

ENTREVISTA COM O SOCIOLINGUISTA JUAN MANUEL HERNÁNDEZ-CAMPOY

ENTREVISTA AL SOCIOLINGÜISTA JUAN MANUEL HERNÁNDEZ-CAMPOY

INTERVIEW WITH SOCIOLINGUIST JUAN MANUEL HERNÁNDEZ-CAMPOY

Egisvanda Isys de Almeida SANDES¹
Antonio MANJÓN-CABEZA CRUZ²
Elena Fernández de MOLINA ORTÉS³

RESUMO: Trata-se da entrevista que Sandes, Manjón-Cabeza Cruz e Molina Ortés fazem com o importante sociolinguista de âmbito anglo-saxão, Juan Manuel Hernández-Campoy. Sua pesquisa inclui a sociolinguística, dialetologia e história da língua inglesa, especialmente sobre a mudança e a variação linguística, áreas nas quais possui uma vasta publicação. Na entrevista, Hernández-Campoy trata de diversos aspectos como seu início como pesquisador, sua linha investigativa, questões relativas às áreas com as quais trabalha, inclusive o intercâmbio com outros pesquisadores de língua inglesa, controvérsias e coincidências nas discussões entre autores, bem como sobre a importância da sociolinguística para o ensino de línguas.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Juan Manuel Hernández-Campoy. Entrevista. Sociolinguística e ensino de línguas.

RESUMEN: *Se trata de la entrevista de Sandes, Manjón-Cabeza Cruz y Molina Ortés al importante sociolingüista anglosajón, Juan Manuel Hernández-Campoy. Su investigación incluye sociolingüística, dialectología e historia del idioma inglés, especialmente sobre el cambio y la variación lingüística, áreas en las que tiene una amplia gama de publicaciones. En la entrevista, Hernández-Campoy aborda varios aspectos, como su inicio como investigador, su línea de investigación, cuestiones relacionadas con las áreas con las que trabaja, incluidos los intercambios con otros investigadores de habla inglesa, controversias y coincidencias en las discusiones entre autores, así como sobre la importancia de la sociolingüística para la enseñanza de lenguas.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Juan Manuel Hernández-Campoy. Entrevista. Sociolingüística y enseñan.*

¹ São Paulo State University (UNESP), Araraquara – SP – Brazil. Professor at the Department of Languages. Post-doctorate by University of Granada (UGR) and National Distance Education University (UNED). ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3824-146X>. E-mail: egisvanda.sandes@unesp.br

² University of Granada (UGR), Granada - Spain. Professor at the Spanish Language Department, Faculty of Philosophy and Literature. ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2112-3793>. E-mail: amanjoncabeza@ugr.es

³ University of Granada (UGR), Granada - Spain. Professor and doctor at the Spanish Language Department, Faculty of Philosophy and Letters. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9907-7985>. E-mail: efortes@ugr.es

ABSTRACT: *This is the interview that Sandes, Manjón-Cabeza Cruz and Molina Ortés do with the important Anglo-Saxon sociolinguist, Juan Manuel Hernández-Campoy. His research includes sociolinguistics, dialectology and history of the English language, especially on linguistic change and variation, areas in which he has a wide range of publications. In the interview, Hernández-Campoy discusses several aspects, such as his beginning as a researcher, his investigative line, issues related to the areas with which he works, including exchanges with other English-speaking researchers, controversies and coincidences in discussions between authors, as well as about the importance of sociolinguistics for language teaching.*

KEYWORDS: *Juan Manuel Hernández-Campoy. Interview. Sociolinguistics and language teaching*

