worthy of further investigation). Moreover, the arguably ‘artificial’ nature of the translation task is analogous to the use of direct elicitation methods allowing access to ‘conscious attitudes.’ Another limitation is a potential priming effect, particularly

for the (PRET) variable, where the French present perfect for pre-hodiernal past (in the stimulus sentence) may trigger the Catalan present perfect in the same context. Of course, such limitations do not vitiate the experimental findings.

Participants were selected from two fieldwork sites in Northern Catalonia: the urban centre of Perpignan (metropolitan population: 318,377) and the rural village of Serdinya sixty kilometres away (population: 227). This was in order to ascertain if demographic factors (such as rurality) constrained variation, and to determine whether diatopic differences could be identified between the two locations. Five men and five women were chosen at each site, yielding a total of twenty participants. The data was subsequently coded in order to ascertain when local or supralocal variants were used; this was then submitted to multiple mixed-effects linear (regression) modelling using the Rbrul interface (Johnson 2008) in the R environment. Linear regression was chosen over logistic regression for several reasons, chiefly that log-odds (equivalent to factor weights in logistic regression) can combine more easily than individual probabilities (Johnson 2009: 361), and that the data contained continuous variables (participant age, and in the phonetic data set discussed below, formant frequencies) as well as categorical ones (Johnson 2009: 362). The independent variables for analysis were as follows:

- Macrosociological variables: *Participant age, participant sex, participant profession*. Under this heading, I also include language competence scores: *Speaks Catalan, reads Catalan, writes Catalan, understands Catalan* (rated on Likert-like scales – 1: no competence, 5: high competence).

- Attitudinal scores: *Catalan status*, *Catalan solidarity*, *French status*, *French solidarity* (rated on Likert-like scales – 1: low evaluation, 5: high evaluation).

While attempts were made to ensure the independence of variables (e.g. the selection of comparable cohorts at both fieldwork sites), there are indeed correlations between certain social and attitudinal variables, and these are explored in full (using an expanded version of the present data set) in Hawkey (2018: 79-114). However, testing confirmed the independence of the relevant social and attitudinal variables in the only case below where both were shown to be significant (the (MEU) variable). *Speaker* and *word* were included as random effects.

RESULTS

The experiment was administered to the twenty participants described above, yielding the following token numbers for each variable:

Figure 2. Token numbers for all morphosyntactic variables and variants.

The variation in figure 2 was then submitted to multivariate analysis, with macrosociological and attitudinal factors serving as independent variables. For (1SG), neither macrosociological categories nor attitudinal scores correlated significantly with the attested variation. For (PRET), macrosociological variables were of significance, but not language attitudes (shown in table 3):

Response variable = (PRET)		Random effects: speaker, word.	
N = 99			
Predictor	Factor	Coefficient	<i>p</i> -value
Participant age	continuous	+0.023 ^{xii}	.0293
Speaks Catalan	continuous	+0.459 ^{xiii}	.0183

Table 3. Regression output for the (PRET) variable.

Participant age was of significance with older participants favouring the use of supralocal variants. Additionally, the language competence variable of *speaks Catalan* was of significance here, with participants who claimed higher oral competence in Catalan using more supralocal variants. For (MEU), both macrosociological category membership and language attitude score correlated significantly with variant choice (shown in table 4):

Response variable = (MEU) ^{xiv}		Random effects: speaker, word.	
N = 68		Application value: local ^{xv}	
Predictor	Factor	Log-odds	p-value
Fieldwork site	Perpignan	+8.484	.0055
	Serdinya	-8.484	
Participant age	continuous	+0.328	.0368
Catalan status score	continuous	-10.374	.0086
Catalan solidarity score	continuous	+12.929	.0154

Table 4. Regression output for the (MEU) variable.

