Varieties of Spanish in Contact: Overt Sociolinguistic Views Among Young Western-Andalusians in Madrid
Findings from a Preliminary Study

Valeria Baruzzo
Alma Mater Studiorum – University of Bologna, Italy

Abstract　The Andalusian variety is one of the most recurrently studied in Spanish. However, little research has been made so far to investigate intra-language variation among young and highly-educated Andalusians. Additionally, in approaching the study of intra-linguistic variation, delving into speakers' own views on certain linguistic elements is important to gain a deeper understanding of the beliefs behind their linguistic behaviour. For these reasons, this contribution presents the sociolinguistic views of a group of young and highly-educated Andalusians in a displacement situation, where their less prestigious vernacular variety faces a more prestigious variety, i.e., the one of the capital city of Spain (Madrid).

Keywords　Intra-language variation. Madrid. Andalusia. Language attitudes. Identity.

Summary　1 Introduction. – 1.1 Two Varieties of Peninsular Spanish: Confronting Madrilenian and Western-Andalusian. – 1.2 On *Ceceo*, *Seseo* and Distinction. – 2 Methodology. – 2.1 The Sample. – 3 Analysis: Comments on the Phonetic Data. – 4 Analysis: Comments on the Sociolinguistic Views. – 4.1 Reflections on a (possible) Diglossic Relationship. – 4.2 Perceptions on Spanish Varieties. – 4.3 Final Highlights from an Interviewee. – 5 Open Conclusions and Indications for the Future.

1   Introduction

The present contribution is an extract from a preliminary investigation whose purpose was to investigate the consequences of contact between two diatopic varieties of Peninsular Spanish after an internal migration process. The varieties considered in the study were the Andalusian and the Madrilenian, which receive different types of overt and covert prestige among the Spanish speech community. The investigation focused on a specific group inside the Spanish speech community: highly-educated young Western-Andalusians. The main reason to choose this specific sample was to fill the empirical gap resulting from the limited research conducted on educated speakers with academic studies when exploring the linguistic accommodation of Andalusians migrants in the north-central Spanish regions.

The investigation set out to determine whether the contact between the two varieties produced convergent accommodation towards the Madrilenian variety and the abandonment of Andalusian vernacular traits. The phenomenon chosen for the analysis was the shift from the *ceceo/seseo* variant, which belongs to participants' vernacular variety, and the convergence to the /s/ and /θ/ phonemic split, i.e., the variant of distinction, which is typical of the variety spoken in Madrid and also is associated to the standard pronunciation for these phonemes. In addition to that, the investigation also intended to understand speakers' views and ideas on the effects produced by the contact between the two varieties, altogether with exploring interviewees' attitudes towards the varieties spoken in Spain. This contribution will mainly focus on this latter part of the study, but will also provide some background information and some details on the phonetic analysis in order to contextualise the remarks on sociolinguistic views. The chapter is structured as follows: the first section introduces the theoretical framework chosen to approach the investigation; the second section describes the methodology and the sample whilst the third provides information on the phonetic data, preceding insights on participants' views and attitudes towards their vernacular variety and the one of Madrid in the fourth section; lastly, conclusions and indications for the future are presented.

1.1   Background ideas on language, variety and identity

The approach adopted in this preliminary study consists of a two-fold perspective on the effects produced by language (or variety) contact, that is, on the one hand, its effects on language in the strictest sense; on the other, its impact on the identity of individuals. Concerning the first point of view, i.e. the consequence of contact on

language, I have looked at the manifestation of contact between the two varieties as a phenomenon of 'over-differentiation' (Weinreich 1979, 18). In this case-study, I considered the central-northern variety as the 'primary system', the southwestern variety as the 'secondary system', and the distinction between /s/ and /θ/ as the imposition of phonological distinctions. This type of contact would lead to the creation of new varieties, a process that Zentella (2003) defines as 'trans-dialectalization' (quoted in Moreno Fernández 2013, 83). In the present investigation, this process may be ignited by what Villena Ponsoda (2013, 174) calls 'imposed or improper variation', which is juxtaposed to 'natural or proper variation'. In other words, alternation between forms would not refer to structural reasons, i.e. proper variation, but to intentional ones, i.e. improper variation, meaning that speakers use variants to mark the differences (or similarities) between them and other individuals in the speech community. This leads to considering the second point of view of the investigation, which is the relationship between language contact and identity-related issues. In a displacement situation, linguistic identity is an especially critical factor, since the original language (or variety) can either be a reason for discrimination or facilitate integration within the new community. As Turner and Reynolds (2010) argue, individuals respond to a social mechanism by which people define their identities according to the group to which they (want to) belong. This mechanism can impact the domain of language, because linguistic acts are also acts of identity (Le Page, Tabouret-Keller 1985), both from the point of view of manifestation and construction (Calamai 2015). In this sense, positive or negative attitudes towards the vernacular variety spoken by the displaced person plays a crucial role, as it can determine whether the person will be likely to maintain or abandon one or more features of the original vernacular variety. For all these reasons, I believe that the connecting point of the two perspectives is the well-known process of accommodation, which Gallois, Ogay and Giles (2005, 137) define as:

> the process through which interactants regulate their communication (adopting a particular linguistic code or accent, increasing or decreasing their speech rate, avoiding or increasing eye contact, etc.) in order to appear more like (accommodation) or distinct from each other (non-accommodation).

In the specific case of this investigation, I applied this twofold perspective on the basis of some observations made by Villena Ponsoda (2000). Firstly, that vernacular traits are lost in contact with the national standard because the closer individuals approximate to their national identity, the more willing they are to lose the regional traits of their speech; secondly, that the identification to national values

grows with the levels of education and young people in urban spaces are leaders of linguistic disloyalty. The vernacular traits under observation in this investigation belong to the phonetic level because, as Calamai (2015) argued, phonetic traits are the most exposed levels of language and, as a consequence, the most susceptible to judgments and evaluations, such as expressions of linguistic attitudes.