Introduction

Juan Manuel Hernández-Campoy⁴ is a professor of Sociolinguistics at the Department of English Philosophy of the University of Murcia, where he teaches the subjects of English Sociolinguistics, Varieties of English and History of the English Language at the undergraduate level, as well as Methods and Research Lines in Sociolinguistics at the graduate level. Similarly, his research interests includes sociolinguistics, dialectology and history of the English language, with special interest in change and linguistic variation and style, having published extensively books such as *Sociolinguistic Styles* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2016), *Style-Shifting in Public* (John Benjamins; con J.A. Cutillas-Espinosa, 2012), *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics* (Wiley-Blackwell; con J.C. Conde-Silvestre, 2012), *Diccionario de Sociolingüística* (Gredos; con P. Trudgill, 2007), *Metodología de la Investigación Sociolingüística* (Comares; con M. Almeida, 2005), *Sociolinguistics and the History of English: Perspectives and Problems* (EditUM; con J.C. Conde-Silvestre, 2005), *Geolingüística* (EditUM; 1999), *Variation and Linguistic Change in English: Synchronic and Diachronic Studies* (EditUM; con J.C. Conde-Silvestre, 1999), o *Sociolingüística Británica* (Octaedro; 1993), and numerous papers in scientific journals such as *Language Variation & Change*, *Language in Society*, *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *Folia Linguistica Historica*, *Neophilologie Mitteilungen*, *Folia Linguistica*, *Journal of Historical Sociolinguistics*, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *Atlantis*, *Language & Communication*, *Sociolinguistic Studies*, *Multilingua*, *Language Awareness*, o *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada*, among others. Currently

⁴ Web page: <http://webs.um.es/jmcampoy/>. E-mail: jmcampoy@um.es

he is a member of the Research Group E020-13 (Linguistic Variation: Phonetics, Lexicon and Style) of the University of Murcia.

Professor, we thank you very much for your participation in this interview and we would like to know a little bit about your work on the subject developed in this issue.

Interview

1. At what moment of your studies did you have contact with sociolinguistics?

*Sociolinguistics was not studied until the last year of the course, initially I used to love Syntax, to be able to unveil complex orational structures and formulate its visualization from syntactic trees, are like our Mathematics. I was thinking of elaborating a graduation paper on contrastive syntax between Spanish and English that would be oriented by Professor José María Jiménez Cano at the University of Murcia, from which I started collecting bibliographical material during my fourth year (1989-1990) at the University of Salford, but that's where the plan remained unfulfilled, when Sociolinguistics came on the scene. It was when I arrived at the fifth year (1990-1991) that I experienced Sociolinguistics, as a great privilege, in the hand of Professor Peter Trudgill during my stay at the University of Essex within the framework of the then incipient Erasmus Programme. After the first week of classes with Professor Trudgill at Essex, I talked with Professor Jiménez Cano to communicate that I was enjoying Sociolinguistics and the work of Peter Trudgill and then we decided to make a radical change in my work and dedicate ourselves to studying the work, taking advantage of the fact that I was with him to be able to get his work - which he kindly provided me without knowing it could be worth it. I wanted to finish my last year in 1991 to dedicate myself to the work, which I completed in May 1992, entitled *British Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to the Work of Professor Peter Trudgill*.*

2. Which professor(s) guided you to it?

I started to hear something about Sociolinguistics in 1990 when I planned the Erasmus exchange for that year at the University of Essex. Examining the teaching offer of this British institution with Dr. Jiménez Cano and meeting LG432 Sociolinguistics, he did not hesitate to recommend that I should study there, together with LG453 Varieties of English, both taught by Peter Trudgill, a recommendation that also made my tutor Erasmus, Professor

Rafael Monroy Casas, whom I had met at Reading University. At that moment I had no idea what this subject was about.

3. What were the readings that substantiated your trajectory?

*In addition to Professor Trudgill's absolutely magnificent master classes, where all his immense knowledge and enthusiasm for this subject was conveyed, the reading that marked me was his famous short manual *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society* (Penguin, 1974) in its 1983 revised edition, which is still being used for this subject in many universities and which already has four editions, expanded revisions, more than 17 reprints and has been translated into languages such as Swedish, Japanese, Korean and Malay. I have worked on a translation into Spanish but have not continued to do so. Also important were the books *Dialectology* (Cambridge University Press, 1980, published with Jack K. Chambers), which was translated into Spanish in 1994 (Visor Libros, 1994), *On Dialect: Social and Geographical Perspectives* (Blackwell, 1983) and *Dialects in Contact* (Blackwell, 1986). Besides Trudgill, he also used *Sociolinguistics* (Cambridge University Press, 1980) by Richard Hudson (also with Spanish version then: Anagrama, 1981). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (Blackwell, 1986) by Ronald Wardhaugh, *Sociolinguistic Theory* (Blackwell, 1995) by Jack K. Chambers and some others and, of course, in Spanish *Variación y Meaning* (Hachette, 1984) by Beatriz Lavandera, *Sociolinguistics: Teoría y Análisis* (Alhambra, 1989) by Carmen Silva-Corvalán, *Sociolinguistics* (Gredos, 1989) by Humberto López Morales, and, of course, *Sociolinguistics Methodology* (Gredos, 1990) by our Francisco Moreno Fernández.*