Fieldwork site and *participant age* were significant, with urban respondents from Perpignan appearing to prefer local variants (this will be addressed in the discussion), and older participants favouring local variants. *Catalan status score* was significant, with participants who rated Catalan highly as a language of potential status favouring supralocal variants; *Catalan solidarity score* was also significant with participants who accorded Catalan high solidarity values favouring local variants. For

(LLUR), only attitudinal factors were significant, with macrosociological category membership not correlating to variant choice (shown in table 5):

Response variable = (LLUR)		Random effects: speaker, word.	
N = 78		Application value: local	
Predictor	Factor	Log-odds	p-value
Catalan status score	continuous	-20.759	.0091
Catalan solidarity score	continuous	+13.538	.0741

Table 5. Regression output for the (LLUR) variable.

As with (MEU), *Catalan status score* was positively correlated with supralocal variant usage; *Catalan solidarity score* fell just below the significance threshold, but exhibited the same polarity seen for (MEU), as it positively correlated with local variant usage.

This experiment was originally developed to ascertain the extent to which language attitudes function as predictors of phonetic variation in Northern Catalan, by examining four phonetic variables, each with local (Northern) and supralocal (influenced by Central Catalan) variants. The present study is thus an extension of Hawkey (2018) in that it seeks to ascertain the extent to which the same attitudinal measurements correlate with analogous patterns of morphosyntactic variation. Language attitude scores emerged as significant predictors of phonetic variation in three of the four variables studied (as opposed to just two in the above morphosyntactic data). The full phonetic analysis can be found in Hawkey (2018: 115-148), but a brief comparative summary is given in table 6:

Variable	(1SG)	(PRET)	(MEU)	(LLUR)	(R)	(IX)	(O)	(ə)
Macrosociological factors	X	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	X	✓
Attitudinal factors	X	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X

Table 6. Summary of findings: phonetic variables (Hawkey 2018) and

morphosyntactic variables. Ticks indicate statistically significant correlations, crosses mean there are none.

For both phonetic and morphosyntactic variables, in all cases when the minority language (Catalan) was rated highly as a language of potential status, supralocal variants were employed; when Catalan was regarded highly on the solidarity dimension, local variants were employed. Status is therefore arguably associated with the use of supralocal pan-Catalan variants shared with the major metropolis of Barcelona, while solidarity is linked to the use of local Northern Catalan variants.

DISCUSSION

The data allows us to deepen our understanding of constraints on morphosyntactic variation in Northern Catalan, as well as how language attitudes correlate to linguistic behaviours and practices. Moreover, I will argue that in order to accurately interpret the role played by attitudes in language variation, we must take into account the specific ideological context of the speech community in question. Therefore, not only will we learn about attitudes and variation, but also about how Catalan speakers in southern France use language to construct their own identities.

Macrosociological factors were shown to account for patterns of variant usage for (PRET), although the specific results may appear counterintuitive at first. Testing reveals that older participants favour use of the supralocal variant, which initially appears at odds with the idea that older, non-mobile, rural participants exhibit the most conservative, local speech patterns (cf. Chambers & Trudgill 1980). However, the local variant for (PRET) is most likely a contact feature from French, and widespread societal bilingualism with French has only been the case in Northern Catalonia for around a century; therefore, traditional Northern Catalan varieties frequently employ the supralocal variant.^{xvi} The supralocal use of the preterit could constitute an instance of innovation (influence from Central Catalan, shown to be pervasive in Northern Catalonia, cf. Hawkey 2018) or of extreme conservatism (speaking a local variety of Catalan that was not yet characterised by admixture from French). The direction of change is thus ambiguous: is preterit usage highly conservative or innovatory? The results here seem to indicate the former, in that the oldest speakers of traditional Northern Catalan varieties use the preterit. The present perfect is adopted by slightly younger speakers, whose variety exhibits greater influence from French. It is of course possible, as we see greater input from Central Catalan, that we witness a return to the use of the preterit for pre-hodiernal past, in an example of revernacularisation that Peytaví Deixona (2016: 23) refers to as ‘nou rossellonès’ (‘new Rossellonese’). For (MEU), macrosociological categories provide another seemingly counterintuitive finding, namely that the urban Perpignan informants prefer the local variant over the rural Serdinya participants. Closer examination of the data shows this to be due to the high presence of the ‘moderately local’ variant (*meua*) in the data. The Perpignan data was split between