1.2 Two Varieties of Peninsular Spanish: Confronting Madrilenian and Western-Andalusian

Madrilenian and Western-Andalusian varieties are characterised by different historical, social, political, and cultural peculiarities that contribute to the construction and maintenance of their sociolinguistic status within the linguistic community of Spain. Specifically, the Madrilenian variety receives higher open prestige at the national level because it belongs to the central-northern macro-variety and is therefore associated with the 'exemplar' variety (Moreno Fernández 2006, 79). On the other hand, the Andalusian variety receives the covert prestige inside the regional boundaries – even if attitudes tend to be ambivalent even inside the Andalusian community (Carbonero Cano 2003; Villena Ponsoda 2000).[1] Over the centuries several events contributed to determining these different layers of prestige for the varieties of the linguistic repertoire in Spain. The developments in the twentieth century were especially significant when, on the one side, political actions were taken to centralise both power and language and, on the other, important economic investments were made to convert Madrid into the political, economic, and social center, as it became the destination for many national and international migrants in search of work (Otero Carvajal 2010). At the same time, concerning the Andalusian variety, its position in the Spanish linguistic panorama was influenced by both the linguistic centralisation policy and the regionalist movements that claimed the dignity of the Andalusian heritage, in addition to those that promoted old negative stereotypes about the Andalusians (González 2000). This probably led to the development of ambivalent attitudes towards this variety, both on the part of Andalusians themselves and by other Spaniards, which persist until the present day.

---

[1] To have a broader view of the sociolinguistic attitudes of other Spaniards towards the Andalusian variety, see Yraola 2014.

1.3   On *Ceceo*, *Seseo* and Distinction

Seseo, *ceceo* and distinction are the linguistic phenomena under interest in the present study. They all refer to the pronunciation of sibilants in syllabic onset. For the *seseo* and *ceceo* variants, /s/ and /θ/ are not two distinct phonemes, but two possible realisations of the [s] in onset that can be articulated with *seseant* tone, and thus traceable to /s/, or with *ceceant* tone and thus traceable to /θ/. Therefore, *seseo* is to be understood as the /s/ pronunciation of 'ce, ci, z' and *ceceo* as the /θ/ pronunciation of 's'. Alternatively, sibilants in syllabic onset can be realised by maintaining the phonological opposition of /s/ and /θ/. In this case, /s/ is articulated with [s] and /θ/ with [θ]. This latter realisation corresponds to the 'distinction' variant. I chose to focus on this particular set of traits for several reasons: firstly, because *ceceo* and *seseo* are considered the most characteristic and stereotypical linguistic element of the Andalusian variety and, historically, they are the features used to identify and recognise the Andalusian origin of a person (Narbona Jiménez, Jesús de Bustos 2009); secondly, because it is only in the region of Andalusia where polymorphism between the three possibilities (*ceceo*/*seseo*/distinction) is given;[2] lastly, because *ceceo* and *seseo* are already losing social acceptance within the Andalusian language community (Santana Marrero 2016; Carbonero Cano 2003) and, therefore, it is interesting to see whether, once uprooted from the community of origin, the *ceceo* or *seseo* is maintained, perhaps as a sign of identity attachment, or is abandoned, either due to the tendency of convergence towards the distinction already present in the community of origin, or as a sign of willingness to fit, even linguistically, within the new linguistic community (the one of Madrid, in our case). However, it should be noted that in this research I am considering language variability when Andalusian speakers use the vernacular variety outside its geographical boundaries and it is difficult to foresee whether the return of immigrants to their community of origin will affect somehow the varieties spoken in the region.

---

2 If considering other varieties that are included in the southern macro-variety (*canario*, *murciano*, *extremeño*), in *canario* only *seseo* is given, in *murciano* mainly distinction is given – except for a *seseante* area in Cartagena – and in *extremeño* only distinction is given.

2   Methodology

The study employed a qualitative multi-method approach combining semi-structured interviews and questionnaires. The interviews were conducted face-to-face between November 2019 and January 2020 and had a minimum duration of 20 minutes. However, two intervals were considered for the analysis, one at the beginning (5'-10') and one at the end (15'-20') of the interview, with a total of 10 minutes. This choice is explained by the attempt to explore eventual changes between the initial and final moments of the conversation, due to the likely reduction of tension along the interview. The first minutes of the interview were discarded, because it is assumed that during this time frame individuals feel more uncomfortable and exhibit a higher degree of self-monitoring in their speech. The interviews started with questions by the interviewer on simple, familiar, and possibly emotionally relevant topics (childhood episodes, funny stories, 'strong' experiences such as study mobilities or life in the army). The choice of these subjects had a dual goal: on the one hand, to provide a sufficient amount of conversational material, thereby minimising the interviewer's interventions, on the other hand, to establish an informal register, which is considered the most appropriate to elicit a spontaneous style (Moreno Fernández 2009), although this is never possible in the context of a formal study. The second part of the data collection was carried out through questionnaires on linguistic attitudes. The set of questions was inspired by the PRECAVES-XXI (*Project for the Study of Beliefs and Attitudes towards Varieties of Spanish in the 21st Century*) and LIAS (*Linguistic Identity and Attitudes in Spanish-speaking Latin America*) projects and adapted to the specific aims of the research. The questionnaires addressed two main aspects: collecting opinions regarding the variety of origin and the Madrid variety, as well as finding out beliefs about the regions where participants think the best/worst Spanish is spoken and about the regions where a Spanish they like/dislike is spoken. It consisted of 19 questions: 6 inquired about personal data and information about participants' life in the capital, 9 pertained to the assessment of the two considered varieties, and 4 focused on beliefs about the speech of different regions of Spain. I opted to investigate these topics using this device, rather than relying only on the interviews, to prevent participants from additionally controlling their speech. The questionnaire[3] was made on the Google Form platform and sent to each participant after the conclusion of the interview.