4. From your first researches, what do you remember with special affection or aversion?

*From my first researches, I remember with special affection those works in which I tried to reflect on Sociolinguistics, such as those published in ELUA (1993), RESLA (1994), or RAEFI (1999), although retrospectively I now see them a bit simple. I took great advantage of the writing of my work on the work of Trudgill, although I took less advantage of its translation into Spanish - it was horrible to translate oneself - to publish as *Sociolinguistics Britannica: Introducción a las Obra de Peter Trudgill* (Octaedro, 1993). Also special was the research developed for the writing of the doctoral thesis applying Trudgill's models of geolinguistic gravity.*

5. Are there sociolinguistic journals in Spain or in Hispanic-America? If so, which ones do you believe have a more innovative, interesting or globalized trajectory?

*Unfortunately, Sociolinguistics journals do not predominate in Spain, in the same way that Sociolinguistics is not as practiced in the Peninsula as it is in the Anglo-Saxon world and even in Latin America. The journal *Estudios de Sociolingüística* at the University of Vigo began in early 2000, edited by Xoán Paulo Rodríguez-Yáñez, Anxo Lorenzo Suárez and Fernando Ramallo, whose dedication and dedication we will never know how to thank, but the Anglo-Saxon world finally swallowed it - because of the impact - having to switch to *Sociolinguistic Studies*, which now publishes Equinox Publishing since 2007, although fortunately with the same publishers and maintaining its editorial policy, promoting sociolinguistic research on Portuguese, Galician, Catalan or Basque Spanish. We also have *Spanish in Context*, published by John Benjamins since 2004, initially edited by Rosina Márquez Reiter, Ofelia García and Ricardo Otheguy, and now by Kim Potowsky, Francisco Moreno Fernández, Patricia Bou-Franch, and follows Rosina Márquez Reiter, to whom we have to thank for her dedication in promoting Hispanic sociolinguistics. But apart from these two, which I believe are very good, I have no knowledge of others, unfortunately. In this sense, the offer in the Anglo-Saxon world is admirable and complex.*

6. How have you developed your research in sociolinguistics and what evolution has your investigative trajectory had in this field?

I have practiced different directions within the spectrum of language and society. After my initiation reflecting on Sociolinguistics, I went deeper into the Geolinguistics line for my doctoral thesis. Thus, mobilized by my professional scope in the English Philology class, I have also carried out works defending the incorporation of a sociolinguistic perspective in foreign language teaching and intercultural communication, or of anthropolinguistics to understand fads, and applied sociolinguistics. Then, with my colleague Juan Camilo Conde, we have worked extensively on historical sociolinguistics, encouraged by our teaching in English Language History, having produced prolifically in this socio-historical direction. Motivated by my homeland, although in an amateur way, for not being from my area of knowledge, I also researched Murcian dialect from sociolinguistic, geolinguistic and social psychology approaches to language (attitudes), which I liked a lot, even though I was wrongly identified as a Hispanist. With my colleague Juan Antonio Cutillas, I have researched intensely the stylistic variation and theoretical models developed, and the need for historical

forensic sociolinguistics to uncover manuscript authorship when dictating. I have enjoyed and searched a lot for team work with several colleagues, such as Juan Villena Ponsoda, Manuel Almeida, Dagmar Scheu, Rafael Monroy Casas, José Antonio Mompeán, José María Jiménez Cano, Natalie Schilling, Francisco Gutiérrez Díez, Elena Fernández de Molina Ortés, Tamara García Vidal, Manuel Díaz-Campos or David Britain, besides the mentioned Juan Camilo Conde and Juan Antonio Cutillas. The publications that have emerged from working together have always been the most comforting and enriching experiences.