some usage of the supralocal variant (*meva*) and many instances of the moderately local variant (*meua*), with very little evidence of the ‘extremely local’ variant (*meu*). The rural Serdinya data consisted of a relatively even split between supralocal and extremely local variants, with very little presence of the moderately local *meua*. This was confirmed when the data was recoded with *meua* as supralocal: *fieldwork site* was no longer of statistical significance ($p = 0.884$), but *participant age* was still significant ($p = 0.028$). Therefore, the results are not quite so unexpected, with the extremely local variant found in more rural areas, the moderately local variant found in the urban centre, and the supralocal variant found throughout the territory (though more tokens would be needed to confirm this). The attitudinal data for both (MEU) and (LLUR) revealed that according high status to Catalan is positively correlated with use of the supralocal variant, and that high solidarity ratings for Catalan correlate with local usage. This matches the findings in Hawkey (2018) for all phonetic variables where attitudes emerged as significant predictors of variation, where we see supralocal usage positively aligned with high status values for the obsolescent variety. How can this be explained?

The results here offer detailed quantitative evidence of the role played by language attitudes, but in order to fully understand the links between positive evaluations of Catalan on the status dimension and use of supralocal morphosyntactic variants, some ideological context needs to be provided. Indeed, Kristiansen & Jørgensen (2005) remind us of the multi-faceted nature of speaker belief systems by asking:

‘How do attitudes, representations, values exist? As frozen sense-making constructs in the brain, ready to be ‘tapped’ in experiments? Or as

communicative practices to be studied primarily through discourse? [...] In fact, the best answer is to reject the ‘either – or’ option and recognise some kind of conflict and tension – a dialectic relationship – between activity and structure, discourse and cognition’ (Kristiansen and Jørgensen 2005: 292-293).

Indeed, it is through familiarity with the language ideological landscape of Northern Catalonia that we can best understand the present findings. By means of an analysis of conversational data, Hawkey (2018: 162) explores the complex ideological relationship between identity, authenticity and Catalan language competence in Northern Catalonia. Simply put, locals’ claims to authenticity are predicated on different values of varying validity, and such claims are always made relative to a competitor. In order of decreasing validity, we have ‘native speaker as more authentic than non-native; [Northern] Catalan speaker as more authentic than supralocal Catalan speaker; Catalan speaker as more authentic than non-Catalan speaker [...], etc.’ (Hawkey 2018: 162). Northern Catalans who have not acquired the language through typical intergenerational transmission^{xvii} are able to make credible claims to authentic local identity through Catalan language competence. However, such competence is likely to be (to a degree) influenced by supralocal varieties of Catalan, since the resources for acquisition of Northern Catalan (outside native speaker transmission) are practically non-existent. Teaching materials for L2 acquisition use supralocal Catalan, and many Northern Catalan adults maintain or reinforce their Catalan through cross-border exchanges with the Autonomous Community of Catalonia (such as Erasmus+ exchanges or political activism) (Hawkey 2018: 168). This is the scenario for the vast majority of younger speakers of Catalan

in Northern Catalonia, since there was a large-scale break in intergenerational transmission of regional and minority languages across France in the mid-twentieth century (cf. Hornsby 2015: 21 on Breton, Mooney 2016: 14 on Occitan), due to increasing ideological and political pressure as outlined in the research context above. In the absence of societal level intergenerational transmission, younger speakers who acquire (supralocal) Catalan must be somehow motivated to learn the language, be that by a political sense of pan-Catalanism, or because of perceived instrumental value attached to Catalan as a useful language in the Autonomous Community of Catalonia, south of the border. Jaffe (2015) highlights the heterogeneity of speaker motivations for learning heritage languages. Indeed, it is not uncommon for minority languages to possess instrumental value by allowing their speakers access to economic capital in a situation in which hitherto suppressed languages are awarded more official recognition (cf. Williams 2013: 1 on Welsh, Te Huia 2015: 614 on Māori). Given the co-official status of Catalan over the border in the Autonomous Community of Catalonia, it is perhaps unsurprising that some Northern Catalans should see Catalan as a language of potential upward social mobility, and that the supralocal variety be associated with prestige (it is the L2 variety acquired, it is the language of the massive urban centre of Barcelona, etc.) Moreover, given the importance of cross-border communication, there is a growing demand for Catalan language competence in the tourism sector in Northern Catalonia (Hawkey 2018: 161), lending the language yet more instrumental value. While the language situation for Catalan is wholly different in the Autonomous Community of Catalonia in terms of speaker demographics and institutional support, there are some interesting attitudinal parallels regarding the status of Catalan.