---

[3]   See Appendix.

2.1 The Sample

The sample selected for the study consisted of 10 people, 5 men and 5 women and it is not intended to be statistically representative. To reach participants, the method of network sampling[4] was chosen. The criteria used to select eligible informants were: gender (F-M); aged between 20-35; high level of education or training; exclusive geographical origin in Western Andalusia (Cordoba, Seville, Huelva, Cadiz). In the process of selection of participants, the isoglosses drawn from the *Atlas lingüístico y etnográfico de Andalucía* (Alvar, Llorente, Salvador 1961-73) were taken into account to avoid the enclaves where the distinction between /s/ and /θ/ is already established[5] and thus results as a feature of the vernacular variety. Table 1 summarises the details of the sample:

Table 1 The sample

Participant	Gender	Age	Origin
1	F	25	Puerto Real (Cádiz)
2	M	27	Seville
3	F	28	Línea de la Concepción (Cádiz)
4	M	21	San Pablo de Buceite (Cádiz)
5	M	21	San Pablo de Buceite (Cádiz)
6	F	26	Seville
7	M	25	Puerto Real (Cádiz)
8	F	35	Seville
9	M	26	Rociana del Condado (Huelva)
10	F	26	Córdoba

All participants arrived in Madrid for professional or study-related reasons. Four of them lived in Madrid for more than one year, other four for exactly one year, and finally, two participants lived in the Spanish capital for less than a year. Most of them (6) plan to stay in Madrid for an undefined time, the others (4) for another 2-3 years.

---

4 Sampling began with a couple of participants and then continued with other connections that my first participants referred.

5 During the collection process, I obtained the contact of a person from Cortegana (Huelva) who met all the age and education requirements. However, the person was excluded from the study because he came from an area of the province where the phonological opposition of /s/ and /θ/ is already established as the dominant variant. Taking this into consideration has been crucial, otherwise the results of the analysis would have been completely distorted. As a matter of fact, I would have assessed his case as a convergence towards the Madrilenian variety, while the presence of distinction in his production is purely due to the fact that the variant is part of his vernacular. Therefore, as for this trait, a real strategy of convergence could not have been uncovered.

The number of times per year they return to Andalusia varies between 9-12 times for four people, 5-6 for three of them and 3-4 for the others.

3   Analysis: Comments on the Phonetic Data

As this contribution primarily focuses on the sociolinguistic attitudes of the participants, rather than on the phonetic realisation, I will not dwell on the outcomes of the oral production. Nevertheless, I should share what I believe to be information useful to enhancing the meaningfulness of the second part of my findings. To observe oral productions, interviews firstly underwent a process of manual transliteration. Then, I isolated the words where the syllabic structure contained a sibilant in onset. Subsequently, the segments where /s/ and /θ/ would appear were identified and, finally, I proceeded with the recognition of each phonetic realisation through hearing recognition process. Dubious cases were proof-heard by a native speaker. Acoustic analysis using adequate software, such as PRAAT,[6] was not carried out, as the hearing recognition alone gave satisfactory results considering the aims of the study. However, it is clear that this operational choice might have conveyed a certain degree of subjectivity to the analysis. The total number of detected segments is 2,160. Among these, 1,435 correspond[7] to /s/ and 725 to /θ/. Within the first group (1,435), I found 1359 cases of /s/ realised as [s] and 76 of /s/ realised as [θ]. On the other hand, within the second group (725), I found 720 cases of /θ/ realised as [θ] and 5 where it was produced as [s]. In other words, there were 2,079 cases in which the variant distinction occurred, 76 cases of *ceceo* (/s/ > [θ]) and 5 of *seseo* (/θ/ > [s]). The variant that prevailed in the majority of cases is the distinction, followed by *seseo*, and then by *ceceo*.

Table 2   Occurrences of the variants

Variant	Cases	Total number	%
Distinction	/s/ → [s]	1,359	63%
	/θ/ → [θ]	720	33%
Ceceo	/s/ → [θ]	76	4%
Seseo	/θ/ → [s]	5	0%
Total		2,160	100%

---

6 https://www.fon.hum.uva.nl/praat/.

7 According to what is considered the standard and prestigious pronunciation for these phonemes (Cruz Ortiz 2020).

I used two criteria to interpret the results: firstly, the 'level of integration', which refers to the solution preferred by the speakers, i.e., the one predominantly used in the analysed minutes; secondly, 'the level of confidence' which indicates whether the speaker combined different variants or consistently stuck to a single choice (Santana Marrero 2016, 265-6). Concerning the level of integration, the majority of speakers (9) preferred the distinction variant, while only one participant used *ceceo* as his preference variant. This was evident as, out of his 108 instances of /s/, 73 were realised as [θ] and 35 as [s].

Table 3 Level of integration

L. of integration	N
Predominant use of distinction	9
Predominant use of other variants	1

As for the level of confidence, it is noteworthy that six people only used the distinction variant, while four participants combined two different variants. Specifically, two combined distinction and *ceceo*, while the other two combined distinction and *seseo*.

Table 4 Level of confidence

L. of confidence	N
Use of a single variant	6
Use of multiple variants (alternation)	4

To conclude the general observations, it should be emphasised that within the context of this study, it is not possible to verify whether the speakers were already making the distinction before moving to Madrid. Furthermore, the moment of the interview (initial or final) did not particularly impact the results, since the manifestations of insecurity occurred both in the first and in the last parts of the conversations. The linguistic context also seemed to have little influence, since hesitations were not linked to specific lexemes or lexical categories. This last aspect is demonstrated by the fact that in several occasions the speaker repeated the same word with the *seseante/ceceante* variant or with the distinction.