7. Do you believe that sociolinguistics is being sufficiently represented in your University's study plans? How? On what levels? Undergraduate or Master's? How has this presence evolved?

Not enough, but I also understand that after the reduction from five to four years with the arrival of other courses, all subjects had to reduce their offers in study plans. In the English Studies course at the University of Murcia we have a 6 credit course called 1565 Language, Society and Varieties of English, offered as an elective in the 4th semester, and which is a traditional English sociolinguistic and dialectology course, although we address something in the mandatory 1550 History of the English Language and 1599 History of the English Language II. When the study plan was five years, we had 12 credits in Sociolinguistics on one hand and Varieties of English on the other, which is now reduced to 6 credits in the above mentioned. In the course of Spanish Language and Literature it also has as sociolinguistic component 1296 Social Varieties of Spanish, besides 1290 Dialectal Varieties of Spanish and 1291 Spanish of America. But, unfortunately, in the course of French Studies and Classical Philology there is nothing, I suppose because they do not see as a priority in their offer.

In our Academic Master's Degree in Theoretical and Applied Linguistics (MALTA), we have two subjects on this subject: the mandatory 5946 Language and Society and the electives 5970 Lines and Methods of Linguistic Research and Change and Variation, 5972 Linguistic Planning and Legislation, 5973 Diglossia and Levels of Language: the Situation of Ancient Greek and Modern Greek, and 5971 Linguistic Anthropology, which supposes a great offer from two different sociolinguistic directions.

8. A question for the controversy: there are their attitudes among Hispanic (and non-Hispanic) sociolinguists because some think that sociolinguistics supposes an epistemological break with the previous linguistics, while others think that it is a consequence of dialectology, what do you think about it?

*I believe it's a bit of everything. In my opinion, four motivations gave rise to the emergence of sociolinguistics in the sixties of the twentieth century: i) dissatisfaction among many linguists with the previous paradigms of Bloomfield, Saussure and Chomsky, ii) the reformulation and redefinition of Traditional Dialectology after the processes of industrialization and urbanization, iii) the growing interest in sociolinguistics and social problems and, finally, iv) the quantitative revolution itself led by the neo-positivist and determinist current, of which Labov and Trudgill were participants. This is a time on which I have invested with Manuel Almeida in our book *Metodología de Investigación Sociolingüística* (Comares, 2005) and with Peter Trudgill in *Diccionario de Sociolingüística* (Gredos, 2007). One of the main causes of the development of socio-culturally contextualized studies, following the epistemological inertia of the quantitative revolution, were found in the structuralist and generativist conceptions themselves; specifically, in the generalized feeling of dissatisfaction with the explanations and interpretations offered by those conceptions to the new problems raised. The Sausurian dichotomy language/parole, later perfected with the chomskyan of competence/performance, centered its study on the formal traits of a systematically homogeneous language and on the competence of the ideal speaker, deliberately ignoring the heterogeneity of the parole and the performance of the speaker, which, however, is what Sociolinguistics sought - hence the reaction. That is, before the emergence of Sociolinguistics, linguists focused on micro-linguistics, the systematic homogeneity of language and the competence of the speaker, intentionally ignoring the macro linguistic level with regularly heterogeneous speech, its variation and the performance of the speaker. Another fundamental concept against which sociolinguists reacted was the Bloomfieldian notion of 'free variation', which normally offered itself to the phenomena of variation, and which, in addition to avoiding having to face the supposed inability to manage them, implied sustaining that, in fact, there is no reason to choose one variant over another among the range of possibilities available for a given linguistic form within the verbal repertoire of the speaker. In other words, one can use any of the variants indistinctly. However, the sociolinguistic approach to these phenomena has defended and empirically found that there is no 'free variation' as such, but rather social and/or contextually conditioned variation, where each variant should be described in terms of frequency of use,*

taking into account social and/or contextual factors. There was a logical reaction against this theoretical model that resulted in a fundamental change: from the notion of a systematically homogeneous speech community to the notion of a regularly heterogeneous speech community. It was mainly from the 1970s when, thanks to the collaboration of social scientists and the presumption of the heterogeneous nature of language communities, some linguists became interested in the forgotten macro linguistic, external linguistics, and decided to address the complex realities of language use in society, using the levels of micro linguistic analysis (phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics) as linguistic variants.