Despite its existence in a state of societal bilingualism with Spanish, Catalan in Catalonia functions as a marker of glocalness (i.e. a fusion of the global and the local) and of ‘cosmopolitan nationalism’ (Trenchs-Parera and Newman 2015: 498). In sum, the Northern Catalans most likely to rate Catalan positively on the status dimension acquire the language despite the break in intergenerational transmission; the variety of Catalan they learn (be that as L2 or in immersion education) is characterised by a degree of influence from supralocal forms, thus accounting for the link between high status evaluations of an obsolescent variety and use of supralocal variants.

Turning to solidarity, we find that high solidarity ratings for Catalan correlate with local variant usage. This may at first appear counterintuitive, as it implies that the supralocal speakers outlined above (who acquire Catalan despite the break in intergenerational transmission in a potential bid to lay an authentic claim to local identity) do not view the language as one of solidarity.^{xviii} Again, as advanced by Kristiansen & Jørgensen (2005), examination of language ideologies in Northern Catalonia holds the key. Attitudinal survey data from Northern Catalonia reveals a lack of oppositionality between French and Catalan regarding solidarity (Hawkey 2018: 101-102); that is to say, if participants rate Catalan as a language of solidarity, this does not preclude French simultaneously fulfilling a solidarity role.

Understandably, for many younger speakers in France, regional and minority languages are not associated with solidarity, since they were not used in the home by native speaker parents. Indeed, we even witness a degree of resentment and contempt between older native speakers of regional languages, and younger speakers who feel shunned by the oldest community members who refuse (or are reluctant) to speak with them in the minority language (cf. Hornsby 2015: 56 on

Breton, Hawkey 2018: 162-163 on Northern Catalan). Data for Breton from Hornsby (2015: 42) indicates that traditional speakers may feel defensive about the language due to the guilt at having been the very people that caused the rupture in intergenerational transmission. Either way, those who rate the language highly as a vehicle of solidarity are most likely therefore to be the oldest, traditional speakers who used it at home with their parents and acquired it natively before the extensive ideological hegemony of French, and these people use the most local variants.

What can this tell us about the links between language attitudes and morphosyntactic variation? After Kristiansen & Jørgensen (2005), I hope to have revealed attitudes as potential *motivations* for (rather than *causes* of) language variation. The speaker attitudes which motivate language variation are only interpretable when viewed in the specific language ideological context of Northern Catalonia. This reinforces the idea (mentioned above) of language variation as goal-driven, since it serves to maintain the existing linguistic ideological hegemony in the region. In both cases where there were statistically significant correlations between attitudes and variant choice, high status evaluations for Catalan corresponded to use of supralocal variants. Views of Catalan as a potential language of status lead younger community members to acquire the language, despite a society-wide break in intergenerational transmission. Given that resources for the acquisition (either as L2 or in immersion education) and maintenance (through cross-border exchanges with Central Catalan speakers) of Catalan prioritise supralocal (rather than local) variants, supralocal Catalan exerts a considerable influence on the speech of those who rate Catalan highly on the status dimension. In the case where high Catalan solidarity evaluations significantly correlate with local variant usage (for (PRET)),