4   Analysis: Comments on the Sociolinguistic Views

According to Wilton and Stegu (2011), the sociolinguistic views of speakers are a fundamental starting point for any study that is interested in the relationship between language and issues of everyday life in both the public and private spheres. In my study, the collection of sociolinguistic views was intended to complement and support the interpretation of phonetic data which, alone, would have been insufficient given the focus on the relationship between the object of the study and extra-linguistic factors such as identity, social status, prestige, and culture. However, the observations of the overt language attitudes questionnaire turned out to be extremely interesting alone, providing insightful perspectives on the phenomena. In the following paragraphs, some extracts[8] of overt language attitudes of participants are presented.

4.1   Reflections on a (possible) Diglossic Relationship

When asked if they think to speak differently from people in Madrid, all participants answered affirmatively. Given this, the significance of preserving their Andalusian identity through linguistic patterns becomes even more pertinent for seven individuals, although it is worth questioning what 'maintaining the identity' means to them and what features constitute this 'Andalusian identity'. In addition, it should be considered that for some participants this relationship may exist, but might not hold significant importance. In fact, when questioned about the eventual changes in their speech after moving to Madrid, four people reported that they modified some features, five stated that they made no changes, and one participant expressed uncertainty. Among the four people who thought they had modified their speech, two individuals stated that maintaining their original linguistic features to preserve their identity was not necessary, while two stated its necessity. Example (1) is a quote from a participant, who initially dismissed the relevance of the relationship between language and identity and also stated to changing his speech since arriving in Madrid:

(1) F. tiene más acento que yo, pero es porque yo vivo con dos… una de Galicia y una de Extremadura entonces es como que lo pierdo […] yo voy a mi pueblo y estoy un día en mi pueblo y tengo acento de… igual que F., de ceceo y demás con las eses.

F. has more accent than me, but it is because I live with two...
one from Galicia and one from Extremadura so it is like I lose it
[...] I go to my town and after one day I am in my town and I have
an accent... just like F., with a *ceceo* and so on with the 's'. (Au-
thor's transl.)

This statement offers an example where the speaker himself describes
his process of communicative accommodation, which is strongly de-
termined by the communicative context: on one hand, there are non-
Andalusian interlocutors, with whom the participant 'loses' his 'ac-
cent'; on the other, there are his Andalusian family members and
people from his home town, with whom he regains his 'accent', in-
cluding the *ceceo*. From his statement, it is possible to infer that he
actually exerts some self-monitoring when speaking with non-Anda-
lusians interlocutors and avoids the *ceceo*. As a matter of fact, in his
production I have detected 0 cases of *ceceo*. Even more interesting is
that the participant to whom the interviewee refers (F.) comes from
the same town, and is one of the two people combining the variant
of the distinction with the *ceceo*.

The awareness of the use of different varieties according to inter-
locutors is enhanced by participants' answers when asked if they be-
lieved they spoke differently with their Andalusian family or friends.
Almost all of them (9 out of 10) answered affirmatively. Table 5 is a
record of the clarifications they provided when asked on this mat-
ter [tab. 5].

A note of caution is due here, since these statements cannot be
treated as absolute truths. However, they reveal interesting elements
that deserve scrutiny. Firstly, participants define the Spanish spo-
ken in Madrid as 'more neutral', maybe because it is perceived as
closer to the north-central variety which is considered the 'target'
to follow. Secondly, certain patterns emerge from interviewees' an-
swers when they are asked to explain how their speech changes de-
pending on the Madrilenian or Andalusian interlocutor. The following
three topics arose in the majority of answers: differences in accent
and speed, the presence of 'more southern expressions', and the idea
that the change in speaking style happens 'unconsciously', and 'with-
out realising it', as they are adapting to the interlocutor. From my
perspective, these recurrent themes suggest a possible consistency
and, therefore, a shared view on the topic.

Table 5 Differences of speech according to place and/or interlocutors

Participant	Quote (ES)	Quote (EN)
1	En mi caso creo que me 'adapto' más a como hablan ellos	In my case I think I 'adapt' more to the way they speak (Author's transl.)
2	No	No
3	[en Madrid] Más 'lento' y 'pronunciando las s finales'	[in Madrid] 'Slower' and 'pronouncing the final s' (Author's transl.)
4	En ocasiones el propio entorno te 'influye' a la hora de hablar. No es lo mismo hablar con personas desconocidas que con personas con las que tienes más trato, te sientes más cómodo e inmediatamente hablas de forma más 'natural'	Sometimes the surrounding environment 'influences' you when it comes to speaking. It is not the same to speak with strangers as with people with whom you have more contact, you feel more comfortable and immediately speak in a more 'natural' way (Author's transl.)
5	Cambio 'inconscientemente' el 'acento' cuando 'escucho alguien de mi pueblo'	I 'unconsciously' change the 'accent' when 'listening to someone from my town' (Author's transl.)
6	'Sin darme cuenta' tengo un 'acento' más de Madrid que de Sevilla	'Without being aware?' I have an 'accent' more from Madrid than from Seville (Author's transl.)
7	Pues cambia el 'acento y expresiones' propias del sur	Well, there is a change in 'accent and expressions' typical of the south (Author's transl.)
8	Diría que no cambio mucho mi forma de hablar. En todo caso, quizás a veces en Madrid, en ciertos contextos (con no andaluces) siento que tengo incluso 'más acento' o uso incluso 'más expresiones andaluzas' que con mi familia o amigos de Sevilla. Lo que sí puede que cambie un poco es que cuando voy a Sevilla o estoy con Sevillanos-andaluces uso más expresiones 'sevillanas profundas'	I would say that I don't change my way of speaking very much. In any case, maybe sometimes in Madrid, in certain contexts (with non-Andalusians) I feel that I have even 'more accent' or use even 'more Andalusian expressions' than with my family or friends from Seville. What may change a bit is that when I go to Seville or when I am with Andalusians from Seville more 'deep Sevillian' expressions. (Author's transl.)
9	Mayor 'velocidad'	More 'quickly' (Author's transl.)
10	En mi casa tengo el 'acento andaluz muy marcado' y en Madrid es 'más español neutro'	At home I have a 'very strong Andalusian accent' and in Madrid it is 'more neutral Spanish' (Author's transl.)