On the other hand, while this was happening in the field of general Linguistics, it is no less true that traditional Dialectology was undergoing a process of redefinition and reformulation of its theoretical principles, on the one hand, and of updating the methods and techniques employed, on the other. Thus, it is appropriate to speak of a transformation in theoretical tasks: from the study of dialects and their description to the study of their nature. The focus placed by traditional Dialectology on the study of the variation present in language from a geographical perspective coinciding with that of Human Geography of those moments prior to 1960, which was concerned with 'regions', with 'difference' and 'distinction' as the most outstanding features of its objects of study. That is, instead of focusing on spatial projects or structures, they analyzed the areas individually, seeking their unique characteristics, and with such independence from those around them. In fact, the acronym NORMS (Nonmobile Older Rural Male Speakers) accurately sums up their obsession: the desire for the search for more 'pure' or 'authentic' dialects of the most remote times led us to think that the informants should be the older male speakers (over sixty years old) and the more isolated rural areas (peasants), with poor school education and scarce travel experience. This did not lead them beyond obtaining inaccurate and imperfect descriptions of the speech of the different areas observed, and so young native speakers from a particular region were often surprised to discover that the speech recorded by dialectologists in field studies of their region was completely foreign to something that remotely might seem familiar to them. By limiting their dialectal studies to rural areas, they were ignoring the speech of the vast majority of the population, i.e., the speech of large urban areas, which could hardly be researched by applying the methods of traditional rural dialectology. And it is that, when the modernization of society generated, with the arrival of industrialization, the succeeding processes of urbanization in the fifties, the insistence on the linguistic description of the rural world lacked meaning, or at least was representatively incomplete, especially when the immense majority of the population was now located in the city, where what prevailed was

differentiation and social variation more than geographical. Thus, urban dialectology appeared combining both linguistic and social functions.

Similarly, in the 1950s and 1960s, the Western model of society was also undergoing a process of global modernization through the correspondents of industrialization and urbanization: the process of urbanization was linked to the emergence of cities, to the detriment of rural areas, as focal points of industrial development. But the inadequacies of this process caused a whole series of social problems in large urban centers. Sociology, which emerged in the sixties as an academic discipline, was then the one that provoked the interest of linguists and educators in western industrialized countries for all those aspects with a social content, concretely for the relations between language and social marginalization, and for the use of its methodology in research on this. Thus, issues such as language and social class in the United Kingdom; language and race in the United States; language and immigration in the former Federal Republic of Germany and other European countries; linguistic attitudes; sexism in language; language policy and language planning in the new multilingual nation states that emerged in Europe after the Second World War, etc.

However, as an argument in Sociolinguistic Styles (Wiley-Blackwell, 2016), Sociolinguistics in absolute emerges from the social philosophy of its time. The Kuhnian thesis on the epistemological rupture motivated by the scientific revolution and the consequent adoption of a new paradigm is a fact evident here. It is, above all, from the Second World War onwards, that the crisis of historicist conceptions and the emergence of a solid neo-positivist current in the world of science in general takes place, first in the Anglo-North American world and then in other countries, which will be the so-called 'quantitative revolution'. A confrontation between the quantitative and the qualitative is then produced in which theories, methods and techniques of work are opposed and, above all, two different conceptions of scientific research. The starting point of the neo-positivist conception of scientific work is always empirical, experiential and profoundly anti-idealistic, in which no type of knowledge derived from pure reason or a priori judgment is recognized as valid except the probability of truth: i) of scientific laws - they are universal and persist outside of space-time; ii) the data provided by the scientific method are objective, given that the research is neutral and aseptic; and iii) all science has the same objectives: explanation, prediction and control with its own system for the generation of knowledge, which will be the formulation of hypothesis through the hypothetical-deductive procedure and contrastation through observation and experimentation. In order to express with precision and clarity the results of scientific research, the use of mathematical language and logic, which are

conceived as an authentic syntax of science, is required, thus, the verifiability of a fundamental criterion. This supposes a rejection of intuition and introspective knowledge, so in vogue around the middle of the 20th century, for considering it a power of knowledge with less guarantees of objectivity. The researcher must be fundamentally, and by vocation, a man of the field and not of the armchair, of which the claim of William Labov, that is, the risk of losing contact with the living reality is considered very high. But this interest in the application of logical systems to the empirical material proposed by the quantitative revolution has affected both Natural and Social Sciences of the moment.