variable usage patterns reveal these are not the same participants who rate the language highly as a vehicle of potential status. Broader ideological data indicates that these participants may be older speakers who pre-date the break in intergenerational transmission, and view Catalan as a vehicle of solidarity as it was the language used in their upbringing. In this case, the attitude is not strictly speaking a motivation for use of the local variant, but rather a symptom of a more general language ideological reality surrounding the transmission of obsolescent varieties in France. In both cases, as indicated by Kristiansen & Jørgensen (2005), knowledge of the language ideological landscape of the community is crucial in the interpretation of the data.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the present findings, to what extent is morphosyntactic variation predicated on speaker belief systems? And what have we learned about Catalan speakers in southern France? Following Kristiansen & Jørgensen (2005), I maintain that language attitudes can motivate the subconscious choice of a particular linguistic variant, and that we need to set each case in its ideological context. That is to say, there is no 'one size fits all' model by which we can discern if certain attitudes will somehow lead to particular patterns of language variation. Northern Catalonia presents us with a very specific situation of language obsolescence, wherein an endangered local variety is juxtaposed with a supralocal variety, which is spoken in an adjacent territory and enjoys considerably greater ethnolinguistic vitality than its local counterpart. In Northern Catalonia, where language attitudes do indeed function as statistically significant correlates of variation, we see language status

understandably motivating use of supralocal variants. However, this is only the case for two of the four morphosyntactic variables studied (as well as three of the four phonetic variables in Hawkey 2018), and more data is required for these findings to be further consolidated. Nevertheless, language attitude scores are clearly useful as quantifiable manifestations of speaker belief systems that can be subjected to statistical testing in order to rigorously determine the existence of correlations with patterns of language variation. This approach builds on the latest scholarship uniting the fields of variationism and language attitudes, and affords us a greater understanding of the links between attitudes and behaviour.

REFERENCES

- Adger, D. 2017. Structure, use, and syntactic ecology in language obsolescence. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 62.4, 614-638.
- Adger, D. & Trousdale, G. 2007. Variation in English syntax: Theoretical implications. *English Language and Linguistics* 11.2, 261-278.
- Baylac Ferrer, A. 2016. *Le catalan en Catalogne Nord et dans les Pays Catalans: Même pas mort!* Perpignan: Presses Universitaires de Perpignan / Institut Franco-Català Transfronterer.
- Carranza, M. & Ryan, E.B. 1975. Evaluative reactions of bilingual Anglo- and Mexican American adolescents towards speakers of English and Spanish. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 6, 83-104.
- Chambers, J.K. & Trudgill, P. 1980. *Dialectology*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Escudero, J-P. 2004. *Les gitans catalans et leur langue. Une étude réalisée à Perpignan*. Perpignan : Les éditions de la Tour Gile.
- Garrett, P. 2010. *Attitudes to Language*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Gass, R. & Seiter, J. 1999. *Persuasion, Social Influence and Compliance Gaining*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Generalitat de Catalunya, University of Perpignan & Conseil Départemental des Pyrénées-Orientales. 2015. *Coneixements i usos lingüístics a la Catalunya del Nord: Principals resultats de l'Enquesta d'usos lingüístics a la Catalunya del Nord (EULCN) 2015*. Accessed online at <
http://llengua.gencat.cat/web/.content/documents/dadesestudis/altres/arxiu/EULCN_2015_principals_resultats.pdf>, June 2018.

- Giles, H., Mulac, A., Bradac, J.J. & Johnson, P. 1987. Speech accommodation theory. The next decade and beyond. In M.L. McLaughlin (ed.) *Communication Yearbook* 10: 13-48. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Greenwald, A.G., McGhee, D.E. & Schwartz, J.L.K. 1998. Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 74.6, 1464-1480.
- Grenoble, L.A. & Whaley, L.J. 2005. *Saving Languages: An Introduction to Language Revitalization*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Gómez Duran, G. 2016. *Gramàtica del català rossellonès*. Montserrat: Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat.
- Hawkey, J. 2018. *Language Attitudes and Minority Rights: The Case of Catalan in France*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Heylen, K., Tummers, J. & Geeraerts, D. 2008. Methodological issues in corpus-based Cognitive Linguistics. In G. Kristiansen & R. Dirven (eds.) *Cognitive Sociolinguistics: Language Variation, Cultural Models, Social Systems*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 91-128.
- Hornsby, M. 2015. *Revitalizing Minority Languages: New Speakers of Breton, Yiddish and Lemko*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hyrkstedt, I. & Kalaja, P. 1998. Attitudes towards English and its functions in Finland: A discourse-analytic study. *World Englishes* 17, 345-357.
- Jaffe, A. 2015. Defining the new speaker: theoretical perspectives and learner trajectories. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 231: 21-44.
- Johnson, D.E. 2008. Rbrul. Accessed online at <http://www.danielezrajohnson.com/rbrul.html>, June 2018.