4.2   Perceptions on Spanish Varieties

Another highly informative section of the questionnaire concerns the answers about the Autonomous Communities (AC) where the best/worst Spanish is spoken, according to speakers' opinion, and where the one they like/dislike is spoken. Each participant was required to indicate one or more ACs for each scenario and explain the reasons for the choice. These questions aimed to unveil how people indirectly value their linguistic variety and whether linguistic stereotypes remain unchanged. In the case of these questions, not only the answers but also their absence was considered relevant. Indeed, the act of not answering the questions that required an open judgment on a specific variety suggests how important and sensitive the topic is for the linguistic community under consideration.

Table 6 Regions whose variety participants like

Region/city	N° quotes
Galicia	3
Andalusia	3
Valencian Community	2
Canary Islands	2
Extremadura	1

Out of all the participants, only one person did not indicate any preference, whereas another mentioned more ACs (Galicia, Extremadura and Andalusia). The justifications behind the responses were quite consistent, with most participants referring mainly to the 'pleasant intonation' of the chosen variety. Andalusian variety, in particular, was appreciated for being 'richer, more comfortable' and 'playable'.

Table 7 Regions whose variety participants do not like

Region/city	N° quotes
Catalonia	2
Murcia	2
Andalusia (Western Andalusia)	2 (1)
Galicia	1
Castile and León	1

In this case, two people preferred not to indicate any AC and it is highly likely that one of those who answered 'Andalusia' did not read the question carefully, since her justification was "tenemos mucha variedad y mucho arte" (we have a great variety and much art; Author's transl.), which is undoubtedly positive. Moreover, she included herself in the group, by using the verb inflection of 1-person plural,

and, therefore, an open criticism of her own speech seems implausible. The justifications of disliking certain varieties, given by interviewees pertain to intonation, to some phono-morphological phenomena. For instance, "no me gusta la forma de hablar de Andalucía oriental, abren las vocales" (I do not like the way of speaking in eastern Andalusia, they open the vowels; Author's transl.). However, cacophony is hardly a true justification for determining the appreciation or dislike for a particular linguistic variety. This is demonstrated by the fact that the participants who 'criticised' the Catalonian accent did so because of "la influencia del catalán le da un acento raro" (Catalan's influence gives it an odd sounding; Author's transl.) and because "lo mezclan mucho con su idioma y no suena bien" (they mix it too much with their own language and it doesn't sound good; Author's transl.). Thus, they based their judgment on extra-linguistic factors or at least factors beyond the specific variety, since a judgment on Spanish is justified through the contact with another language (Catalan). It seems that socio-political factors may be more influential than linguistic ones, also because if the influence of another official language in the region was adopted as a criterion for 'dislike', it would not be explained why Galicia and Valencian Community – which are AC where a local language is spoken together with Spanish – were appreciated in answers to the first question.

Table 8 Regions whose variety participants think is the best

Region/city	N° quotes
Castile and León / Valladolid	4
Malaga	1

What stands out in this case is that half (5 out of 10) of participants preferred not to indicate any region, stating that "en cada zona se dicen unas palabras u otras o un acento u otro, pero al final el hablar bien depende de personas no de la zona donde sean" (in each area there are different words and different accents, but speaking well ultimately depends on people, and not on the area where they find themselves; Author's transl.), they also emphasised that "hablar 'bien' o 'mal' no es una cuestión de la zona que se considere" (speaking 'well' or 'badly' is not a question of the area considered; Author's transl.), and that "no existe un 'mejor español', solo variedades" (there is no 'better Spanish', only varieties; Author's transl.). One participant who indicated Malaga justified his choice by stating that "se entiende bien y no tienen ceceos ni seseos" (it is easy to understand and there are no *ceceos* or *seseos*; Author's transl.). On the other hand, those who indicated the areas of Castile and León argued that in that area the pronunciation was more correct: "pronuncian

bien" (they have a good pronunciation; Author's transl.), "son más correctos en la pronunciación" (they are more correct in pronunciation; Author's transl.), and "pronuncian muy bien todas las palabras" (they pronounce all the words very well; Author's transl.). They also mentioned that the grammatical rules were respected, and there was no accent. It is noteworthy that, as in the case of the responses about the most liked Spanish, the justifications mainly refer to the phonetic level. However, it is not a matter of 'intonation', which is more related to melody – something sweet and pleasant – and was often attributed to the Andalusian variety. Instead, the respondents focus on 'pronunciation', which is closely linked to the respect of grammatical rules and linguistic norm.

Table 9   Regions whose variety participants think is the worst

Region/city	N° quotes
Community of Madrid	3
Catalonia/Valencia	3
Murcia	1

Finally, four people preferred not to answer this last question, while two participants indicated two ACs each, namely Valencian Community and Catalonia, and Madrid and Catalonia, respectively. The motivations refer to grammatical aspects (*dequeísmos* and *laísmos*), as well as spelling 'mistakes', which were influenced once again by Catalan. Furthermore, interesting are also the reasons that explain the views about the speech of Madrid, considered 'worse' also because of "la mezcla de acentos y cambios lingüísticos" (the mixture of accents and linguistic changes; Author's transl.) and its "acento cerrado" (closed accent; Author's transl.).