9. Another question for the controversy: there are scholars who think that the so-called third wave (attention to the specific speaker) may mean a return to paradigms of studies close to dialectology. What is your opinion on this?

Perhaps so, but not only closer to Dialectology, but somehow directed towards - or rescuing - the models and theoretical conceptions prior to Sociolinguistics in general. In this epistemological progress since the origins of Sociolinguistics, a theoretical and methodological evolution has been carried out from the most deterministic and system-centered approaches to the recent socio-constructivist and speaker-centered approaches and their voluntary and creative action, shifting the focus of attention from the collectivity to individuality; from the generality of statistical media to the singularity of the deviation from the mean; from the accumulative patterns of conduct of the average speaker in large-scale studies with immense amounts of data to the individual use of the 'case study'; from the reactive to the agentive or creative; from the responsive to the initiated or proactive. In fact, the concept of 'authentic' has changed: it began with Labov as a non-negotiable methodological condition in sociolinguistic research through his model of linguistic variation of deterministic foundation for the observation of everyday natural speech produced by spontaneous speakers of the pure vernacular - that is: 'authentic' as synonymous with 'prototypical'/'pattern' and passive (reactive) - now, on the contrary, with recent socio-constructivist theories, authenticity is understood as 'different' ('non-idiosyncratic') and proactive, as Barbara Johnstone, Mary Bucholtz, and Nik Coupland point out. Similarly, and to the same extent, in stylistic variation studies the same evolution has also been given to the treatment of linguistic performance, rhetorical posture and identity projection, among other effects. In other words, it has a very intuitive and qualitative component, contrary to the objectivity sought by Labovian empirical models, which certainly prevailed before the emergence of Sociolinguistics, which can be understood as a resumption of precepts.

Having practiced both, I would argue that, in addition to traditional large-scale studies, 'case studies' are very useful, in a complementary way, but not as an alternative. After observing speech communities, placing a concrete interviewee under the microscope lens can be very revealing, such as the concepts of 'community of practice', 'speaker design', 'agency' and 'authenticity' within the framework of the socio-constructionist theories being demonstrated. However, as a complement to where macro-studies cannot arrive, because these individual cases, which are usually media characters, are not the common of mere mortals in terms of representativeness.

10. What do you think about the techniques and methods used in sociolinguistics? After nearly 60 years of initial studies, should they be modified, expanded or retouched?

Theoretical and methodological evolution is inevitable because technological innovations provide us with new tools for data collection or analysis, and social systems, their conduct and values also change. Since the Sociolinguistics Congress held in 1964 at UCLA Center for Research in Languages and Linguistics, the first congress focused on this field, many new concepts and new theories have emerged from Sociolinguistics, since there are new problems to solve, new worries, new methodologies and, certainly, new techniques for obtaining data and more sophisticated resources for their recording, as well as new statistical analysis tools for the estimation of meaning and reliability of the results in relation to interpretation and theoretical implications. With the traditional theories of the 19th century and the free variation theory of structuralists as a legacy received, Sociolinguistics has evolved considerably in theoretical and methodological terms in the last decades: from the assumption of socially conditioned variation, with the sociolecto, el generolecto, el cronolecto, social media, the linguistic market, accommodation theory, dialectometry and geolinguistic gravity models, to the most recent socio-constructionist theories of public design, speaker design, script design, or optimization; from armchair linguistics to field linguistics; from initial face-to-face interviews to email questionnaires, from Traditional Dialectology to telephone interviews and web questionnaires via Google or Facebook, from the most recent Variationist Sociolinguistics; from indiscriminate recording to ethics in fieldwork; from covert and manifested linguistic loyalty or prestige from the Social Psychology of Language to the mental maps of Perceptive Dialectology; from Historical Sociolinguistics to Corpus Linguistics; etc. or from basic statistics, from VarBrul and SPSS to R Language of now.