- Johnson, D.E. 2009. Getting off the GoldVarb standard: Introducing Rbrul for mixed-effects variable rule analysis. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 3.1, 359-383.
- Kasstan, J. 2019. New speakers and language revitalisation: Arpitan and community (re)formation. In M.A. Harrison & A. Joubert (eds.) *French Language Policies and the Revitalisation of Regional Languages in the 21st Century*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- King, R. 2013. Morphosyntactic variation. In R. Bayley, R. Cameron & C. Lucas (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: OUP, 445-463.
- Kircher, R. 2009. *Language Attitudes in Quebec: A Contemporary Perspective*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Queen Mary, University of London.
- Kircher, R. & Fox, S. 2019. Attitudes towards Multicultural London English: Implications for attitude theory and language planning. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. DOI: 10.1080/01434632.2019.1577869
- Krauss, R.M. & Chiu, C.-Y. 1998. Language and social behaviour. In D. Gilbert, S. Fiske & G. Lindsey (eds.) *Handbook of Social Psychology*. Boston: McGraw-Hill, 41-88.
- Kristiansen, G. & Dirven, R. (eds.) 2008. *Cognitive Sociolinguistics: Language Variation, Cultural Models, Social Systems*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kristiansen, T. & Jørgensen, J. 2005. Subjective factors in dialect convergence and divergence. In P. Auer, F. Hinskens & P. Kerswill (eds.) *Dialect Change:*

Convergence and Divergence in European Languages. Cambridge: CUP, 287-302.

- Kristiansen, T. 2011. Attitudes, ideology and awareness. In R. Wodak, B. Johnstone & P. Kerswill (eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. London: Sage, 265-278.
- Labov, W. 1972a. *Language in the Inner City*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, W. 1972b. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Labov, W. 2001. *Principles of Linguistic Change. Volume 2: Social Factors*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Labov, W. 2007. Transmission and diffusion. *Language* 83.2: 344-387.
- Lambert, W.E., R.C. Hodgson, R.C. Gardner, and S. Fillenbaum. 1960. Evaluational reactions to spoken languages. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 60.1: 44–51.
- Lavandera, B. 1978. Where does the sociolinguistic variable stop? *Language in Society* 7, 171-182.
- Mooney, D. 2016. *Southern Regional French: A Linguistic Analysis of Language and Dialect Contact*. Cambridge: Legenda.
- Mooney, D. & Hawkey, J. Forthcoming. The variable palatal lateral in Occitan and Catalan: Linguistic transfer or regular sound change? *Journal of French Language Studies*.
- O'Rourke, B., Pujolar, J. & Ramallo, F. 2015. New speakers of minority languages: The challenging opportunity – foreword. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 231, 1-20.

- Peytaví Deixona, J. 2016. *El català al nord de Catalunya a principi del segle XXI: Perspectiva històrica de la llengua i realitat lingüística del dialecte*. Barcelona: IEC.
- Potter, J. & Wetherell, M. 1987. *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour*. London: Sage.
- Preston, D. 1989. *Perceptual Dialectology: Nonlinguists' Views of Areal Linguistics*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Rosenberg, M. & Hovland, C. 1960. Cognitive, affective, and behavioural components of attitude. In M. Rosenberg, C. Hovland, W. McGuire, R. Abelson & J. Brehm (eds.) *Attitude Organisation and Change: An Analysis of Consistency among Attitude Components*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Ryan, E.B., Carranza, M. & Moffie, R. 1977. Reactions towards varying degrees of accentedness in the speech of Spanish-English bilinguals. *Language and Speech* 20, 267-273.
- Ryan, E.B., Giles, H. & Sebastian, R.J. 1982. An integrative perspective for the study of attitudes towards language variation. In E.B. Ryan & H. Giles (eds.) *Attitudes towards Language Variation: Social and Applied Contexts*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Sarnoff, I. 1970. Social attitudes and the resolution of motivational conflict. In M. Jahoda and N. Warren (eds.) *Attitudes*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 279-284.