4.3   Final Highlights from an Interviewee

As a final remark, I present an extract from an interview that outstandingly summarises all concepts explored so far. The interviewee spontaneously offered this reflection, which can be considered especially meaningful not only for its spontaneity but also for touching all the key issues that emerged in the study.

(2) Yo por ejemplo no ceceo, la gente de mi pueblo cecea mucho […] mi compañera de piso es del mismo pueblo y yo la escucho hablar y ella me escucha hablar y ella cecea más que yo. A lo mejor si me cabreo algún ceceo sí qué suelto, pero normalmente como estoy hablando contigo no lo suelto. Luego soy una persona que se les pegan muy los acentos, pero al parecer no pasa con este de

Madrid. Cuando estaba en Granada y volvía a casa mis padres se burlaban de mí porque hablaba granadino. Al principio sí que se me pegaba el de Madrid per cuando llegaba a casa se reían de mí porque hablaba muy fino, con las eses. Sí que es verdad que aquí cuando estoy hablando con gente de aquí intento hablar con las eses ultimas para que me entiendan y hablar lo más lento posible […]. También es verdad que intento que no se me pegue el acento porque el acento que tengo no creo que sea feo, que ya que estoy en Madrid que por lo menos llevarme algo de mi tierra, no tengo a mis padres, no tengo a nadie. Antes me sentía rara porque parecía que la que hablaba mal era yo. Y no. No es que hablemos mal. Es acento y punto.

I, for example, do not use 'ceceo'. People from my town largely use it […] my roommate is from my village and I hear her speaking, she hears me speaking, and she use 'ceceo' much more than I do. Maybe when I get angry, I release some 'ceceo', but in ordinary situation, like now talking to you, I don't. I am a person who is very affected by accents, but apparently it doesn't happen with this one from Madrid. When I was in Granada and returned home my parents made fun of me because I used to speak Granadino. At the beginning I did catch the Madrid accent, but when I got home my family laughed at me because I spoke very posh, with the 'eses'. It is true that when I am talking to people from here I try to speak with the last 's' so that they understand me and speak as slowly as possible […]. It is also true that I try not to catch the accent because I don't think the accent I have is ugly. Since I am in Madrid I should at least keep something of my homeland: I don't have my parents here, I don't have anyone. In the past, I used to feel uncomfortable because it seemed that I was the one who spoke poorly. But no. It is not that I speak poorly. It is just an accent, that is all. (Author's transl.)

This excerpt is quite revealing on several grounds. Firstly, the interviewee provides a perfect example of divergent accommodation, when she says "como estoy hablando contigo no lo suelto" (as I am talking to you, I don't let it go: Author's transl.) referring to the vernacular variant under study. In other words, she indicates that the vernacular trait is part of her repertoire, but she consciously avoids using it during controlled speech, especially when conversing with someone not from her village. It is highly probable that the vernacular trait belongs to her repertoire because she states that her roommate, who is from the same village, produces it 'more' than she does. Moreover, she declares that when she is angry, she "lets [the vernacular] go". This not only confirms the presence of the trait in her repertoire but also reveals that the shift to the distinction – which was

the only choice found and analysed in her oral production – is a consequence of a controlled process. When she loses "control", she reverts to using the vernacular. Another core issue coming from this spontaneous declaration is the conflict of identity related to language use and accent. The interviewee states that "accents normally 'stick' to her", as the experience in Granada shows. During this time, her family made fun of her for having lost her original accent[9] and for speaking with 's'.[10] A similar situation occurred after her displacement to Madrid, where she adopted the local accent which her family did not like. So, she dropped it and came to the realisation that she does not even want to adopt the accent from Madrid because, while being alone there, she wants "por lo menos llevarme algo de mi tierra" (at very least carry something from my homeland). Finally, she says to have realised that her way of speaking is not worse than others'. It is just a different accent, and that distinction does not hold any significance.

5 Open Conclusions and Indications for the Future

The objective of this chapter was to illustrate some examples of the sociolinguistic views collected in the context of a broader study, which aimed at investigating the possible communicative accommodation towards the Madrid variety and the consequent abandonment of certain vernacular traits. The core assumption underlying this inquiry was that, within the realm of intra-linguistic variation, delving into speakers' views on certain linguistic elements is not only important but also intriguing. The examples presented here allow to draw the following final observations. Firstly, it is evident that individuals maintain a positive attitude towards their original context, emphasising the importance of preserving their way of speaking to uphold their sense of belonging to the Andalusian community. Secondly, participants are aware of speaking differently from individuals in Madrid, and some of them acknowledge (or believe) that they have modified certain elements of their original variety. What confirms the intuition of these speakers, even those who believe they have not altered anything, is the recognition of having a different linguistic behaviour when returning home or speaking with Andalusian family and friends. In this regard, one could argue for the existence of a diglossic relationship for these speakers between the

---

9 She is from the province of Cádiz.

10 One can infer that the family was claiming that, maybe, she was not using /θ/ anymore, together with other manifestations of the /s/ where normally it does not occur in the southern varieties.