- The role of statistical analysis in sociolinguistics is also controversial. Some scholars think that it is becoming a formal apparatus that can make vision difficult and that it is falling into defects similar to those of other formalistic linguistic schools, what is your opinion about the role of statistics in sociolinguistic studies?

I totally agree. Statistics should be a tool, or a means, for our analysis and interpretation of large amounts of data, not the end.

- Could you summarize any of your most recent research / publications? What are you dedicating yourself to now?

*The most recent research I have been dedicating myself to at the moment is on stylistic variation, which resulted in the book *Sociolinguistic Styles* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2016), as well as the application of current diaphasic models to the private corpus of correspondence from the medieval English past. In the book, I highlight that the history of scientific revolutions has shown that the adoption of new paradigms is always based on an earlier stage from which they begin, but against which they usually react. Thus, sociolinguistics and its studies of stylistic variation have also been no strangers to the philosophical currents and social theory of their time. In the Labovian foundational postulates of the 60s of the last century (20th), the proper thought of Determinism and Neopositivism was installed, which witnessed the speaker as a totally predictable automaton and predestined from regular, universal and socially structural patterns of sociolinguistic variation and only observable in an objective reality from the scientific method. However, more recently, Socio-constructivism and Relativism are the new foundations of 21st century Sociolinguistics, which profile the speaker as an active, autonomous and unpredictable subject participating in the construction, perception and interpretation of his multiple realities and the projection of his multiple identities through his stylistic options and linguistic uses in interpersonal communication. In the context of antirealistic, relativistic and interpretive thinking, stylistic resources in linguistic production constitute a deliberate strategic initiative for the creation and projection of one's own identity and image at the interpersonal level. For this reason, the new approaches to the phenomenon of stylistic variation in Sociolinguistics are developing a more multidimensional, interdisciplinary characterization, deepening the social meaning of language and its capacity as an indentured and ideological resource, by understanding it not simply as a means of communicating information, but also as an exceptional means of establishing and maintaining social relations, as well as, crucially, transmitting information about the speaker*

himself. Although I continue to investigate aspects of historical stylistic and sociolinguistic variation, we are planning new fronts for our Research Group at the University of Murcia: sociolinguistics and teaching, lingua franca, regional varieties, etc. There are more design ideas than time.

11. Do you consider that there are areas for the study of variation that have not yet been developed or received little attention?

Of course. Sociolinguistic research is very prolific and, every day, it focuses on new aspects and fields. It is enough to see how tremendously productive literature is in our field of study, and we do not have time to follow everything, since it is very broad in its different directions. And also how popular are congresses in this specialty, such as the Sociolinguistics Symposium or the New Ways of Analyzing Variation, which attests to the impetus and vitality of Sociolinguistics (although unfortunately it is more outside our borders than in Spain).

12. Do you believe you formed a school: theses, followers, shared articles, etc.?

I don't think I graduated from school (nor would I have this perspective yet to say), and especially and fortunately because we still have our founders of the discipline active and making research more dynamic. I still see myself more immersed in the Trudgillian school than the leader of a Campoyan school. As I said before, I have enjoyed and sought a lot for teamwork with many different colleagues, understanding that the publications emanating from the joint work always constitute the most enriching and comforting experiences due to the contrast they provide.

13. Finally, this volume is dedicated to sociolinguistics and teaching, what kind of relationship is established between them, in your opinion?

I think there is a strong relation between sociolinguistics and the teaching of both mother tongues and second languages (foreign language) and it is something on which not much - at least not enough - has been worked on and not given the importance it deserves; especially for its possible applications in teaching and in the elaboration of teaching materials, still very sociolinguistically insensitive, as we addressed in our article for this issue (for which I congratulate you for being timely and necessary).

How to reference this interview

SANDES, Egisvanda Isys de Almeida; MANJÓN-CABEZA CRUZ, Antonio; MOLINA ORTÉS, Elena Fernández de. Entrevista com o sociolinguista Juan Manuel Hernández-Campoy. **Rev. EntreLínguas**, Araraquara, v. 6, n. 1, p. 22-36, jan./jun., 2020. e-ISSN: 2447-3529. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29051/el.v6i1.13728>

Submitted: 07/30/2019

Revisions required on: 08/30/2019

Accepted: 11/30/2019

Published on: 06/01/2020