- Soukup, B. 2013. Austrian dialect as a metonymic device: A cognitive sociolinguistic investigation of Speaker Design and its perceptual implications. *Journal of Pragmatics* 52, 72-82.
- Te Huia, A. 2015. Exploring goals and motivations of Māori heritage language learners. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching* 5.4, 609-635.
- Trenchs-Parera, M. & Newman, M. 2015. Language policies, ideologies, and attitudes, Part 2: International immigration, globalization and the future of Catalan. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 9.12, 491-501.
- Weinreich, U., Labov, W. & Herzog, M.I. 1968. Empirical foundations for a theory of language change. In W.P. Lehmann & Y. Malkiel (eds.) *Directions for Historical Linguistics*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 95-195.
- Wheeler, M., Yates, A. & Dols, N. 1999. *Catalan: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Williams, C. 2013. Ysgolion Cymraeg: An act of faith in the future of Welsh. In H.S. Thomas & C. Williams (eds.) *Parents, Personalities and Power: Welsh-medium Schools in South-east Wales*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Woolard, K. 1989. *Double talk: Bilingualism and the Politics of Ethnicity in Catalonia*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

ⁱ The definition in Garrett (2010) is explicitly informed by fifty years of development in the discipline of language attitudes. Initial quantitative approaches (e.g. Lambert *et al.* 1960; Carranza and Ryan 1975; Ryan, Giles and Sebastian 1982) gave way to a social constructionist turn (e.g. Potter and Wetherell 1987; Hyrkstedt and Kalaja 1998) that rejected positivism and favoured the exclusive use of

qualitative methods. Garrett integrates all of this into his approach, reminding us that focusing exclusively on qualitative analyses is ‘overly restrictive’, and that ‘there is much to be gained from taking an open view of research methods and interpretation and to allow approaches that aim at reaching generalisations about community-level phenomena, [since] most of the work conducted into language attitudes [...] has been situated in group-focused empirical work’ (Garrett 2010: 30). It is helpful that Garrett (2010: 34-35) also clearly distinguishes ‘language attitudes’ from ‘language ideologies’, the latter being societally-held constructs that have the potential to influence individual attitudes. While ideologies are commonly held, individuals may orient themselves differently towards them – these different individual stances are attitudes.

ⁱⁱ For a detailed account of language use as a form of social behaviour, cf. Krauss and Chiu (1998).

ⁱⁱⁱ Although Garrett (2010: 25) helpfully reminds us that it seems counterintuitive to talk of the ‘links between attitudes and behaviours’ if behavioural components are contained *within* the notion of attitude.

^{iv} Although it should be noted that methodologically, the current work constitutes a departure from canonical work in cognitive sociolinguistics, which marries usage-based approaches with ‘big data’ by using large corpora to analyse language variation (cf. Heylen *et al.* 2008).

^v For an exhaustive examination of the research context, see Hawkey (2018), Chapter 1.

^{vi} Ascertaining the vitality of obsolescent varieties is a highly complex business, contingent on community size, levels of intergenerational transmission, domains of usage and language attitudes (Grenoble and Whaley 2005: 13). This is further complicated when we take into account that the main way to discern the size of the speech community (at least in this case) is through self-reported speaker competence, which may not reflect community members’ abilities to use the language (either actively or passively).