Andalusian and Madrid varieties, strongly influenced by location and interlocutors. Furthermore, linguistic stereotypes prevalent in the Spanish linguistic community are pronounced, particularly regarding the 'preferred' variety identified by those who chose to respond with the central-northern variety. The relevance of linguistic judgments formulated based on extra-linguistic factors is noteworthy, as evidenced by negative judgments about the variety spoken in Catalonia, disparaged for Catalan influences. Lastly, it is interesting to note how certain historical stereotypes towards the Andalusian variety are maintained even in this small sample, as participants attribute to the Andalusian variety the traditional characteristics of being playful, light, and entertaining. All of this is relevant if one also observes the fact that, firstly, this preliminary study shows a general trend towards the loss of the vernacular trait (*ceceo*/*seseo*) and secondly, these traits – altogether with broader accent-related issues – are quoted as being 'negative' or at least 'under observation' when interviewees self-evaluate their variety and speaking habits. However, in my opinion, the most poignant observation is that the shift from the vernacular identity to the one of the new place – expressed both in terms of sociolinguistic views and linguistic behaviour – appears to be rather fluid, dynamic and strongly related to internal and external circumstances of the individuals. To conclude, I am aware that the small number of informants and the foreign origin of the interviewer are substantive limits to the generalizability of the speakers' responses. As such, this preliminary work means to serve only as a starting point to explore new perspectives on the study of sociolinguistic accommodation in groups such as young university students/workers as well as on the intricate relationship between language and identity.

Acknowledgments

Appendix 1

Questionnaire – Spanish version (original)

1. Nombre

2. ¿Cuánto tiempo llevas en Madrid?

3. ¿Hasta cuándo piensas quedarte en Madrid?

4. ¿Has vivido en otros sitios antes de mudarte a Madrid?

5. ¿Cuántas veces vuelves a tu casa al año (aproximadamente)?

6. Tienes más amistades con personas…
  ☐ De Madrid
  ☐ De otras procedencias geográficas

7. En tu opinión, el andaluz (o las hablas andaluzas) es (son)
  ☐ Una lengua
  ☐ Un dialecto

8. Hablas…
  ☐ Español
  ☐ Castellano
  ☐ Andaluz
  ☐ Otro…

9. ¿Piensas que la forma de vida de los madrileños es más interesante que la de los andaluces?
  ☐ Sí
  ☐ Tal vez sí
  ☐ Tal vez no
  ☐ No

10. ¿Piensas que mantener tu forma de hablar es necesario para mantener tu identidad andaluza?
  ☐ Sí
  ☐ Tal vez sí
  ☐ Tal vez no
  ☐ No

11. ¿Has cambiado tu forma de hablar desde tu llegada a Madrid?
  ☐ Sí
  ☐ Tal vez sí
  ☐ Tal vez no
  ☐ No

12. Cuando hablas con tu familia o tus amigos andaluces, ¿hablas de manera diferente con respeto a cuando hablas con los madrileños? En caso de respuesta afirmativa, ¿podrías explicar en qué términos es 'diferente'?

13. ¿Piensas que tu forma de hablar es distinta que la de los madrileños?
  ☐ Sí
  ☐ Tal vez sí
  ☐ Tal vez no
  ☐ No

14. Nombra una comunidad autónoma de España, si hay, donde te gusta el español que se habla.
Motiva la respuesta

15. Nombra una comunidad autónoma de España, si hay, donde se habla el mejor español.
Motiva la respuesta

16. Nombra una comunidad autónoma de España, si hay, donde no te gusta el español que se habla.
Motiva la respuesta

17. Nombra una comunidad autónoma de España, si hay, donde se habla el peor español.
Motiva la respuesta

18. ¿Cómo valoras el habla de Madrid?
Agradable(totalmente) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (para nada)
Bonita(totalmente) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (para nada)
Cercana(totalmente) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (para nada)
Divertida(totalmente) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (para nada)
Sencilla(totalmente) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (para nada)
Cortés(totalmente) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (para nada)
Blanda(totalmente) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (para nada)
Suave(totalmente) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (para nada)
Variada(totalmente) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (para nada)
Clara (totalmente) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (para nada)
Rápida(totalmente) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (para nada)
Urbana(totalmente) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (para nada)

19. ¿Cómo valoras el habla de tu ciudad de origen?
Agradable(totalmente) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (para nada)
Bonita(totalmente) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (para nada)
Cercana(totalmente) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (para nada)
Divertida(totalmente) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (para nada)
Sencilla(totalmente) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (para nada)
Cortés(totalmente) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (para nada)
Blanda(totalmente) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (para nada)
Suave(totalmente) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (para nada)
Variada(totalmente) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (para nada)
Clara (totalmente) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (para nada)
Rápida(totalmente) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (para nada)
Urbana(totalmente) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (para nada)

Appendix 2

Questionnaire – English version

1. Name

2. How long have you been in Madrid?

3. Until when do you plan to stay in Madrid?

4. Have you lived in other places before moving to Madrid?

5. How many times do you go back home per year (approximately)?

6. Do you have more friendships with people…
☐ From Madrid
☐ From other places

7. In your opinion, is the Andalusian variety (or the Andalusian varieties)
☐ A language
☐ A dialect

8. Which language(s) do you speak?
☐ Spanish
☐ Castilian
☐ Andalusian
☐ Other

9. Do you think that the way of life of people in Madrid is more interesting than that of Andalusians?
☐ Yes
☐ Maybe yes
☐ Maybe not
☐ No

10. Do you think that maintaining your way of speaking is necessary to preserve your Andalusian identity?
☐ Yes
☐ Maybe yes
☐ Maybe not
☐ No

11. Have you changed your way of speaking since you arrived in Madrid?
☐ Yes
☐ Maybe yes
☐ Maybe not
☐ No

12. When you talk with your family or friends from Andalusia, do you speak differently compared to when you talk with people from Madrid? If yes, could you explain in what terms it is 'different'?

13. Do you think that your way of speaking is different from that of people from Madrid?
☐ Yes
☐ Maybe yes
☐ Maybe not
☐ No

14. Name one autonomous community in Spain, if any, where you like the Spanish spoken. Please explain your answer.

15. Name one autonomous community in Spain, if any, where the best Spanish is spoken. Please explain your answer.

16. Name one autonomous community in Spain, if any, where you do not like the Spanish spoken. Please explain your answer.