^{vii} In cases of societal bilingualism and language obsolescence, much work has recently been devoted to ‘new speakers’, defined as individuals ‘with little or no home or community exposure to a minority language but who instead acquire it through immersion or bilingual education programs, revitalization projects or as adult language learners’ (O’Rourke *et al.* 2015: 1). While the category is clearly applicable to minority language situations in France (cf. Kasstan 2019 on Francoprovençal), it should be noted that it is not helpful in the present study, since all participants claimed to have

learned Catalan at a young age from parents or grandparents. As such, there was no clear basis on which to categorise a speaker as ‘new’ or ‘native’, and such a distinction was avoided.

^{viii} The experiment yielded a broad range of data, with only morphosyntactic variation discussed here. For information regarding the ability of language attitudes to function as predictors of phonetic variation, please consult Hawkey (2018) Chapter 4. A further detailed phonetic analysis of data from Northern Catalonia can be found in Mooney & Hawkey (forthcoming).

^{ix} Given that French competence was not widespread in the region until the early twentieth century, there are unique characteristics of Northern Catalan (i.e. not shared by other Catalan varieties) that have been present for centuries and are thus not due to contact with French (or indeed, to recent contact with supralocal forms of Catalan). Where this detail is important, I will discuss ‘traditional’ Northern Catalan, in order to refer to traits that arguably pre-date societal bilingualism with French and are not therefore attributable to contact with French (or with supralocal forms of Catalan).

^x Note that there would be no difference between these two local variants in the third-person singular and third-person plural, due to overlapping paradigms.

^{xi} Question 7 related to Catalan, and question 15 to French. The order of the questions was randomised to avoid the same questions (pertaining to the different languages) appearing consecutively.

^{xii} The (PRET) variants were coded as 1 (extremely local), 2 (moderately local) or 3 (supralocal). The magnitude of the coefficient for *participant age* was moderate (0.023), meaning that for every year of age, the participant score would increase by 0.023. Thus, on this three-point scale, a difference of forty years of age would correspond to a difference of 0.92 points (0.023×40), with older participants scoring higher.

^{xiii} The language competence and attitudinal variables are rated on Likert scales from 1 (no competence / low attitude evaluation) to 5 (high competence / high attitude evaluation). Therefore, this coefficient for *speaks Catalan* (0.459) means that for every one-point increase on the five-point Likert scale, the participant score would increase by 0.459.

^{xiv} Although both (PRET) and (MEU) variables consist of three potential variants on a scale from ‘supralocal’ to ‘extremely local’, they have been treated differently in the analysis. For every (PRET) token, all three variants were theoretically possible, and therefore (PRET) has been analysed as a

continuous variable (on a scale from 1 to 3). However, for (MEU), not all variants were possible for all tokens, since the data contains instances of masculine plural nouns and the ‘moderately local’ variant is contingent on the presence of a subsequent feminine marker ‘-a’/‘-es’. Therefore, while a feminine noun can be realised one of three ways (*la meva X*, *la meua X*, *la meu X*), there are only two options for masculine plural nouns (*els meus X*, *els meu X*). For this reason, ‘moderately local’ and ‘extremely local’ tokens have been coded together as ‘local’, and the variable has been analysed as binary (local/supralocal). Another consequence of treating (MEU) as categorical is that coefficients are expressed as log-odds (cf. Johnson 2009).

^{xv} In the categorical variables (MEU) and (LLUR), one value (either the local or supralocal variant) is chosen as the application value. Positive correlations favour the application value. Therefore, for both variables, positive correlations indicate a preference for the local variant.

^{xvi} It is important to remember that supralocal features can indeed be autochthonous to Northern Catalonia. ‘Supralocal’ is not necessarily the opposite of ‘local’: while local features are only found in Northern Catalonia, supralocal features are those attested throughout the Catalan-speaking world. This could of course include Northern Catalonia.

^{xvii} This not only includes non-native speakers, but also those who acquired the language through one of the few privately run immersion education programmes in the region, such as *La Bressola* or the *Escola Arrels*, i.e. ‘new speakers’ (O’Rourke *et al.* 2015).

^{xviii} Of course, I do not imply that supralocal usage *causes* low solidarity evaluations, since such an argument is circular.