17. Name one autonomous community in Spain, if any, where the worst Spanish is spoken. Please explain your answer.

18. How would you evaluate the speech of Madrid?
Pleasant (completely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (nothing at all)
Beautiful (completely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (nothing at all)
Approachable (completely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (nothing at all)
Fun (completely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (nothing at all)
Simple (completely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (nothing at all)
Polite (completely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (nothing at all)
Soft (completely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (nothing at all)
Smooth (completely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (nothing at all)
Varied (completely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (nothing at all)
Clear (completely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (nothing at all)
Fast (completely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (nothing at all)
Urban (completely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (nothing at all)

19. How would you evaluate the speech of your hometown?
Pleasant (completely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (nothing at all)
Beautiful (completely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (nothing at all)
Approachable (completely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (nothing at all)
Fun (completely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (nothing at all)
Simple (completely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (nothing at all)
Polite (completely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (nothing at all)
Soft (completely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (nothing at all)
Smooth (completely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (nothing at all)
Varied (completely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (nothing at all)
Clear (completely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (nothing at all)
Fast (completely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (nothing at all)
Urban (completely) 1 2 3 4 5 6 (nothing at all)

Bibliography

Alvar, M.; Llorente, A.; Salvador, G. (1961-73). *Atlas lingüístico y etnográfico de Andalucía*. Granada: Universidad de Granada /CSIC.

Calamai, S. (2015). *Introduzione alla sociofonetica*. Roma: Carocci editore.

Carbonero Cano, P. (2003). *Estudios de sociolingüística andaluza*. Sevilla: Universidad De Sevilla, Secretariado De Publicaciones.

Cruz Ortiz, R (2020). "Seseo, ceceo y distinción de /s/ y /Ɵ/ - seseo, ceceo and the distinction between /s/ and /Ɵ/: el caso de los políticos andaluces en Madrid". *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*, 68(1), 137-74. `https://doi.org/10.24201/nrfh.v68i1.3585`.

Gallois, C.; Ogay, T.; Giles, H. (2005). "Communication Accommodation Theory. A Look Back and a Look Ahead". Gudykunst, W.B. (ed.), *Theorizing About Intercultural Communication*. SAGE Publications, 121-48.

González, F.B.D.A. (2000), "Los andaluces en busca de su identidad". Bossong, G.; González, F.B.D.A. (eds.), *Identidades lingüísticas en la España autonómica*. Iberoamericana Editorial Vervuert, 151-86. `https://doi.org/10.31819/9783865278456-008`.

Le Page, R.; Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985). *Acts of Identity: Creole-Based Approaches to Language and Ethnicity*. Cambridge: CUP. `https://doi.org/10.1017/s0047404500000403`.

Moreno Fernández, F. (2006). "Los modelos de lengua. Del castellano al panhispanismo". Cestero Mancera, A.M. (ed. lit), *Lingüística aplicada a la enseñanza de español como lengua extranjera: desarrollos recientes*. Universidad de Alcalá, 75-94.

Moreno Fernández, F. (2009). *Principios de sociolingüística y sociología del lenguaje*. Barcelona: Ariel.

Moreno Fernández, F. (2013). "Lingüística y migraciones hispánicas". *Lengua y Migración*, 5(2), 67-89.

Narbona Jiménez, A.; Jesús De Bustos, J. (2009). *La identidad lingüística de Andalucía*. Sevilla: Fundación Centro De Estudios Andaluces.

Otero Carvajal, L. (2010). "Madrid, de capital a metrópoli". *Sociedad y espacio urbano de Madrid en el siglo XX*. Ayuntamiento de Madrid, 10-33.

Santana Marrero, J. (2016). "Seseo, ceceo y distinción en el sociolecto alto de la ciudad de Sevilla: nuevos datos a partir de los materiales de PRESEEA". *Boletín De Filología*, 51, 255-80. `https://doi.org/10.4067/s0718-93032016000200010`.

Turner, J.; Reynolds, K.J. (2010). "The Story of Social Identity". Postmes, T.; Branscombe, N. (eds.), *Rediscovering Social Identity: Key Readings*. New York: Psychology Press, Taylor & Francis, 13-32.

Villena Ponsoda, J.A. (2000). "Identidad y variación linguistica: prestigio nacional y lealtad vernacular en el español hablado en Andalucía". Bossong G.; Báez de Aguilar González, F. (eds.), *Identidades lingüísticas en la España autonómica*. Frankfurt a. M.; Madrid: Vervuert Verlagsgesellschaft, 107-50. `https://doi.org/10.31819/9783865278456-007`.

Villena Ponsoda, J.A. (2013). "Actos de Identidad. ¿Por qué persiste el uso de los rasgos lingüísticos de bajo prestigio social? Divergencia geográfica y social en el español urbano de Andalucía". Guillén, S.; Millán, G. (eds.), *Sociolingüística andaluza. Estudios descriptivos y aplicados sobre el Andaluz*. Sevilla: Secretariado de publicaciones de la Universidad de Sevilla, 173-208.

Weinreich, U. (1979). *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, Inc. `https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110802177`.

Wilton, A.; Stegu, M. (2011). "Bringing the 'folk' into Applied Linguistics". *AILA Review*, 24, 1-14. `https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.24.01wil`.

Yraola, A. (2014). "Actitudes lingüísticas en España". Chiquito, A.B.; Quesada Pacheco, M.A. (eds.), *Actitudes lingüísticas de los hispanohablantes hacia el idioma español y sus variantes*, 5, Bergen Language and Linguistic Studies (BeLLS), 552-636. `https://doi.org/10.15845/bells.v5i0.685`.

Zentella, A.C. (2003). "Spanish in New York", García O.; J.A. Fishman J.A. (eds.), *The Multilingual Apple. Languages in New York City*, (2002). 2nd ed., Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 167-201. `https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110885811.167`.